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The OWASP Top Ten

• The OWASP Top 10 provides a list of the 10 Most Critical Web Application Security Risks. (since 2004)

• Project members include a variety of security experts from around the world who have shared their expertise to produce this list.

• This list is meant to spread awareness regarding Web Security issues. It is not a standard.

• https://www.owasp.org/index.php/Category:OWASP_Top_Ten_Project
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OWASP Top 10 - 2013</th>
<th>OWASP Top 10 - 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A2 – Broken Authentication and Session Management</td>
<td>A2:2017-Broken Authentication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3 – Cross-Site Scripting (XSS)</td>
<td>A3:2017-Sensitive Data Exposure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6 – Sensitive Data Exposure</td>
<td>A6:2017-Security Misconfiguration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A8 – Cross-Site Request Forgery (CSRF)</td>
<td>A8:2017-Insecure Deserialization [NEW, Community]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A9 – Using Components with Known Vulnerabilities</td>
<td>A9:2017-Using Components with Known Vulnerabilities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OWASP Top Ten (2017)

1. Injection
2. Broken Authentication and Session Management
3. Sensitive Data Exposure
4. XML External Entity (XXE)
5. Broken Access Control
6. Security Misconfiguration
7. Cross-Site Scripting (XSS)
8. Insecure Deserialization
9. Using Known Vulnerable Components
10. Insufficient Logging and Monitoring
OWASP Application Security Verification Standard 3.0
The OWASP Application Security Verification Standard (ASVS) Project provides a basis for testing web application technical security controls and also provides developers with a list of requirements for secure development.

The primary aim of the **OWASP Application Security Verification Standard (ASVS) Project** is to normalize the range in the coverage and level of rigor available in the market when it comes to performing Web application security verification using a commercially-workable open standard.

**Use as a metric** - Provide application developers and application owners with a yardstick with which to assess the degree of trust that can be placed in their Web applications.

**Use as guidance** - Provide guidance to security control developers as to what to build into security controls in order to satisfy application security requirements, and

**Use during procurement** - Provide a basis for specifying application security verification requirements in contracts.
ASVS MAIN GOALS

• to help organizations develop and maintain secure applications

• to allow security service, security tools vendors, and consumers to align their requirements and offerings
The Application Security Verification Standard defines three security verification levels, with each level increasing in depth.

- ASVS Level 1 is meant for all software.

- ASVS Level 2 is for applications that contain sensitive data, which requires protection.

- ASVS Level 3 is for the most critical applications - applications that perform high value transactions, contain sensitive medical data, or any application that requires the highest level of trust.
Application Security Verification Standard 3.0

- First application security standard by developers, for developers
- Defines three risk levels with around 150 controls
- Similar but not the same: ISO 27034
Application Security Verification Standard 3.0

- Level 1: Baseline
- Minimum required for all apps
- Mostly fully testable
- Mostly automatable
- 82 Controls
Application Security Verification Standard 3.0

- Level 2: Standard
- Suitable for sensitive data
- About 75% testable
- Somewhat automatable
- 139 Controls
Application Security Verification Standard 3.0

• Level 3: Comprehensive
• Suitable for critical apps
• Mostly testable, but many more manual verifications required
• Not amenable to automation
• 154 Controls
### Security Verification Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>L1</th>
<th>L2</th>
<th>L3</th>
<th>Since</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>All app components are identified and known to be needed.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Security controls are never enforced only on the client side, but on the respective remote endpoints.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>A high-level architecture for the application and all connected remote services has been defined and security has been addressed in that architecture.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>Data considered sensitive in the context of the application is clearly identified.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>All app components are defined in terms of the business functions and/or security functions they provide.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>A threat model for the application and the associated remote services has been produced that identifies potential threats and countermeasures.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>All security controls have a centralized implementation.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>Components are segregated from each other via a defined security control, such as network segmentation, firewall rules, or cloud based security groups.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>A mechanism for enforcing updates of the application exists.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>Security is addressed within all parts of the software development lifecycle.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>All application components, libraries, modules, frameworks, platform, and operating systems are free from known vulnerabilities</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>3.0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>There is an explicit policy for how cryptographic keys (if any) are managed, and the lifecycle of cryptographic keys is enforced. Ideally, follow a key management standard such as NIST SP 800-57.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>Threat Profile</td>
<td>L1 Recommendation</td>
<td>L2 Recommendation</td>
<td>L3 Recommendation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance and Insurance</td>
<td>Although this segment will experience attempts from opportunistic attackers, it is often viewed as a high value target by motivated attackers and attacks are often financially motivated. Commonly, attackers are looking for sensitive data or account credentials that can be used to commit fraud or to benefit directly by leveraging money movement functionality built into applications. Techniques often include stolen credentials, application-level attacks, and social engineering. Some major compliance considerations include Payment Card Industry Data Security Standard (PCI DSS), Gramm Leach Bliley Act and Sarbanes-Oxley Act (SOX).</td>
<td>All network accessible applications.</td>
<td>Applications that contain sensitive information like credit card numbers, personal information, that can move limited amounts of money in limited ways. Examples include: (i) transfer money between accounts at the same institution or (ii) a slower form of money movement (e.g. ACH) with transaction limits or (iii) wire transfers with hard transfer limits within a period of time.</td>
<td>Applications that contain large amounts of sensitive information or that allow either rapid transfer of large sums of money (e.g. wire transfers) and/or transfer of large sums of money in the form of individual transactions or as a batch of smaller transfers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Where can I get a copy of ASVS, and talk to people using ASVS?

• You can download a copy from the ASVS Project page:
  – http://www.owasp.org/index.php/ASVS

• You can send comments and suggestions for improvement using the project mailing list:
  – See “Mailing List/Subscribe” link on project web page.
  – Tell us how your organization is using the OWASP ASVS. Include your name, organization's name, and brief description of how you are using the ASVS
THANK YOU!

Joe Blanchard  
Cyber & Application Security Lead  
Allstate  
joe.blanchard@allstate.com  
joe.blanchard@owasp.org  
Office: 618-409-8535  

LinkedIn: https://www.linkedin.com/in/joe-blanchard-499bb918/  
Twitter: xmoxxen
Take 10.

Grab a drink!
Chapter Goals

• Commit to at least quarterly meetings
• Find stable locations for meetings
• Find great speakers!
• Publicize the chapter and recruit new members
• Keep the chapter non-commercial
Frequency & Type of Meetups

• Quarterly or Bi-Monthly
• Night of the Week (Mon, Tue, Thur)
• Speakers (Full Length, Mini Talks?)
• In Depth or High Overview
• CTF & Labs

• Study Groups/Sessions
Enhancing the committee!

- Leadership Roles
  - Chapter Lead x2
  - Venue Chair & Assistant
  - Speaker Chair & Assistant
  - Sponsor Chair & Assistant
  - Communications Chair
Appsec: Midwest 2019

- St. Louis Chapter has been invited to participate
- Seeking a volunteer(s) to service on committees
- Will receive a portion of the proceeds
- Looking to be May/June of 2019