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TOPICAL REVIEW OF VULNERABILITY MANAGEMENT FOR LOCAL HAMPTON ROADS INDUSTRY

By Greg Hubbard* and Matthew Eunice

NOMENCLATURE

CVE – Common Vulnerabilities and Exposures

I. INTRODUCTION

Cyber security can be summarized as a two-party strategic battle between attacking “threats” and defending networks/systems. Cyber threats are constantly evolving to exploit weaknesses in cyber systems. Once manipulated, a threat (e.g. virus) can have devastating monetary or physical effects. To counteract these threats, defense involves the independent patching and constant update of used systems. Specifically, the study of vulnerability management concerns the prediction and identification of potential areas of cyber attack.

II. HISTORY OF CYBER SECURITY AWARENESS

The principles of electronic hacking first began in the late 1800’s as innocuous practical-joke-manipulating phone calls (“History of Hacking”). These pranks usually consisted of tinkering

* This research is supported in part under NSF grant DGE-1723635.
with telephone switchboards, which could disconnect or misdirect calls. One of the first “hacks”
recorded was reported by Bell Telephone in 1878 when a group of teenage boys hired to operate
switch boards intentionally interfered with calls (“History of Hacking”).

Nearly 80 years later, the first authentic computer hackers began to “hack” using witty
shortcuts to compute tasks quickly. At this time, the audience for computational design was
primarily a tight knit community of computer engineers and related fields. These early pioneers
in programming had to adapt to specific hardware mainframes for software development.
Additionally, functional tooling that we take for granted in today’s programing environment, for
example, “Save function, copy function, paste function,” occasionally failed, thereby resulting in
loss of full days of work. Due to these primitive issues, computer engineers in the 1960’s were
trained to become very innovative in their development. One of these innovations was created
by two employees of Bell Lab, Dennis Ritchie and Ken Thompson, called UNIX. This
“shortcut” hack was used to act as an open set of rules to run machines on a large scale ("The

The modern history of cybersecurity has evolved alongside network development dating
back to the 1970’s. Bob Thomas at Bolt, Beranek, and Newman Inc. realized it was possible to
spread programs across a network in 1971. An experimental program developed for the
ARPANET was used to print the message “I'M THE CREEPER: CATCH ME IF YOU CAN”
across the network.
“CREEPER is a demonstration program which can migrate from computer to computer within the ARPA network while performing its simple task.”


The CREEPER program was an experimental self-replicating program destined to demonstrate a mobile application. Ray Tomlinson, a colleague of Bob Thomas, recognized (perhaps unintentionally) the dangers of a self replicating “Creeper.” He created a companion program coined “Reaper” which was designed to terminate instances of “Creepers” on the ARPAnet (“Core War: Creeper and Reaper”).

Thus, if Creeper is considered the first network-based virus, Reaper was the first anti-virus software. This prospect of two programs actively spawning and eliminating each other inspired A. K. Dewdney’s Core War, with “two programs doing battle in the dark and noiseless corridors of core” (Dewdney, 1984).
History of Cyber Security Awareness

Though the first computers were engineered in the 1930s, everyday computers were first developed in the 1980s. The release of IBM’s 5150 Personal Computer revolutionized the technological world (“The Evolution of Technology in the Classroom”, 2017). Between the years 1980 and 1986, the number of computers used in the United States increased from around one million to over 30 million units (“History of Hacking”). At this time, the concept of interfering or “hacking” was a very foreign topic. In 1983, however, a movie called “War Games,” brought popularity to the idea of hackers operating on a grand scale (“History of Hacking”).

Awareness Over The Past 10 Years

Today, nearly everyone is accustomed—at least to the premise—of computer viruses; however, the magnitude of danger is oftentimes overlooked. According to the Microsoft Security Intelligence Report, 40% of households in the United States are infected by malware. The estimated cost of all individual users can be estimated to be around $4.55 billion. Despite these shocking statistics, cyberspace is still a non-cooperative dynamic environment for both personal and organizational workers alike.
III. PREVENTING CYBER ATTACKS

Prevention Practice

Cyberattacks are often opportunistic responses to vulnerabilities in computer defenses. A vulnerability by definition is “the quality or state of being exposed to the possibility of being attacked or harmed.” In the field of cybersecurity, a vulnerability is a weakness in a system’s design that may potentially allow malicious entry. Common vulnerabilities are documented in the Common Vulnerabilities and Exposures (CVE) database. Automated tools are used to look for vulnerabilities under the process of vulnerability scanning. These scans search for issues in a system that could lead to backdoor, denial-of-service, direct-access, eavesdropping, polymorphic, phishing, privilege escalation, social engineering, spoofing, or tampering attacks.

CVE Database

The Common Vulnerabilities and Exposures (CVE) provide a dictionary set of known security vulnerabilities and exposures. In the field of vulnerability management, CVE has become the de facto standard for uniquely identifying vulnerabilities (Adinolfi, 2017). Individual vulnerabilities are correlated with a specific ID and are labeled with correlating information between security protocols and services. Due to the fluid nature of cyber vulnerabilities, the CVE can never preemptively predict a source vulnerability (Adinolfi).
Fig. 2. Sample CVE database entry shown. Notice the specific CVE-ID (CVE-2017-8538).

http://corewar.co.uk/creeper.htm

Scanners

Inspection of “weaknesses” in a computer system is conventionally done by automated scanners. Scanners are computer programs designed to search for known flaws using a dictionary set (e.g. CVE). The key point of the scanner is best summarized by Cristian Florian, Product Manager at GFI Software, who remarks that:

A vulnerability scan outlines the gates that malware can use to reach the network. Some of these gates are easy to detect and remediate because they are represented by vulnerabilities that have been disclosed to the public and for which a security update is available. In this case all that’s necessary to close the vulnerability is to apply the security patch. However, vulnerability scanning also outlines security misconfigurations, open ports, running services, open shares and other security sensitive information that
collectively help administrators to detect and close unnecessary services in order to minimize the attack surface and provide protection from zero-day exploits.

**GFI LanGuard**

GFI LanGuard is a proprietary scanning software designed for the Network Security on small to medium-sized business. Once initialized, the GFI LanGuard scans each IP in the local network. While scanning, LanGuard automatically detects specific vulnerabilities on the network. Specifically, the scanner reports information on service level of the machine, security patch information, wireless access points, USB devices, key registry entries, weak passwords, and other relevant security solutions.

![Sample GFI LandGaurd Scan](image)

**Fig. 3.** Sample GFI LandGaurd Scan shown. Note that the network scanned is at high danger of exploitation based on automated scan.
Network Scan Example

In industry practice, the vulnerability management processes shown above can be briefly consolidated into the steps shown below. An executive report showing network vulnerability levels, most vulnerable computers, agent status, vulnerability trends, and additional relevant information on operating systems is displayed by the first scan of GFI LanGuard.

Vulnerability Status Test

Using a single workstation as an example host for vulnerabilities, the practice of identifying potential threats can be clearly seen.

![Vulnerability Distribution by Severity](image1)

![Vulnerability Distribution by Computer](image2)

Fig. 4. Sample GFI LandGaurd Scan for local network labeled (MEUNICE-7510)

![Pie Chart](image3)

Fig. 5. Sample GFI LandGaurd Scan with threat resolution shown in a pie diagram.

This initial portion of the GFI LandGard scan offers the user a clear understanding of the severity of threats on the network. The classification of vulnerability concerns adheres to their Common Vulnerabilities and Exposures (CVE) database itemization. The classification of high, medium,
low, and potential vulnerabilities are enumerated by CVSS according to CVSS documentation version 3.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>CVSS Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>0.1-3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>4.0-6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>7.0-8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical</td>
<td>9.0-10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 6. Enumerated CVSS scores using Ratings vs. CVSS Scores.

A vulnerability description of respective high (13), medium (5), low (2), and potential (2) issues are shown below:

Fig. 7. High ranking (9.3) vulnerability found on test station

Fig. 8. Medium ranking (4.3) vulnerability found on test station

Fig. 9. Low ranking (NA) vulnerability found on test station
Fig. 10. Potential (NA) vulnerability found on test station

In practice, the given classification of vulnerabilities reflects only a loose assessment of actual issues. The enumerated classification of vulnerability depends on the value of the system. For example, a critical vulnerability on a low value asset will often rank lower than unimportant vulnerability on a high value asset. The CVSS ranking takes into account the fluid nature of such vulnerabilities.

**AWARE Program**

Beginning in 2020, the US government will mandate an enforced cyber vulnerability analysis on all government agencies (Nycezepir, 2019). This mandate will rank agencies based on an algorithm calculated according to the number of scanned vulnerabilities, unpatched configurations, and overall cyber hygiene reports. This algorithm is appropriately coined AWARE or Agency-Wide Adaptive Risk Enumeration. Kevin Cox, the current program manager of Homeland Security’s Department of Continuous Diagnostic and Mitigation, claims that the AWARE initiative will allow governing officials “to have a scale as to what agencies are doing well, what agencies might need some additional support, and help get us a sense of one of the most important factors in combating the threat: basic cyber hygiene—getting things patched, getting things configured (Nextgov, 2018).”
Bridge to The Community

While the federal security is the foremost concern of a nation, related layaways must be embedded in the community. Hampton Roads has always been a region heavily dependent on government contracts. While this symbiotic relationship is incredibly vested in the community, local businesses must be prepared to act independently as the federal procurement dwindles. Small businesses must be given specific attention as they lack the outstanding infrastructure and resources given to large corporations. To make matters worse, Hampton Roads is currently facing an extreme shortage of cyber security workers. Larry Filer, associate professor of the Economics Department at Old Dominion University states, “[local] companies often need to look outside the state and region to fill open positions (Carballo, 2018).” According to The Virginian Pilot—the local press newspaper—Hampton Roads is faced with a dynamic issue with filling cyber security jobs in the private sector due to a low supply of workers and low cyber industry awareness (Carballo, 2018). This incredibly high demand for knowledgeable workers has forced local companies to employ university students in positions normally reserved for candidates with years of experience.

IV. CONCLUSION

Software vulnerabilities provide a constantly evolving threat for computer systems. Due to the cyclical nature of vulnerabilities, it is imperative to understand the current management of such threats in anticipation for the future. In a topical overview of a local Hampton Roads cyber management group, the importance and methodologies of vulnerability management are summarized. Specifically, this overview covers the joint usage of both the CVE database and the GFI Landguard scanner.
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