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STRATEGIC ROADMAP
PAST AND PRESENT
Previous 2014 Plan

1. Guide technical audiences around mobile appsec risks
2. Publish a list that prioritizes what organizations should address for mobile app risks
3. Establish the group as an authoritative source for mobile technical guidance that is trustworthy to technical communities
   - Follow an evidence-based (rather than purely prescriptive) approach to recommendations
     - Generate / gather vulnerability data by January 2014
     - Gather feedback from OWASP community over 90 days
Successes of 2014 Plan

Objective Outcomes for 2014:

- Data was successfully gathered by January 2014;
- Data was successfully grouped and presented AppSec Cali 2014
- List was finalized in August 2014

Strategic Outcomes for 2014:

- Publication of list was achieved;
- An evidence-based approach to data collection was executed

Goal Outcomes for 2014:

- Guiding technical audiences around mobile risk achieved
Lessons Learned From 2014 Plan

1. Goal of providing clear guidance was a partial success
   - Grouping vulnerabilities and attaining consensus is difficult
   - Difficulty in understanding who exactly are the primary audiences

2. Goal of establishing legitimacy was a partial success
   - Not enough data sources / transparency in data analysis
   - Not enough inclusion of other OWASP projects
2015 Strategic / Objective Plan

1. Clarify who is using the list and why:
   ◆ Formally analyze the users to help clarify the way the list should be organized and presented

2. Improve transparency of data / existing processes in group:
   ◆ Increase number of data contributors and their diversity
   ◆ Provide greater transparency of data / data analysis

3. Increase outreach:
   ◆ Engage / promote other OWASP projects within list
   ◆ Promote more feedback opportunities
MARKET ANALYSIS

Q: Who is using the list and why?

Answering this question helps clarify how to group things and present solutions.
What is your current role?

- Software Engineer
- Quality Assurance
- Security Specialist
- CISO / CSO / CRO
- Security Manager
- Security Architect...
- Penetration Tester
- Compliance
- Operations / Depl...
- Other
Do you see value in having an OWASP Mobile Top 10 list?

- Yes: 180 (95.2%)
- No: 1 (0.5%)
- Undecided: 8 (4.2%)

Who do you think would benefit the most from utilizing it within your organization?

- Security Tests: 75
- Software Engineering: 44
- Software Architecture: 39
- Operations: 4
- Compliance: 9
- C-Level Executives: 9
- Other: 5
If you believe it is of value, what is its greatest value?

Guiding prioritization of vulnerability remediation 42  22.7%
Maintaining compliance 4  2.2%
Establishing testing methodologies 35  18.9%
Training and security awareness 76  41.1%
Ensuring vendors think about security 26  14.1%
Other 2  1.1%
Q: What does the latest vulnerability data suggest?

Answering this question helps clarify what the list can afford to drop or introduce.
Participants

cigital
bugcrowd
HackLabs
X FORCE
MetaIntelli™
securenetwork
VERACODE
pure hacking
WhiteHat Security
HP
ARXAN
KRvW Associates, LLC
Information Security -- Consulting and Training Services
OWASP
Volume Adjusted Vulnerability Distribution

- M1: 6%
- M2: 17%
- M3: 16%
- M4: 13%
- M5: 6%
- M6: N/A
- M7: 13%
- M8: 13%
- M9: 13%
- M10: 19%

Total: 100%
Volume Bias of Submitted Data
Focus Bias

- N/A: No Appropriate Category
- M9: Improper Session Handling
- M8: Security Decisions Via Untrusted Inputs
- M7: Client Side Injection
- M6: Broken Cryptography
- M5: Poor Authorization and Authentication
- M4: Unintended Data Leakage
- M3: Insufficient Transport Layer Protection
- M2: Insecure Data Storage
- M10: Lack of Binary Protections
Focus and Volume Bias Adjusted Vulnerability Distribution Across All Datasets

- Weights w/Bias
- Bias Adjusted
Potential Data Bias from Products

- Products used to automate analysis results can also skew results:
  - Static code analysis rules (ease with which to report on things found in source code)
  - Dynamic analysis rules (ease with which to report on runtime behaviors)
Views Per Category

- M1: Weak Server Side Controls
- M10: Lack of Binary Protections
- M2: Insecure Data Storage
- M3: Insufficient Transport Layer Protection
- M4: Unintended Data Leakage
- M5: Poor Authorization and Authentication
- M6: Broken Cryptography
- M7: Client Side Injection
- M8: Security Decisions Via Untrusted Inputs
- M9: Improper Session Handling
INSIGHTS FROM THE ANALYSIS
Key Observations

1. People believe the MTT is valuable and will serve Software Engineers and Pen Testers the most
   – Security awareness / training primarily
   – Remediation prioritization secondarily

2. Substantial number of findings that don’t currently have a home:
   – code-quality / stability issues

3. Some categories are
   – M1 <-> M7; M2 <-> M4; M8

4. There are many categories that aren’t being reported very often:
   – M1; M6; M7; M8; M9
Safe Bets...

1. Categories least often used will get axed
2. M2, M3, and M4 are definitely working and will stay but probably tweaked further
3. M10 will be included but overhauled based on lots of feedback
4. New category will be added to take into account code-quality / stability issues
5. Categories will become less ambiguous
6. Categories will be presented differently for each audience (pen tester; engineer; consumer; etc.)
Next Steps

• Analysis is now complete
• Group is currently meeting to debate new groupings / tweaks to existing content
• After release candidate is formulated, conduct 90-day review cycle with formal market analysis

Would you like to join the debate?
Join the OWASP Mobile Top Ten mailing list!

Subscribe:
owasp-mobile-top-10-risks@owasp.org