

Challenges of mapping Vulnerabilities and Exposures to Open-Source Packages

Tobias Dam

St. Pölten University of Applied Sciences

St. Pölten, Austria

tobias.dam@fhstp.ac.at

Sebastian Neumaier

St. Pölten University of Applied Sciences

St. Pölten, Austria

sebastian.neumaier@fhstp.ac.at

Abstract—Much of the current software depends on open-source components, which in turn have complex dependencies on other open-source libraries. Vulnerabilities in open source therefore have potentially huge impacts. The goal of this work is to get a quantitative overview of the frequency and evolution of existing vulnerabilities in popular software repositories and package managers. To this end, we provide an up-to-date overview of the open source landscape and its most popular package managers. We discuss approaches to map entries of the Common Vulnerabilities and Exposures (CVE) list to open-source libraries. Based on this mapping approaches, we show the frequency and distribution of CVE entries with respect to popular programming languages.

Index Terms—open source, vulnerabilities, CVE, software repository

I. INTRODUCTION

According to a 2021 open-source security report by Synopsys,¹ 98% of 1,5k reviewed codebases depend on open-source components and libraries. Given the number of dependencies of medium- to large-size software projects, any vulnerability in open-source code has security implications in numerous software products and involves the risk of disclosing vulnerabilities either directly or through dependencies, as famously seen in the 2014 Heartbleed Bug,² a vulnerability in the popular OpenSSL software which exposed large parts of the existing websites at this time.

Open-source code is written in various programming languages and published in corresponding package managers. Currently, the largest package managers are the platform of the Go programming language, the NPM repository of the Node.js language, Packagist (PHP), and PyPI (Python), cf. Table I. The documentation and communication of discovered open-source vulnerabilities, however, does not take place directly at the package managers. The most important platform for discovered vulnerabilities is the Common Vulnerabilities and Exposures (CVE) list [1]. It is a dictionary and reference of common and publicly known IT system vulnerabilities, operated by the Mitre Corporation, an American non-profit institution. As such, CVE has achieved wide acceptance by

the security community and industry and provides a comprehensive list of publicly known and documented vulnerabilities. CVE is available at <http://cve.mitre.org>.

CVE is a critical source for security management, however, is to some extent an heterogeneous and unstructured source. Each vulnerability in the CVE list is identified by a unique identifier, contains a textual description and a list of references (links to relevant documentation and code repositories). However, CVE does not include structured pointers and references to package managers (e.g., NPM) and/or the source code in software repositories (e.g., Github). Therefore, CVE does not always provide enough information to get an overview of the status and evolution of existing vulnerabilities in the different software repositories and package managers.

The goal of this work is to study the open research problems when mapping CVE entries to open-source projects. To do so, we focus on the following concrete contributions:

- We provide an overview of the landscape of open-source projects and libraries in popular package managers.
- We discuss three concrete approaches to map Common Vulnerabilities and Exposures (CVE) list entries to open-source libraries and projects.
- We perform a quantitative analysis of the frequency and distribution of CVE entries corresponding to open-source libraries based on the mapping approaches.
- Eventually, we discuss identified challenges and quality issues wrt. the available data and the mapping.

The remainder of this paper is structured as follows: Section II provides an overview of the current landscape of package managers and Section III introduces the CVE list. Section IV discusses approaches on mapping open-source libraries to listed vulnerabilities, and presents the respective findings. Section V relates our research to other works and, eventually, Section VI concludes the paper.

II. OPEN SOURCE LANDSCAPE

In the context of this paper, open source refers to source code that is made available in online software repositories for use or modification. We provide an overview of the most important repositories and package managers and report important

¹ <https://www.synopsys.com/software-integrity/resources/analyst-reports/open-source-security-risk-analysis.html>, last accessed 2022-03-21

² <https://heartbleed.com/>, last accessed 2022-03-21

aspects such as the use of licenses, and the developments and growth of the vast amount of software that is available – and becomes available.

In this work, we make use of the monitoring project *Libraries.io* [2]: it monitors and crawls the meta-information of over 30 package managers and indexes data from over 5 million projects. Libraries.io provides the collected information as open data; in this paper we make use of the January 2020 dump of the Libraries.io data which is hosted on Zenodo [2].

Table I: Number of projects in top-7 package managers.

Repository	Projects	Perc.
Go	1,818,666	39.45
NPM	1,275,082	27.66
Packagist	313,278	6.80
Pypi	231,690	5.03
NuGet	199,447	4.33
Maven	184,871	4.01
Rubygems	161,608	3.51
<i>Others</i>	425,020	9.22

As shown in Table I, currently the largest package managers are the platforms of the Go programming language and the Node.js platform NPM. According to the 2020 data, the Go platform makes up even 39% of all projects indexed in Libraries.io by listing 1.8 million projects; NPM lists around 1.3 projects which amount to 28%. The *Others* category in Table I includes 25 other repositories which only sum up to 9% of all indexed projects.

a) *Licenses*: The licensing of code is a critical aspect of the open-source movement. Depending on the concrete license conditions and terms, the code is then available to download, modify, re-publish, etc. The authors of open-source projects may want to put restrictions on the use of the code, such as expression of the origin/name of the authors, copyright statements, or re-use of the concrete license. This number of conditions and restrictions led to a broad range of popular open-source software licenses.

Table II: Top-7 licenses across all packages.

License	Count	Perc
MIT	1,637,451	44.13
Apache-2.0	848,475	22.87
ISC	332,676	8.97
Other	298,626	8.05
BSD-3-Clause	140,806	3.80
GPL-3.0	63,890	1.72
MPL-2.0	51,517	1.39
<i>Others</i>	336822	9.08

In Table II we list the 7 most common licenses across all packages and repositories. The most popular license is the MIT License (44% of the projects), which is a permissive

license, i.e. it imposes only very limited restrictions on reuse and is highly compatible with other open-source licenses.³

b) *Releases and Versions*: A version in the Libraries.io data corresponds to an immutable published version of a project from a repository. Not all repositories provide the concept of publishing versions, so in these cases the tags/branches from a source control system are mapped to the existing versions.

Table III: Number of versions published at repositories in 2015 and 2019, respectively.

Repository	2015	2019
NPM	716,207	3,892,909
NuGet	210,929	614,774
Pypi	150,591	469,753
Packagist	233,643	334,059
Maven	326,089	144,813
<i>Others</i>	459,265	364,164

Table III displays the number of versions published at the monitored repositories in 2015 and 2019, respectively. We can see that the largest repository, the NPM package manager, increased considerably from 716k to 3.9 million published versions per year. Notably, the Apache Maven Repository for the Java language is the only repository whose numbers have decreased in the monitored time period. The chart in Figure 1 visualizes the rapid growth, in number of published versions, of the package managers NPM, NuGet, and PyPI; note that the y-axis is in logarithmic scale.




Figure 1: Evolution of the total number of published versions at top-5 largest repositories.

III. COMMON VULNERABILITIES AND EXPOSURES

Historically, with the increased connectivity and the commercialization of the Internet in the mid-1990s, cybersecurity research gained importance and various security vendors

³ Note that the entry “Other”, with around 8%, refers to the set of projects where “Other” is explicitly stated in the repository meta-information which indicates a custom license definition.

started to develop vulnerability monitoring strategies and documentations. In 1999, Mann and Christey [1] proposed the Common Vulnerability and Exposures (CVE) List, a public list of exposure references. The goal was to find out and document if multiple tools had identified the same vulnerabilities.

Each *CVE Identifier* in the list identifies a concrete vulnerability and gives an unique, individual name to it. New CVE identification numbers are assigned by the CVE Numbering Authorities.⁴ Typically, these authorities are software vendors, open-source projects, security researchers, and bug bounty programs. There are currently 213 partners from over 30 countries participating as authorities. Table IV displays the number of newly published CVE entries in the last 7 years. The number of entries increased from 6.6k to 22.2k new entries in the year 2021.

Table IV: Number of newly published CVE entries in recent years.

2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
6,602	6,520	18,161	18,213	19,095	20,516	22,226

CVE-Search / CVE-2021-44631	
ID	CVE-2021-44631
Summary	A Buffer Overflow vulnerability exists in TP-LINK WR-886N 20190826 2.3.8 in the /cloud_config/router_post/reset_cloud_pwd feature, which allows malicious users to execute arbitrary code on the system via a crafted post request.
References	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> https://github.com/Yu3H0/loT_CVE/tree/main/886N/resetCloudPwdRegister
Vulnerable Configurations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> cpe:2.3:o:tp-link:tl-wr886n_firmware:20190826_2.3.8:*:*:*:*:* cpe:2.3:h:tp-link:tl-wr886n-*:*:*:*:*
CVSS	Base: 10.0 (as of 12-03-2022 - 04:23) Impact: Exploitability:
CWE	CWE-120

Figure 2: Screenshot of an example CVE entry and its respective fields.

In Figure 2 we provide an example CVE entry as displayed on the *cve-search* web interface.⁵ Besides the ID and the summary of the vulnerability, a CVE entry provides relevant references (e.g., Github documentation as in Figure 2), an assessment of the severity of the vulnerability using the Common Vulnerability Scoring System (CVSS),⁶ and the Common Weakness Enumeration (CWE) taxonomy of weakness types.⁷ Additionally, the CVE entry provides Common Platform Enumerations (CPE) [3] version 2.3 string, which is a standard for identifying classes of applications, operating systems/platforms, as well as hardware information. The CPE string consists of various fields providing information such as the software name, vendor as well as the target software, which

contains the software computing environment (e.g. “node.js” or “python”).

IV. FINDINGS

In this section, we first provide details on the used data to facilitate reproducibility of our results. Then we discuss different mapping approaches and report the identified challenges.

A. Datasets

To perform this study, we use the most recent Open Data dump of the Libraries.io database⁸ – available as compressed archive of several CSV files – to obtain data about open-source repositories and respective libraries; details of the repositories are described in Section II. The Libraries.io data includes the fields NAME, PLATFORM (the package manager), ID, REPOSITORY TYPE (e.g., GitHub), REPOSITORY LINK, REPOSITORY OWNER and KEYWORDS.

We used the dockerized version of the open-source project CVE-Search⁹ as basis for our CVE analyses. The Computer Incident Response Center Luxembourg (CIRCL) operates a publicly accessible instance of the CVE-Search project and provides a daily dump of their CVE data in JSON format,¹⁰ which we imported into our database. The CIRCLE CVE data provides the CVE fields SUMMARY and REFERENCES, as well as the fields PRODUCT and TARGET SOFTWARE which hold extracted information from the Common Platform Enumerations (CPE) information.

B. Mapping Approaches

In order to establish a mapping between the software packages of the Libraries.io dataset and the corresponding CVE entries of the CIRCL CVE dataset, we applied three different approaches, yielding varying results:

1) *Strict Name Mapping*: The first approach iterates over each entry contained in the Libraries.io dataset and checks whether the package manager (in the field PLATFORM) can be matched to any target software in the CIRCL CVE dataset (as stated in the TARGET SOFTWARE field).

For our query, we created a mapping between package manager values of the Libraries.io dataset and the corresponding TARGET SOFTWARE values. The query then matches the value of the Libraries.io NAME field with the values of the CVE PRODUCT field as well as the PLATFORM value with either the TARGET SOFTWARE or checks if it is contained in the SUMMARY of the CVE dataset.

⁴ <https://www.cve.org/ProgramOrganization/CNAs>, last accessed 2022-03-21

⁵ <https://cve.circl.lu/cve/CVE-2021-44631>, last accessed 2022-03-21

⁶ <https://nvd.nist.gov/vuln-metrics/cvss>, last accessed 2022-03-21

⁷ <https://cwe.mitre.org/>, last accessed 2022-03-21

⁸ <https://zenodo.org/record/3626071/files/libraries-1.6.0-2020-01-12.tar.gz>, last accessed 2022-03-21

⁹ <https://github.com/cve-search/cve-search>, last accessed 2022-03-21

¹⁰ <https://www.circl.lu/opendata/>, last accessed 2022-03-21




Figure 3: Vulnerable package count of the top-10 package manager across all three mapping approaches.

a) *Discussion:* The results of this mapping, i.e. the vulnerable package counts, is compared with the other matching approaches in Figure 3. The figure is limited to the top-10 package managers wrt. number of mapped packages. The *strict name mapping* approach yields an unexpected low number of mapped packages for certain package managers. We identified the following issues: (i) In particular, Go packages provide the repository identifier consisting of provider, owner and repository name in the Libraries.io dump, while the CVE entry contains only the repository name. (ii) The CPE strings of CVE entries contain potentially wrong attribute values or lack some information as for instance the *target_sw* value. (iii) Additionally, various entries do not specify the package manager, neither in the CPE string nor inside the SUMMARY.

Additionally to comparing the amount of vulnerable packages, we grouped the CVE entries per year and package manager if we were able to create a mapping with the *strict name mapping* approach. This distribution as well as the trend of the top-7 package managers with the highest CVE count are depicted in Figure 4. Despite some fluctuating values, there is a noticeable upwards trend especially for the last few years.

2) *Partial and Fuzzy Name Matching:* In our second approach we build a lookup table for each package manager: we define specific keywords (e.g., NPM, Maven, etc.) for the CVE SUMMARY field and domain names or partial URLs (e.g., npmjs.com, pypi.org, etc.) for the REFERENCES. We iterate over each CVE entry, assign a package manager based on the lookup table, and check if the Libraries.io PLATFORM value equals the assigned package manager and if a value of the CVE PRODUCT list occurs either in the NAME or KEYWORDS fields. In case multiple Libraries.io entries match the CVE entry, our program uses a fuzzy string matching




Figure 4: Comparison of CVE count per package manager per year including seven package managers containing most entries.

method provided by the *fuzzysset2* python package¹¹ with a *cutoff* value of 0.3 and chooses the entry with the highest similarity value.¹²

a) *Discussion:* The results of this approach are shown in Figure 3. The vulnerable package counts of the *partial and fuzzy name matching* are considerably lower than compared to the *strict name mapping* approach. Due to choosing the best result of the fuzzy string matching as well as the necessary *cutoff* to avoid high false-positive rates, the approach is prone (i) to miss sub-packages with the same package name and (ii) to miss matches because of the *cutoff* value.

3) *Repository Matching:* In order to increase the accuracy of the matching of software packages to CVE entries, we focus in this approach on the references in the respective CVE entries. The hypothesis is that the URLs in the references consist of the repository owner and repository name.¹³

We use the value of the Libraries.io REPOSITORY URL field and extract the repository provider (i.e., github.com, bitbucket.org or gitlab.com) as well as the owner and the name of the repository. REPO_LINK contains the concatenated values of those fields. Additionally, we search for partial URLs of the format *provider.tld/owner/repository* in the CVE REFERENCES fields and store the results in a new array LINKS.

We iterate over the CVE entries and check whether the values of the LINKS array occur in the REPO_LINK field of any Libraries.io entry. First, we assigned the CVE entries to every

¹¹ <https://pypi.org/project/fuzzysset2>, last accessed 2022-03-21

¹² Fuzzy string matching is necessary, because some package names are concise, common words, such as "archiver". These are often contained in other longer package names and result in a high amount of false positives.

¹³ Consider for instance the GitHub URLs, which include the organisation/owner and repository.

package that matched the repository link resulting in very different vulnerable package counts compared to the other approaches. These results are shown in the “All Links” column of Table V. To determine the amount of multiply assigned CVE entries, we reapplied the approach and only counted the first match of the repository link. Notably, in the “First Link” column of Table V, the vulnerable package count is considerably lower. Figure 3 compares the “First Link” results to the other matching methods.

Table V: Top-10 vulnerable package count per package manager using the repository matching approach. “All Links” counts all packages with a matching link, while “First Links” only counts the first match.

Package Manager	All Links	First Link
Go	13201	199
NPM	5359	510
Maven	3396	171
Pypi	458	224
Rubygems	432	152
NuGet	411	52
Packagist	319	273
Bower	265	114
Homebrew	210	142
Cargo	168	44

a) *Discussion:* We found, that various entries in the Libraries.io dataset contain the same REPOSITORY URL or at least the same combination of repository provider, owner and repository name. A lot of them seem to be sub-packages that are contained inside one repository or they erroneously contain the URL of the main project. Table VI shows the ten most common REPO_LINK values and the respective package count.

Table VI: Count of the 10 most occurring repositories in the Libraries.io dataset.

Repository	Count
github.com/openshift/origin	1523
github.com/kubernetes/kubernetes	1181
github.com/liferay/liferay-portal	508
github.com/facebook/create-react-app	508
github.com/lodash/lodash	499
github.com/hyperledger/fabric	487
github.com/apereo/cas	353
github.com/docker/docker	350
github.com/golang/go	277
github.com/jupyterlab/jupyterlab	266

While counting all occurrences results in assigning a high number of non-vulnerable packages, matching only the first entry results in wrong mappings and potentially missed vulnerable sub-packages.

C. Identified Challenges

To summarize, we identified the following challenges when mapping CVE to open source packages:

- 1) *No clear repository identifiers:* The CVE entries do not contain clear identifiers of the code base in the corresponding package manager and/or software repository.
- 2) *Incomplete or wrong CVE entries:* The CVE list contains potentially wrong attribute values or lacks some critical information to map to corresponding code bases.
- 3) *Multiple relevant software packages:* In some cases, the CVE entry relates to multiple software packages and potentially multiple code repositories.
- 4) *Reliable datasets:* There is no complete and reliable index of open source projects; the Libraries.io data is potentially erroneous and incomplete.

The mapping approaches allowed us to derive some insights regarding the number of vulnerabilities for certain package managers (cf. Figure 3), in particular, the strict name mapping approach displayed a noticeable upwards trend in reported vulnerabilities in recent years (Figure 4), however, an improved approach and a thorough evaluation is necessary to reach robust conclusions.

V. RELATED WORK

The overview and analysis of the open-source landscape in this paper is based on Libraries.io [2]. Alternatively, there are various other works that monitor existing repositories and provide quality and popularity metrics. For instance, the PyDriller framework [4] is a tool to mine git-based software repositories. In this respect, the GHTorrent framework [5] collects and provides data for all public projects available on Github and therefore is a very comprehensive resource for analysis.

The detection and reporting of vulnerabilities and threats in open-source software has been the subject of extensive research for several years already [6]–[8]. In a recent paper, Tan et al. report the deployment of security patches on stable branches of open-source projects [9]. Similar to our approach, the authors map CVE entries based on the name of an open-source package. The approach is however based on manual investigation of the software packages and the mappings.

Most related to our mapping of CVE entries to libraries in open-source repositories is the work of Snyk.io¹⁴ which provides a monitoring service to identify vulnerable packages and libraries. It consists of a detailed list of security reports for various repositories and contains information about the vulnerability, the name of the affected library, the versions of the library that are affected, etc. Similarly, the GitHub Advisory Database¹⁵ is a list of CVEs and GitHub originated security reports and vulnerabilities of software available on the GitHub platform. In [10] the authors make use of Snyk.io to provide an empirical study on vulnerable dependencies and security policies in 600 open source projects.

¹⁴ <https://snyk.io/>, last accessed 2022-03-21

¹⁵ <https://github.com/advisories>, last accessed 2022-03-21

VI. CONCLUSION

Since an increasing amount of software packages use open-source components and libraries, potential vulnerabilities within such shared code bases affect not only the libraries themselves, but also the dependent packages. The re-use of software increases productivity and contributes to better maintained code, but can also lead to an increased distribution of vulnerabilities across different software packages. After being discovered, such common vulnerabilities are documented and information about them is shared via CVE entries.

In this work, we have provided insights in the landscape of open-source projects in popular package managers, and have discussed three approaches to map an up-to-date list of CVE entries to their respective software package. In our analyses we have discussed both, shortcomings and quality issues of the available data, and shortcomings of our mapping approaches wrt. accuracy and false-positive rate.

In future work, we plan the following research directions: Firstly, a thorough evaluation of the mapping approaches is required to provide more accurate results and to provide a large-scale mapping of CVE entries. Second, performing data cleansing on the Libraries.io and the CVE dataset would highly increase accuracy and would enable further analyses about software packages and their vulnerabilities. Third, research in improving the CVE standard; adding for instance additional meta-information such as a project identifier or project URL.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This research was funded by the Austrian Research Promotion Agency (FFG) Bridge project 880592 “SecDM – Sichere und vertrauenswürdige on-premise data markets”. The financial support by the Austrian Research Promotion Agency is gratefully acknowledged.

REFERENCES

- [1] D. E. Mann and S. M. Christey, “Towards a common enumeration of vulnerabilities,” in *2nd Workshop on Research with Security Vulnerability Databases, Purdue University, West Lafayette, Indiana*, 1999.
- [2] J. Katz, “Libraries.io Open Source Repository and Dependency Metadata,” Jan. 2020. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.3626071>
- [3] B. A. Cheikes, B. A. Cheikes, K. A. Kent, and D. Waltermire, *Common platform enumeration: Naming specification version 2.3*. US Department of Commerce, National Institute of Standards and Technology, 2011.
- [4] D. Spadini, M. Aniche, and A. Bacchelli, “Pydriller: Python framework for mining software repositories,” in *Proceedings of the 2018 26th ACM Joint Meeting on European Software Engineering Conference and Symposium on the Foundations of Software Engineering*. ACM, 10 2018, pp. 908–911.
- [5] G. Gousios, “The ghtorrent dataset and tool suite,” in *2013 10th Working Conference on Mining Software Repositories (MSR)*. IEEE, 2013, pp. 233–236.
- [6] N. Edwards and L. Chen, “An historical examination of open source releases and their vulnerabilities,” in *the ACM Conference on Computer and Communications Security, CCS’12, 2012*. ACM, 2012, pp. 183–194.

- [7] B. Kaplan and J. Qian, “A survey on common threats in npm and pypi registries,” *CoRR*, vol. abs/2108.09576, 2021. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2108.09576>
- [8] A. Decan, T. Mens, and E. Constantinou, “On the impact of security vulnerabilities in the npm package dependency network,” in *15th International Conference on Mining Software Repositories, MSR 2018*. ACM, 2018, pp. 181–191.
- [9] X. Tan, Y. Zhang, J. Cao, K. Sun, M. Zhang, and M. Yang, “Understanding the practice of security patch management across multiple branches in oss projects,” in *Proceedings of the ACM Web Conference 2022*, ser. WWW ’22. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2022, p. 767–777. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3485447.3512236>
- [10] B. Carlson, K. Leach, D. Marinov, M. Nagappan, and A. Prakash, “Open source vulnerability notification,” in *Open Source Systems - 15th IFIP WG 2.13 International Conference, OSS 2019, Montreal, QC, Canada, May 26-27, 2019, Proceedings*, ser. IFIP Advances in Information and Communication Technology, F. Bordeleau, A. Sillitti, P. Meirelles, and V. Lenarduzzi, Eds., vol. 556. Springer, 2019, pp. 12–23. [Online]. Available: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-20883-7_2