

Towards Measuring Vulnerabilities and Exposures in Open-Source Packages

Tobias Dam^[0000–0002–2463–5831] and Sebastian Neumaier^[0000–0002–9804–4882]

St. Pölten University of Applied Sciences, Austria
`firstname.lastname@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 and we show the frequency and distribution of existing CVE entries with respect to popular programming languages.

1 Introduction

According to a 2021 open-source security report by Synopsis,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 OpenSSL 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 and the NPM repository for Node.js, cf. Table 1. The documentation and communication of discovered 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 [7].³ It is a dictionary and reference of common

¹ <https://www.synopsys.com/software-integrity/resources/analyst-reports/open-source-security-risk-analysis.html>, last accessed 2023-02-09

² <https://heartbleed.com/>, last accessed 2022-12-06

³ <http://cve.mitre.org>, last accessed 2023-02-09

and publicly known IT system vulnerabilities, operated by the Mitre Corporation, an American non-profit institution. CVE is a critical source for security management, however, is to some extent an heterogeneous and unstructured source. In particular, it 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 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 problem of mapping CVE entries to open-source projects. To do so, we focus on the following contributions:

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

2 Related Work

The overview and analysis of the open-source landscape in this paper is based on Libraries.io [6]. Alternatively, there are various other works that monitor existing repositories and provide quality and popularity metrics. For instance, the PyDriller framework [8] is a tool to mine git-based software repositories. In this respect, the GHTorrent framework [4] 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 [2, 3, 5]. 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.io⁴ 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 Database⁵ is a list of CVEs and GitHub ori-

⁴ <https://snyk.io/>, last accessed 2023-02-09

⁵ <https://github.com/advisories>, last accessed 2023-02-09

generated security reports and vulnerabilities of software available on the GitHub platform.

3 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. In this work, we make use of the monitoring project *Libraries.io* [6]: 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 [6].

Table 1: The left table lists the number of projects in the top-7 package managers and the middle table the top-7 licenses across all packages. The right table gives the number of versions published at repositories in 2015 and 2019, respectively.

P.M.	Projects	Perc.	License	Count	Perc.	P.M.	2015	2019
Go	1,818,666	39.45	MIT	1,637,451	44.13	NPM	716,207	3,892,909
NPM	1,275,082	27.66	Apache-2.0	848,475	22.87	NuGet	210,929	614,774
Packagist	313,278	6.80	ISC	332,676	8.97	Pypi	150,591	469,753
Pypi	231,690	5.03	Other	298,626	8.05	Packagist	233,643	334,059
NuGet	199,447	4.33	BSD-3	140,806	3.80	Maven	326,089	144,813
Maven	184,871	4.01	GPL-3.0	63,890	1.72	<i>Others</i>	459,265	364,164
Ruby	161,608	3.51	MPL-2.0	51,517	1.39			
<i>Others</i>	425,020	9.22	<i>Others</i>	336822	9.08			


As shown in Table 1, 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 the left table includes 25 other repositories which only sum up to 9% of all indexed projects. Note that the size of a package managers (i.e. the number of versions hosted) does not necessarily correlate with the impact of these managers. For instance, while the language Go has the most populous package manager, it has not been in the 10 most popular languages in the last years.⁶

The middle table lists the 7 most common licenses across all packages and repositories. The most popular license is the MIT License (44% of the projects),

⁶ <https://octoverse.github.com/2022/top-programming-languages>, last accessed 2023-03-20

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

A version in the Libraries.io data corresponds to an immutable published version of a project from a repository. Table 1 (right) displays the number of versions published at the monitored repositories in 2015 and 2019, respectively. The largest repository NPM increased considerably from 716k to 3.9 million published versions per year. Figure 1 visualizes the rapid growth, in number of published versions, of the package managers NPM, NuGet, and PyPI.



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

Figure 1: Evolution of the total number of published versions at top-5 largest repositories; the y-axis is in logarithmic scale.

Table 2: Number of new CVE entries in recent years.

4 Common Vulnerabilities and Exposures

In 1999, Mann and Christey [7] 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 (e.g., software vendors, open-source projects, security researchers). Table 2 displays the number of newly published CVE entries in the last 7 years. This number increased from 6.6k to 22.2k new entries.

Besides the ID and the summary of the vulnerability, a CVE entry provides relevant references (e.g., link to Github documentation), an assessment of the severity of the vulnerability using the Common Vulnerability Scoring System (CVSS), and the Common Weakness Enumeration (CWE) taxonomy of weakness types. Additionally, the CVE entry provides Common Platform Enumerations (CPE) [1] 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”).

5 Findings

To perform this study, we use the most recent Open Data dump of the Libraries.io database⁷ – 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 3. 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-Search⁸ 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,⁹ which we imported into our database. The CIRCL 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.

5.1 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:

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.

⁷ <https://zenodo.org/record/3626071/files/libraries-1.6.0-2020-01-12.tar.gz>, last accessed 2023-02-09

⁸ <https://github.com/cve-search/cve-search>, last accessed 2023-02-09

⁹ <https://www.circl.lu/opendata/>, last accessed 2023-02-09




Figure 2: Vulnerable package count of Figure 3: Comparison of CVE count the top-10 package manager across all per package manager per year including seven package managers containing most entries.

Discussion: The results of this mapping, i.e. the vulnerable package counts, is compared with the other matching approaches in Figure 2. 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 3. Despite some fluctuating values, there is a noticeable upwards trend especially for the last few years.

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 method provided by the `fuzzysset2` python package¹⁰ with a *cutoff* value of 0.3 and chooses the entry with the highest similarity value. This low cutoff value was empirically chosen since we observed a number of projects with matching substrings but mismatching content length and surroundings.

Discussion: The results of this approach are shown in Figure 2. 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.

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.¹¹

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 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 3. 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 3, the vulnerable package count is considerably lower. Figure 2 compares the “First Link” results to the other matching methods.

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 3 shows the ten most common REPO_LINK values and the respective package count.

¹⁰ <https://pypi.org/project/fuzzysset2>, last accessed 2023-02-09

¹¹ Consider for instance the GitHub URLs, which include the organisation/owner and repository.

Table 3: The left table gives the top-5 vulnerable package count per package manager using the *repository matching* approach. “All Links” counts all packages with a matching link, “First Links” counts the first match. The right table gives the 10 most occurring repositories in the Libraries.io dataset.

P.M.	All Links	First Link	Repository	Count
Go	13201	199	github.com/openshift/origin	1523
NPM	5359	510	github.com/kubernetes/kubernetes	1181
Maven	3396	171	github.com/liferay/liferay-portal	508
Pypi	458	224	github.com/facebook/create-react-app	508
Ruby	432	152	github.com/lodash/lodash	499

5.2 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 package manager and/or software repository.
2. *Incomplete or wrong CVE entries*: The CVE list potentially contains wrong attribute values or lacks some critical information to map to 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 2), in particular, the strict name mapping approach displayed a noticeable upwards trend in reported vulnerabilities in recent years (Figure 3), however, an improved approach and a thorough evaluation is necessary to reach robust conclusions.

6 Conclusion

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 the mapping 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.

Another possibility to improve our work is to consider alternative data sources, such as the GHTorrent¹² database – a large and rich (meta)database of GitHub projects – as an additional DB to map with.

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. We are grateful to the anonymous referees for suggesting numerous improvements.

References

1. Cheikes, B.A., Cheikes, B.A., Kent, K.A., Waltermire, D.: Common platform enumeration: Naming specification version 2.3. US Department of Commerce, National Institute of Standards and Technology (2011)
2. Decan, A., Mens, T., Constantinou, E.: On the impact of security vulnerabilities in the npm package dependency network. In: 15th Int. Conf. on Mining Software Repositories, MSR 2018. ACM (2018). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3196398.3196401>
3. Edwards, N., Chen, L.: An historical examination of open source releases and their vulnerabilities. In: the ACM Conf. on Computer and Communications Security, CCS’12. pp. 183–194. ACM (2012). <https://doi.org/10.1145/2382196.2382218>
4. Gousios, G.: The ghtorrent dataset and tool suite. In: 2013 10th Working Conference on Mining Software Repositories (MSR). pp. 233–236. IEEE (2013)
5. Kaplan, B., Qian, J.: A survey on common threats in npm and pypi registries. CoRR **abs/2108.09576** (2021), <https://arxiv.org/abs/2108.09576>
6. Katz, J.: Libraries.io Open Source Repository and Dependency Metadata (Jan 2020). <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.3626071>
7. Mann, D.E., Christey, S.M.: Towards a common enumeration of vulnerabilities. In: 2nd Workshop on Research with Security Vulnerability Databases, Indiana (1999)
8. Spadini, D., Aniche, M., Bacchelli, A.: 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. pp. 908–911. ACM (10 2018). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3236024.3264598>
9. Tan, X., Zhang, Y., Cao, J., Sun, K., Zhang, M., Yang, M.: Understanding the practice of security patch management across multiple branches in oss projects. In: ACM Web Conference (2022). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3485447.3512236>

¹² [gousios2014/lean](https://github.com/gousios2014/lean)