

# Secure Software Development Methodologies: A Multivocal Literature Review

Arina Kudriavtseva, Olga Gadyatskaya

**Abstract**—In recent years, the number of cyber attacks has grown rapidly. An effective way to reduce the attack surface and protect software is adoption of methodologies that apply security at each step of the software development lifecycle. While different methodologies have been proposed to address software security, recent research shows an increase in the number of vulnerabilities in software and data breaches. Therefore, the security practices incorporated in secure software development methodologies require investigation.

This paper provides an overview of security practices involved in 28 secure software development methodologies from industry, government, and academia. To achieve this goal, we distributed the security practices among the software development lifecycle stages. We also investigated auxiliary (non-technical) practices, such as organizational, behavioral, legal, policy, and governance aspects that are incorporated in the secure software development methodologies. Furthermore, we explored methods used to provide evidence of the effectiveness of the methodologies. Finally, we present the gaps that require attention in the scientific community. The results of our survey may assist researchers and organizations to better understand the existing security practices integrated into the secure software development methodologies. In addition, our bridge between “technical” and “non-technical” worlds may be useful for non-technical specialists who investigate software security. Moreover, exploring the gaps that we found in current research may help improve security in software development and produce software with fewer number of vulnerabilities.

**Index Terms**—Security, software development, secure software engineering methodology, secure software development lifecycle, security-by-design.



## 1 INTRODUCTION

ACCORDING to Common Vulnerabilities and Exposures database of MITRE [1], the number of reported vulnerabilities continues to rise since 1999. Forbes and RiskIQ report that “every minute, \$2,900,000 is lost to cyber crime and top companies pay \$25 per minute due to cyber security breaches” [2], [3]. The growing risk of cyber attacks has pushed the “shifting security left” concept that demands performing security practices early on while creating software, and not leaving them for the testing or even post-deployment phases. The “shifting left” paradigm creates an impetus for organisations to implement a secure software development lifecycle.

In the early 2000s, personal computers with a connection to the Internet were becoming increasingly common<sup>1</sup>. This trend created opportunities for attackers to target remote machines and led to a wave of self-propagating malware. At that time existing security practices in the industry were inadequate [4]. Therefore, a fundamentally different approach to security was required to protect organisations from malicious software.

The first publications that systematically studied how to build secure software appeared in 2001 [5], [6], [7], [8], [9], [10]. From 2004 onwards, organisations started integrating security processes into the software development life cycle. For example, in 2004 Microsoft Security Development

Lifecycle (SDL) was finalized and became a part of software development processes at Microsoft. Since then, many companies and organisations have developed their own approaches to produce secure software [11], [12], [13]. The ever growing numbers of these approaches call for their systematic investigation and identification of their similarities and differences.

This survey aims to investigate and summarize the security practices involved in each step of the established secure software development methodologies. As the target audience of these methodologies are organisations engaged in software development, a multivocal study, covering methodologies from industry, government organisations and academic research is the most appropriate method. In our survey, we map the security practices used in the methodologies according to the software development lifecycle (SDLC) stages, as it is customary for such methodologies [4]. It is intriguing that there is a plethora of methodologies focused on the same end goal, and new ones continue to emerge regularly.

While there exist several surveys [14], [15], [16], [17], [18], [19], [20] investigating and comparing existing secure software development methodologies (SSDMs), to the best of our knowledge, ours is the most comprehensive one, covering 28 SSDMs from industry, government and academia that were issued in 2004-2022. We start by comparing the methodologies to each other based on included security practices, such as threat modeling or static security analysis. In line with the emerging understanding in the field that software security is not a purely technical quest, but socio-technical [21], [22], we pay special attention to auxiliary (non-technical) practices that support software security. At

• A. Kudriavtseva and O. Gadyatskaya are with Leiden Institute of Advanced Computer Science, Leiden University, The Netherlands

In submission

1. <https://www.microsoft.com/en-us/securityengineering/sdl/about>

the same time, we are looking for supporting evidence that the studied SSDMs actually help to improve software security. For this, we study the literature on validation studies (including validation reports included with the methodologies themselves, if any). Finally, we identify the gaps we encountered in the literature and propose new research directions that could cover these gaps.

To summarize, the contributions of our research are:

- We systematized security practices involved in 28 secure software development methodologies.
- Our systematization covers practices integrated in the usual software development lifecycle and auxiliary (often non-technical) practices that support software security.
- We systematize the existing evaluation approaches for secure software development methodologies.
- We report on the discovered gaps that require more attention in the research community.

## 2 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

In this survey, we only include secure software development methodologies that embrace security practices in every phase of SDLC. This is why security activities of maturity models [23], [24] and methods that focus on a specific stage of SDLC [25], [26], [27], [28] lie beyond the scope of this research. We also aim to find general secure software development methodologies but not applicable to a specific technology (e.g. mobile security, IoT, cloud).

In this study we address the following research questions:

- RQ1** What are the existing general secure software development approaches?
- RQ2** What are the auxiliary steps that these methodologies use besides the security practices integrated into the usual SDLC?
- RQ3** What are the evaluation methods of these approaches?

### 2.1 Literature search methodology

**Search strategy:** For this survey we used Google Scholar<sup>2</sup> to find relevant academic papers, and we used Google Search<sup>3</sup> to find relevant grey literature (blogs, white papers, reports, government documents).

**Search terms:**

To find secure software development methodologies we use the following search strings:

- 1) "Secure" AND (("Software" AND ("Engineering" OR ("Development" AND ("Methodology" OR "Framework" OR "Model" OR "Standard" OR "Lifecycle")))) OR (("Systems" OR "Software") AND ("by Design" OR "design")))
- 2) ("DevSecOps") AND ("Methodology" OR "Framework" OR "Model" OR "Standard" OR "Lifecycle")

2. <https://scholar.google.nl/>

3. <https://www.google.nl/>

TABLE 1  
Inclusion and exclusion criteria for literature

Inclusion criteria	
IN-1	Literature discussing the methodologies which add security practices in each phase of the SDLC
IN-2	Literature written in English
IN-3	The full text is available (either it is free or it is included in our academic subscription)
IN-4	Include only the five first pages on Google Search
Exclusion criteria	
EX-1	Literature discussing security only in a particular phase of the SDLC
EX-2	Evident advertisement of a vendor or a product
EX-3	Literature discussing a methodology for a specific technology (IoT, web applications, etc.)




Fig. 1. Literature search process

- 3) ("Application Security" OR "AppSec") AND ("Methodology" OR "Framework" OR "Model" OR "Standard" OR "Lifecycle")

**Study selection:** After receiving the initial search results, we exclude irrelevant literature using inclusion and exclusion criteria (Table 1).

**Search procedure:** We found an initial set of the methodologies using the search process as displayed in Fig. 1. For academic and grey literature we used two different search procedures.

For selecting the relevant academic papers, we read the titles and the abstracts of the articles. We then applied the inclusion and exclusion criteria, picking only literature relevant to the topic of the survey. After that we read full text of the relevant literature and allocated information according to the RQs.

For grey literature we implemented two research stages. The first stage was to select the articles using the defined search strings. The second stage was to identify more grey

literature adding specifically pdf documents. For this second stage we added the condition `filetype:pdf` before each search string. To select the relevant grey literature, we first read the title and meta-text provided by Google Search. As in the case of academic literature, we applied inclusion and exclusion criteria. We then read full text of the relevant grey literature and used the AACODS checklist [29] to determine the quality of the grey literature. After that, we extracted data according to the RQs.

To find additional academic and grey literature, we used “backward” (identifying new papers based on those papers citing the paper being examined) and “forward snowballing” (identify new papers using the reference list) [30].

## 2.2 Terminology

While investigating different approaches to build secure software, we discovered that the authors use synonyms to define the approaches to embrace security practices in each step of software development lifecycle. For example, the following synonyms appear in publications: *secure software development process* [14], [16], *secure software development lifecycles* [11], [13], [12], [31], [32], *secure development lifecycle* [33], [34], *secure software development framework* [35], *security-by-design framework* [36], *framework* [37], [38], [39], [40], *secure software development* [41], *guidelines* [42], *model* [43], [44], *methodology* [45].

In our survey, we use the term *secure software development methodologies* (SSDMs), to define a set of high-level secure software development practices that are integrated into a SDLC. We use the term *methodology* as a synonym for words *guideline*, *lifecycle*, *model*, and *framework*.

While searching the literature on SSDMs, we came across the terms *DevSecOps* and *application security* that are used to integrate security into development processes. As these terms are relevant to the topic of our research, we included them in search strings, as specified earlier, but these terms did not yield many relevant sources.

### 2.2.1 DevSecOps

DevOps (development and operation) is a trending term that implies merging of development and operation teams. According to IBM<sup>4</sup>, “DevOps encourages collaboration, automation, and integration between developers and operations teams to improve the speed and quality of agile software development”. A DevOps automated pipeline allows to deploy software changes at a fast rate. For instance, at Facebook [46] software engineers can deploy changes in production code up to 500 times a day. In 2012 MacDonald [47], a Gartner analyst first mentioned a need to integrate security in DevOps and called the concept DevSecOps. Currently, one of the challenges for organizations to adopt DevOps is ensuring secure software delivery [48].

There are multiple academic (e.g., [48], [49], [50], [51], [52], [53], [54], [55], [56], [47]) and industry (e.g.,<sup>5</sup>,<sup>6</sup>) studies on DevSecOps. However, the results of these studies cannot

be adopted by the organizations as a methodology because the studies do not describe the security practices involved in each step of SDLC as required by inclusion criterion IN-1. Therefore, we excluded DevSecOps studies from the research.

### 2.2.2 Application Security

McGraw [57] posited that *software security* is about building security in but *application security* is about protecting the software in a reactive way after development is complete. Similarly, Payne [58] studied the challenges of application security initiatives involved after software has been developed. The author proposed a proactive approach implementing application security in software development projects. As Payne’s approach [58] does not cover all stages of SDLC, as required by the inclusion criteria IN-1, we do not include it in our study.

On the Synopsys’s website<sup>7</sup> there is a blog that compares applications security with software security. According to the author of the blog, application security is a subset of software security and deals with the post-deployment issues (for example, patch, IP filtering, post deployment security tests), while software security concerns the pre-deployment issues.

ISO/IEC 27034 [59] offers guidance on security techniques of application security. The guidance is focused on specifying, designing, and implementing security controls throughout the entire SDLC. As we could not find a free version of the guidance, we did not include it in our research.

To summarize, we found no application security methodology in academic papers, but only literature focused on particular technologies, e.g., on mobile, web, and cloud application security. As we are interested in the general methodologies that involve security practice in each phase of the SDLC, we do not include this literature in our survey. We found only one industry publication that presents an application security framework that satisfies our criteria [60]. We discuss this framework in section 3.2.

### 2.2.3 Software assurance maturity models

Software assurance maturity models allow organizations to measure the capabilities in software security and maturity of SDLC. These models are derived from software security surveys. Thus, the organizations can compare them with peers who have already implemented software security initiatives<sup>8</sup>. The security practices of maturity models are structured into several maturity levels. The lower the maturity level, the easier to execute security practices included in the category of this level. It is not necessary for the organizations to achieve the highest level of maturity in each category. In fact, the level of maturity should be determined according to the organization’s needs.

We found two software maturity models: OWASP Software Assurance Maturity Model (SAMM) [23] and Building Security In Maturity Model (BSIMM) [24]. Both are made up of software security frameworks used to organize security activities. The security activities are used to evaluate

4. <https://developer.ibm.com/devpractices/devops/>

5. <https://www.synopsys.com/content/dam/synopsys/sig-assets/reports/rep-opensource-devsecops-survey-2020.pdf>

6. <https://aws.amazon.com/blogs/devops/>

building-end-to-end-aws-devsecops-ci-cd-pipeline-with-open-source-scans-https://aws.amazon.com/blogs/devops/

7. [synopsys.com/blogs/software-security/application-security-vs-software-security/](https://www.synopsys.com/blogs/software-security/application-security-vs-software-security/)

8. <https://www.synopsys.com/blogs/software-security/application-security-vs-software-security/>

the security initiatives. Although the security activities for evaluating the progress (the maturity) are beyond the scope of our research, general security practices that made up the software security frameworks match our inclusion criteria. As a result, we discuss these frameworks in section 3.2.

### 3 SECURE SOFTWARE DEVELOPMENT METHODOLOGIES

Based on the search procedure and the inclusion and exclusion criteria defined in the previous section, we have discovered 28 SSDMs published in the period from 2004 to 2022. In this section, we briefly summarize these methodologies.

The timeline with the data on when the methodologies were published is displayed in Fig. 2. It is important to mention that the publication date is not always the same as the date of introducing the methodology. For example, SDL [4] became a part of software development processes at Microsoft in 2004. However, the methodology was published two years later in 2006.




Fig. 2. The timeline

#### 3.1 The structure of an SDLC

To present security practices included in the studied methodologies, we first define the structure of the software development lifecycle (SDLC). An SDLC consists of important phases of building software. Though there are many different approaches to SDLCs, we divide all lifecycles into two categories: (1) Waterfall, which is a sequential development model and (2) Agile, which is an iterative approach. If the authors of a methodology do not provide explicit information with which SDLC category they apply security practices (as is the case for the majority of the methodologies), we consider such methodologies in the Waterfall category. We put a methodology in the Agile category only if the authors explicitly mention it.

There are different ways to present the structure of the SDLC stages. In our research, to introduce the structure, we collected all SDLC stages from the methodologies and used the union of these stages. The only exception is the *test plans* phase in McGraw Touchpoints [57]. As this phase is only used in Touchpoints and is not consistent with other methodologies, we combined it with the design phase. The final set of the SDLC stages and their brief explanation are the following:

- Project inception, or planning phase, includes a high-level view on the goals and requirements for the project and also preliminary activities for the software development.

- Analysis and requirement involves creating and maintaining the software requirements.
- Architectural and detailed design “identifies the major components of the system and the communication between these components” [70].
- Implementation is writing a program based on the requirements.
- Verification and testing checks that software meets the requirements and meets the customer’s expectations.
- Release and maintenance includes preparation activities for release, deployment, and post-production maintenance.
- Disposal involves activities for retiring the software.

While investigating the security practices we discovered that some of them cannot be placed in a specific stage of SDLC. Some practices are project-wide (e.g., cover all stages of SDLC), and some practices are organization-wide and cover all projects within a company. We therefore divided all security practices into three categories: (1) organization-wide, (2) security practices that cover all stages of SDLC, and (3) practices for a specific project. We used the reference text about the framework to position a practice in a given column. If it was not stated explicitly for a practice which stage it is applicable to, the authors discussed this case and made a joint decision on where to position this practice.

Some authors emphasize that their security approaches are process-agnostic and security practices do not map explicitly to the specific stages of SDLC [57], [41]. We use the SDLC as the natural mapping for the majority of security practices performed during secure software development. In this survey, we provided our explanation of the methodologies, but we tried to follow the authors’ ideas as accurately as possible. However, if the author does not explain some specific security practice in the text, we decided not to put those practices in the table (e.g., in ISDF methodology [38] there is no explanation of *logging and tracing* in the coding phase).

26 SSDMs for the Waterfall software development sorted by publication date and classified by origin are displayed in Table 3. The other two methodologies applicable to Agile development are shown in Table 4. In Table 4 bucket practices are marked in green, every sprint in red, and one-time in blue. In both tables we provide the (possibly shortened) names of the security practices per each studied methodology. If the name of the practice coincides with the column name, we denote it with the checkmark ✓. To avoid confusion in the terminology, we use the term SAST to describe static analysis and source code analysis.

TABLE 2  
Secure software development methodologies ordered chronologically

The source of methodology	Name	Year of publication
Industry	Microsoft Software Development Life Cycle (SDL) [4], [33]	2006
	McGraw's Secure Software Development Lifecycle Process [57], [61]	2006
	Comprehensive, Lightweight Application Security Process (CLASP) [62]	2006
	Microsoft SDL version 5.2 for Agile Development [63]	2012
	Software Assurance Forum for Excellence in Code (SAFECode) [64]	2018
	Building Secure and Reliable Systems [65]	2020
	BSA framework [37]	2020
	The Secure Software Development Lifecycle at SAP [11]	2020
	ReBIT Application Security Framework [60]	2020
	OWASP Software Assurance Maturity Model [23]	2020
	Cisco Secure Development Lifecycle [13]	2021
	Citrix Security Development Lifecycle [12]	2021
	Building Security in Maturity Model [66]	2021
GE Secure Development Lifecycle [34]	2022	
Government	Grip on Secure Software Development [41]	2015
	NIST 800-160 [67], [68]	2016
	CSA Singapore [36]	2017
	SSDLC cybersecurity Malaysia [42]	2020
	Security in SDLC – Secure Software Development Lifecycle – SSDLC [31]	2021
NIST 800-218 [35]	2022	
Academia	Secure Coding: Building Security into the Software Development Life Cycle [69]	2004
	Secure Software Development Life Cycle Process [32]	2005
	The Secure Software Development Model (SSDM) [43]	2006
	The Integrated Security Development Framework (ISDF) [38]	2010
	Secure Software Development Model: A Guide for Secure Software Life Cycle [44]	2010
	Secure Software Development: a Prescriptive Framework [39]	2011
	Framework for Development of Secure Software [40]	2013
Methodology for Enhancing Software Security During Development Processes [45]	2018	

TABLE 3: Summary of SSDMs and involved secure practices

Methodology	Organizational-wide processes						SDLC stages for a specific project								
	Policies and strategies	Response and recovery	Risk management framework	Supply chain security	Security culture	Other	Processes that cover all stages of SDLC	Project inception	Analysis and requirements	Architectural and detailed design	Implementation	Verification and testing	Release and maintenance	Disposal	
Industry methodologies															
MS SDL [4], [63], [33] (2006)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Define a list of approved tools</li> <li>Define cryptographic standards</li> <li>Track factors that influence security requirements</li> </ul>	Establish a standard incident response process		✓	Provide training			Define metrics and compliance reporting	Define security requirements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Establish design requirements</li> <li>Threat modeling</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Define and use cryptographic standards</li> <li>SAST</li> <li>Use approved tools and standards</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>DAST</li> <li>Penetration testing</li> </ul>			
Touchpoints [57] (2006)	Establish guidelines, principles and rules		✓		Knowledge management and training		External review		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Architectural risk analysis</li> <li>Define abuse cases</li> <li>Security requirements</li> </ul>		Code review (tools)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Penetration testing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Risk analysis</li> <li>Security operations</li> </ul>		
CLASP [62] (2006)	Identify global security policy			Research and assess security posture of technology solutions	Institute security awareness program		Monitor security metrics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Specify operational environment</li> <li>Identify user roles and resource capabilities</li> <li>Document security-relevant requirements</li> <li>Define misuse cases</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identify resources and trust boundaries</li> <li>Identify attack surface</li> <li>Specify database security configuration</li> <li>Annotate class designs with security properties</li> <li>Apply security principles to design</li> <li>Threat modeling</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Integrate security analysis into source management process</li> <li>Implement interface contracts</li> <li>Implement and elaborate resource policies and security technologies</li> <li>Address reported security issues</li> <li>Source-level security review</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identify, implement, and perform security tests</li> <li>Verify security attributes of resources</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Code signing</li> <li>Build operational security guide</li> <li>Manage security issue disclosure process</li> </ul>			
SAFECode [64] (2018)	Establish coding standards and conventions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Define internal and external policies of vulnerability disclosure</li> <li>Define roles and responsibilities of vulnerability disclosure</li> </ul>	✓		Planning the implementation and deployment of secure development			Application security control definition	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Follow the secure design principles</li> <li>Threat modeling</li> <li>Perform architectural and design reviews</li> <li>Develop an encryption strategy</li> <li>Standardize identity and access management</li> <li>Establish log requirements and audit practices</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Handle data safely</li> <li>Use safe functions only</li> <li>Use code analysis tools</li> <li>Handle errors</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Automated testing</li> <li>Manual testing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fix the vulnerability</li> <li>Vulnerability disclosure</li> <li>Manage vulnerability reporters</li> <li>Secure development lifecycle feedback</li> </ul>			
The methodology by Google [65] (2020)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Disaster planning</li> <li>Recovery planning</li> <li>Crisis management</li> </ul>			Build a culture of security and reliability	Understanding roles and responsibilities		Understanding adversaries	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Design trade-offs</li> <li>Design for least privilege</li> <li>Design for understandability</li> <li>Design for a changing landscape</li> <li>Design for resilience</li> <li>Design for recovery</li> <li>Mitigating DoS attacks</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Use of advanced mitigation strategies</li> <li>SAST</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unit testing</li> <li>Integration testing</li> <li>DAST</li> <li>Fuzz testing</li> <li>Debugging and collecting logs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Deploying code using best practices</li> <li>Recovery and aftermath</li> </ul>			
The BSA framework [37] (2020)	Identification of coding standards		✓	✓	Security training	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Create and maintain software development environment</li> <li>Personnel is accountable for software security</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Secure development processes are documented</li> <li>Identity and access management</li> </ul>	Gathering security requirements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Threat modeling and risk analysis</li> <li>Use of assurance measures</li> <li>Design for least privilege</li> <li>Design for authorization and access control</li> <li>Ensure security capabilities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Secure coding practices</li> <li>Checking for known vulnerabilities, unsafe functions, unsafe libraries</li> <li>Code review</li> <li>Log implementation</li> <li>Measures to prevent counterfeiting and tampering</li> <li>Assure that proper usages of software are established</li> <li>Software is identifiable</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Analysis and validation of attack surface</li> <li>Software security controls are tested</li> <li>Adversarial security testing techniques</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Vulnerability notification and patching</li> <li>Vulnerability management</li> <li>Configuration guidance</li> <li>Maintenance of lifecycle guidance</li> </ul>			
SAP [11] (2020)			✓		Security training			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Risk assessment</li> <li>Data protection compliance evaluation</li> <li>Define the security and privacy requirements</li> <li>Define security controls</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SAST</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Code reviews</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>DAST</li> <li>Open-source known vulnerability scans</li> <li>Security validation</li> </ul>	Security response		
Cisco [13] (2021)				✓	Security training			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gap analysis and risk assessment</li> <li>Security requirements</li> </ul>	Threat modelling	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Use of security modules</li> <li>SAST</li> <li>Secure code repositories</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Vulnerability and penetration testing</li> <li>Privacy control validation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Security and privacy readiness</li> <li>Security and operational management</li> <li>Continuous monitoring and updates</li> <li>Maintaining privacy controls</li> </ul>			
Citrix [12] (2021)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Remediation programs</li> <li>Bug bounty</li> <li>Red team engagements</li> <li>Product-wide pentests</li> <li>External assessment</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Third party dependency tracking</li> <li>CI/CD pipeline security</li> </ul>	Security training			Planning and requirement gathering	Threat modeling	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Code review</li> <li>SAST</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Security regression testing</li> <li>Automated variant analysis</li> <li>Vulnerability assessment</li> <li>Feature penetration testing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Vulnerability response</li> <li>Product security incident response</li> <li>Logging and monitoring</li> </ul>			

TABLE 3: Summary of SSDMs and involved secure practices

Methodology	Organizational-wide processes						SDLC stages for a specific project							
	Policies and strategies	Response and recovery	Risk management framework	Supply chain security	Security culture	Other	Processes that cover all stages of SDLC	Project inception	Analysis and requirements	Architectural and detailed design	Implementation	Verification and testing	Release and maintenance	Disposal
ReBIT Application security framework [60] (2020)								Request for proposal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Security planning</li> <li>Requirement specification</li> <li>Security review</li> <li>Define security specifications</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Security architecture</li> <li>Security design</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Secure coding</li> <li>Identify the list of all third-party code to be used</li> <li>Secure code review</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assess system security</li> <li>Mitigate risks</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>VAPT</li> <li>Fix vulnerabilities</li> <li>Security authorization</li> <li>Secure deployment</li> <li>Security assessment</li> <li>Change management</li> </ul>	
OWASP SAMM [23] (2020)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Define strategy and metrics</li> <li>Policy and compliance</li> </ul>		✓		Education & guidance		Defect management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Threat assessment</li> <li>Security requirements</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Security architecture</li> <li>Architecture assessment</li> </ul>	Secure build	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requirements-driven testing</li> <li>Security testing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Secure deployment</li> <li>Incident management</li> <li>Environment management</li> <li>Operational management</li> </ul>		
BSIMM [66] (2021)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Define strategy and metrics</li> <li>Compliance and policy</li> </ul>		✓		Training	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Standards and requirements</li> <li>Attack models</li> <li>Security features and design</li> </ul>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Architecture analysis</li> </ul>	Code review	Security testing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Penetration testing</li> <li>Software environment</li> <li>Configuration Management &amp; Vulnerability Management</li> </ul>		
Government methodologies														
Grip on SSD [41] (2015)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Set up standard security requirements</li> <li>Maintain standard security requirements</li> </ul>					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Business impact analysis</li> <li>Maturity guidance</li> <li>Provide accountability</li> </ul>	Risk control and risk acceptance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Risk analysis</li> <li>Security requirements</li> </ul>	Security test plans	Code reviews	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Security testing</li> <li>Penetration testing</li> </ul>	Risk acceptance		
NIST 800-160 [67] (2016)			✓		Knowledge management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lifecycle model management</li> <li>Infrastructure management</li> <li>Portfolio management</li> <li>Human resource management</li> <li>Quality management</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Decision management</li> <li>Configuration management</li> <li>Information management</li> <li>Measurement or mission analysis</li> <li>Project assessment and control</li> <li>Quality assurance</li> <li>System analysis</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Acquisition</li> <li>Stakeholder needs and requirements definition</li> <li>Business or mission analysis</li> <li>Project planning</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Architecture definition</li> <li>Design definition</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Implementation</li> <li>Integration</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Verification</li> <li>Validation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Transition</li> <li>Operation</li> <li>Maintenance</li> <li>Supply</li> </ul>	✓	
The methodology from Singapore [36] (2017)			✓					Security planning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Systems security classification</li> <li>Threat and risk assessment</li> <li>Define security requirements for tender</li> <li>Evaluate security specification</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review security architecture</li> <li>Review security controls</li> </ul>	Code review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Application security testing</li> <li>System security testing</li> <li>Penetration testing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Security review</li> <li>Configuration management</li> <li>Change management</li> <li>Continuous monitoring</li> </ul>	✓
The methodology from Malaysia [42] (2020)	Develop end-of-life policies								<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Define security requirements</li> <li>Data classification</li> <li>Use case and misuse case modeling</li> <li>Risk management</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Security design considerations</li> <li>Additional design configurations</li> <li>Threat modeling</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Check for common security vulnerabilities and controls</li> <li>Secure software processes</li> <li>Securing build environments</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Attack surface validation</li> <li>Test data management</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Software acceptance considerations</li> <li>Verification and validation</li> <li>Certification and accreditation</li> <li>Installation</li> <li>Operation, monitor and maintenance</li> <li>Incident management</li> <li>Problem management</li> <li>Change management</li> </ul>	✓
NIST 800-218 [35] (2022)	Define general security requirements			Verify third-party software complies with security requirements		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Implement roles and responsibilities</li> <li>Reuse existing software</li> <li>Implement supporting toolchains</li> <li>Implement and maintain secure environments</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Define and use criteria for software security checks</li> <li>Protect all forms of code from unauthorized access and tampering</li> </ul>	Configure the compilation, interpreter, and build processes to improve executable security	Design software to meet security requirements and mitigate security risks		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review and/or analyze human-readable code</li> <li>Create source code by adhering to secure coding practices</li> </ul>	Test executable code	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide a mechanism for verifying software release integrity</li> <li>Archive and protect each software release</li> <li>Identify and confirm vulnerabilities on an ongoing basis</li> <li>Assess, prioritize, and remediate vulnerabilities</li> <li>Analyze vulnerabilities to identify their root causes</li> </ul>	
SSDLC [31] (Last accessed in 2022)									<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Risk assessment</li> <li>Security considerations</li> </ul>	Apply coding standards	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Code review</li> <li>Unit testing, integration testing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Platform security</li> <li>Penetration testing</li> <li>Continuous monitoring</li> </ul>	✓	
Academia methodologies														

TABLE 3: Summary of SSDMs and involved secure practices

Methodology	Organizational-wide processes						Processes that cover all stages of SDLC	SDLC stages for a specific project						
	Policies and strategies	Response and recovery	Risk management framework	Supply chain security	Security culture	Other		Project inception	Analysis and requirements	Architectural and detailed design	Implementation	Verification and testing	Release and maintenance	Disposal
The methodology by Jones and Rastogi [69] (2004)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Define response process for handling security bugs</li> <li>Define backup procedures</li> <li>Define business continuity procedures</li> </ul>	✓		Security training		Form the security team	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Risk assessment</li> <li>Asset identification and validation</li> <li>Requirement gathering</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Threat modelling</li> <li>System design</li> <li>Security review</li> <li>Risk mitigation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cognizance of security risks</li> <li>Secure coding</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unit testing</li> <li>Integration quality assurance testing</li> <li>Penetration testing</li> <li>Certification</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Patch management</li> <li>Monitoring</li> </ul>	✓	
The methodology by Apville and Pourzandi [32] (2005)								<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Security environment and objectives description</li> <li>Threat modeling</li> <li>Security policy</li> <li>Risk evaluation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Security design</li> <li>Reviewing design</li> </ul>	Use secure coding best practices	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Peer review</li> <li>Unit testing</li> <li>System testing</li> <li>Evaluate bugs' criticality</li> </ul>	Operation and maintenance		
SSDM [43] (2006)					Security training			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requirements definition</li> <li>Threat modelling</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Define and review security specifications</li> </ul>	Coding	Penetration testing	Implementation and maintenance		
ISDF [38] (2010)					Education and awareness			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Security requirements</li> <li>Abuse cases</li> <li>Risk assessment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Risk analysis</li> <li>Threat modeling</li> <li>Security toolkits selection</li> <li>External reviews of design</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Secure coding practices</li> <li>Static/dynamic analysis tools</li> <li>Code review</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fuzz testing</li> <li>Penetration testing</li> <li>Threat-based testing</li> <li>Automated testing tools</li> <li>Code integrity</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Final security review</li> <li>Security feedback</li> <li>Response planning and execution</li> <li>Threat models update</li> <li>Release preparation</li> </ul>		
The methodology by Daud [44] (2010)								<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>User stories</li> <li>Security functional requirements</li> <li>Non-functional security requirements</li> <li>User requirements</li> <li>Misuse cases</li> <li>Mitigation plan</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Threat model</li> <li>Define input data types</li> <li>Security use cases</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Use security modules</li> <li>Define the list of known security vulnerabilities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unit testing</li> <li>Functional testing</li> <li>Penetration testing</li> <li>Fuzz testing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Security measurement</li> <li>Monitoring requirements</li> <li>Security controls upgrade</li> </ul>		
The methodology by Khan [39] (2011)								<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Security requirements identification and documentation</li> <li>Risk analysis</li> <li>Secure requirements review and verification</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Security design architecture and documentation</li> <li>Threat modeling</li> <li>Review and verification of secure design</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Secure code writing</li> <li>Static analysis</li> <li>Code review</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Security test activities</li> <li>Security test cases</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Security monitoring and creating a response plan</li> <li>New threats identification</li> <li>Attack surface measurement</li> <li>Develop mitigation techniques</li> </ul>		
The methodology by Chatterje, Gupta, and De [40] (2013)								<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Security requirements: elicitation</li> <li>analysis</li> <li>prioritization</li> <li>management</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Map security requirements with cryptographic services</li> <li>Security design analysis, constraints, structuring, decisions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Data protection services</li> <li>Application security integration</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Vulnerability scanning</li> <li>Vulnerability assessment</li> <li>Security assessment</li> <li>Security audit and review</li> </ul>			
The methodology by Farhan and Mostafa [45] (2018)					Developer training			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Architecture risk analysis</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Design risk analysis</li> <li>External security review</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Coding standards development</li> <li>Static code analysis</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Penetration testing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Security metrics development</li> <li>Test reviews</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Application infrastructure management</li> </ul>	



TABLE 4: Summary of SSDMs and involved secure practices for Agile development

Methodology	Organizational-wide processes						Processes that cover all stages of SDLC	SDLC stages for a specific project						
	Policies	Response and recovery	Supply chain security	Third party components management	Security culture	Other		Project inception	Analysis and requirements	Architectural and detailed design	Implementation	Verification and testing	Release and maintenance	Disposal
SDL-Agile [63] (2012)		Determine security response standards			Security education			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identify security and privacy expert</li> <li>Identify primary security and privacy contacts</li> <li>Ensure all team members have had security education within the past year</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Update the threat model</li> <li>Communicate privacy-impact design changes to the team</li> <li>Design review</li> <li>Baseline threat model</li> <li>Threat model the product, its attack surface and its new features</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Security coding standards</li> <li>Security coding standards</li> <li>Host security deployment review</li> <li>Fix all issues identified by code analysis tools for unmanaged code</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Verification tasks</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Final security review</li> <li>Response planning</li> </ul>	
GE [34] (Last access 2022)					Developer security training	Continuous risk assessment		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review design</li> <li>Provide security design input</li> <li>Establish security user stories</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Threat model</li> <li>Update security user stories</li> <li>Update threat model</li> <li>Attack surface analysis review and reduction</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SAST</li> <li>DAST</li> <li>Open Source vulnerability assessment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Penetration testing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Update response services</li> </ul>		
	One time practices				Every sprint practices			Bucket practices			No colour if not specified			

Next, we briefly summarize the distinct aspects of each methodology.

## 3.2 Industrial methodologies

### 3.2.1 Microsoft Secure Development Lifecycle SDL

Microsoft first introduced its security and privacy considerations integrated into all phases of SDLC in 2004. Thereafter in 2006 Howard and Lipner released the methodology “The security development lifecycle (SDL)” [4]. Microsoft notices two secure practices: executive support, and education and awareness, because these steps are the most successful at reducing the number of code bugs [4]. The company organizes obligatory security training, exercises, and labs for all engineering staff. Microsoft also pays secure-design principles as much attention as secure-coding best practices. To the date of publication of the book, the authors claimed that most of the SDL secure practices could be also incorporated into agile software development.

However, in 2012 Microsoft published a white paper [63], new version 5.2 of SDL with the SDL for agile development (SDL-Agile) addition. The SDL-Agile methodology will be considered in section 3.5.1. The main difference between Microsoft SDL 2006 and Microsoft SDL v.5.2 is that in the new version 5.2 authors added privacy concern. As non-technical practice privacy is considered in RQ2.

The latest version of Microsoft SDL is located on the website [33]. Compared to the former version 5.2, Microsoft added the following practices. To define a minimum level of security quality before starting the project, in the inception stage Microsoft created the *metrics definition and compliance reporting* process. Furthermore, it is important to define and approve the list of tools for developing the software. The *define and use cryptography standards* process is added to allow to use of only approved encryption libraries while developing a project. *Security response execution* is not provided in the modern version of Microsoft SDL [33].

### 3.2.2 McGraw Touchpoints

In 2004 McGraw published a paper [5] where he first introduced the concept of touchpoints. In 2006 he published the book “Software Security: Building Security in” [57] as an extension of [10] and [71] research. We classify this methodology as industry because McGraw affiliated to Cigital. McGraw describes software security as an ongoing process that is based on three pillars: (1) applied risk management, (2) software security best practices (touchpoints), and (3) knowledge [57]. Although a set of security practices is concentrated in touchpoints, knowledge management and risk management are integral parts of each software development project.

One of the crucial parts of knowledge management is training secure development staff on the most important security issues to increase awareness of security problems. Knowledge management also helps to realize that security is everyone’s job in the organization, including builders, operations people, administrators, users, and executives. In addition to education and awareness tasks, knowledge pillar includes guidelines, principles, rules, and historical knowledge that can be applied throughout the SDLC.

Touchpoints are directly linked to the Waterfall software development stages. However, they can be applied regardless of which software process is used to build software and can be cycled through more than once because the software evolves. McGraw considers two touchpoints as the most critical: code review and architectural risk analysis. They are combined because it is impossible to correctly address software security problems by using a code review but skipping architectural risk analysis.

McGraw puts the test plans phase as a separate practice with the *risk-based security preparation security* practice. This phase is based on the abuse case scenarios made in the analysis and requirement phase and includes a set of constructive and destructive activities. We put test plans in the design phase in Table 3.

What is remarkable in the McGraw framework is that all lifecycle stages are covered by ongoing external analysis (review). This review is conducted by people outside the company. McGraw also considers the risk analysis to be a continuous process during the requirement, design and testing phases rather than a single step. The results from risk analysis thus lead to requirements and planning of specific tests. Penetration tests is also a continuous process that covers the verification and testing and release and maintenance phases to ensure security of the system in its deployment environment.

### 3.2.3 Comprehensive, Lightweight Application Security Process (CLASP)

In 2006 Dan Graham published a set of processes “Introduction to the CLASP Process” [72] to help the software development team consider security at the early stages of SDLC. In 2013 the methodology was revised, however, the link to the document no longer functions. We therefore studied the document published in 2006.

CLASP (stands for Comprehensive, Lightweight Application Security Process) has then been taken on by the OWASP<sup>9</sup> consortium and it is considered to be a lightweight methodology and more affordable for small organizations with less strict security demands [14]. CLASP is a role-based methodology, what means that all security practices are linked to the specific project roles.

One ongoing practice that covers the specific project’s lifecycle is the *monitoring of security metrics* that helps to measure the progress of a project or project team. In NIST 800-160 there is a similar process *define and use criteria for software security checks* and in Microsoft SDL the *define metrics and compliance reporting* practice.

In the *identify user roles and resource capabilities* practice, there is a mapping of the roles and capabilities process. The role of the attackers is considered in this practice as well. The same *understanding adversaries* practice Google methodology [65] uses.

Besides the comprehensive description of the best security practices, CLASP provides the worksheets with coding guidelines to support the security practices.

### 3.2.4 SAFECODE

In 2018 the Software Assurance Forum for Excellence in Code (SAFECODE) published the “SAFECODE Fundamental

9. <https://owasp.org/>

Practices for Secure Software Development: Essential Elements of a Secure Development Lifecycle Program” [64] to help the industry to adopt security software development practices.

Instead of duplicating security principles, the authors provide the source of these practices. Thus, to describe the security design principles, SAFECODE refers to Saltzer and Schroeder principles [73]. The threat modeling practices are described in a white paper [74]. For managing the third-party components, SAFECODE also published a white paper [75].

SAFECODE emphasizes the importance of the *planning the implementation and deployment* of secure development practices considering this as an integral part of each health organization. One of the main practices of the planning phase is *creating the product development model and lifecycle*. The main idea of this practice is to merge the security and non-security specialists in one world (framework) to reduce friction while introducing the security practices into the lifecycle.

One of the outstanding practices is *application security control definition* which concerns the identification of threats, risks, security requirements, validation of the implementation of security requirements, and compliance with policies.

Another important practice is *standardize identity and access management* which encompasses the mechanisms for authentication and authorization. Identity and access management is also used in the BSA methodology [37].

SAFECODE argues that when the organization plans to introduce new practices, it needs to consider the activities that may help to create a culture of the organization. Such activities may be the experience of other organizations, mistakes made, and past successful activities.

### 3.2.5 The methodology by Google

In 2020 Adkins et al. released a book “Building Secure & Reliable Systems” [65] that is the result of a collaboration between O’Reilly and Google. The authors claim that despite the focus of the book on security, general approaches may be applied to achieve privacy goals. For short, we call this methodology by Google.

The authors argue that to make security requirements it is important to understand and assess the attacker’s motivation. In addition, it is crucial to consider potential risks from insiders. We discuss understanding adversaries’ processes in section 4.

From the authors’ point of view, the term supply chain means writing, building, testing, and deploying software. To harden the software supply chain against insider threats, code review and automation are crucial tactics. Moreover, automated systems may perform many steps in the supply chain helping to remove humans and reduce mistakes. To protect against adversaries the authors also involve binary provenance and verifiable builds.

In the book, the authors focus on the questions about how to prepare for disaster, what to do when a disaster happens, and how to recover after disaster. To ensure that system will survive the disaster and continue to work under attack, *disaster planning* is required. When the organization is under malicious actors the system should withstand a security crisis through *crisis management*. According to the

authors, the components of crisis management are detailed plans and communications. Crisis management includes operational security (OpSec) plan. OpSec plan establishes, which information needs to be a secret and how the response can be proceeded without exposing the organization to further risk. After a serious security incident, the organization should know how to recover. The role of recovery is to mitigate an attack and return the system to its normal state while making any necessary improvements.

At the end of the book, the authors highlight that all described security practices will be effective if a company has a culture of security and reliability. This culture is considered in section 4.

### 3.2.6 The BSA framework

In 2020 BSA foundation published a white paper “The BSA Framework for Secure Software: A new approach to securing the software lifecycle” [37]. We briefly call it the BSA framework. The structure of BSA is applicable for small and large organizations, for the Internet of Things, Artificial Intelligence, and all software development methods, including DevOps.

In Table 3 *secure development processes are documented throughout software development* activities are located in processes that cover all stages of SDLC. However, security guidance for the development and testing activities documentation may be general practices for all projects within a company. Moreover, gathering and documenting security requirements is a part of the analysis and requirements phase.

*Supply chain* category includes the practices related to third-party risk management (supply chain data is protected) and also to the implementation phase (software ensures integrity, the software is identifiable, the proper usages of software are assured).

The authors highlight that organizational processes and product security capabilities are vital components of secure software. Security capabilities comprise all technical aspects and should be taken into account while designing the software. These capabilities are: support for identity management and authentication, patchability, cryptographic services, authorization and access controls, logging, error and exception handling.

The BSA framework provides the term “SDL Governance” which means building a culture of security in the organization and also establishing policies, standards, and metrics.

### 3.2.7 The SAP methodology

In 2020 SAP corporation published a white paper “The Secure Software Development Lifecycle at SAP” [11]. We briefly call this SAP methodology. SAP pays attention to preparation stages that are defined in ISO/IEC 27034-1 standard [59].

The SAP methodology uses three types of modeling of risk assessment to identify and analyze risks: product-level, scenario-based, and fast-track threat modeling. After the *risk assessment* practice, a *security planning* follows. Based on the risk assessment results, security and privacy requirements, and security controls to mitigate the defined risks. The security controls are divided into two categories (1)

security functions that are used to enforce the security of the software, and (2) how a product team decides to prevent vulnerabilities. Because there are no boundaries between the analysis and requirements phase, and the design phase in SAP methodology, we merge these phases in Table 3.

In SAP, software development phase combines the design and implementation phase, where product teams use secure principles for design, secure programming techniques, libraries, and tools.

### 3.2.8 ReBIT Application Security Framework

In 2020 Reserve Bank Information Technology (ReBIT) published application security framework as a guide for Chief Information Security Officer (CISO) to implement application security within the organization.

Application security lifecycle consists of four main stages: (1) request for proposal, (2) development lifecycle, (3) production rollout, and (4) post deployment processes. Request for proposal phase is used to define the security requirements for the organization. The security requirements may discuss the following: secure design, secure deployment, security assessment, disaster recovery, secure use of open source, security compliance to policies and processes, and security for support and maintenance. We consider this phase to be a project planning phase.

One of the remarkable practices of ReBIT framework is vulnerability assessment and penetration testing (VAPT). The framework prescribes the minimum tests that must be performed: grey box and white box, web application, thick client app underlying infra, mobile app, windows app, handheld device application.

### 3.2.9 OWASP SAMM

In 2020 OWASP published Software Assurance Maturity Model (SAMM) [23] version 2.0 that supports Waterfall, Iterative, Agile, and DevOps development. 15 security practices are grouped into five categories according to the business functions: (1) governance, (2) design, (3) implementation, (4) verification, and (5) operation.

In implementation phase, there is a *defect management* practice that concentrates on tracking and analyzing the security defects within a project. The acquired information can be used to decrease the number of new defects.

*Environment management* is a part of the operation domain and focuses on keeping the environment secure. This process involves patching and updating, and configuration hardening once software is released. The BSA [37] framework has a similar practice *development environment*, however, BSA uses this term to focus on protecting the development environment against security threats while software is developing.

SAMM also provides a self-assessment toolbox for organizations to measure the level of software assurance maturity performance.

### 3.2.10 The Cisco methodology

In 2021 Cisco published a white paper “Secure Development Lifecycle” [13], describing their secure-by-design philosophy. We briefly call it the Cisco methodology.

Cisco considers the planning phase to be the crucial phase because it is a starting point for incorporating

defense-in-depth techniques. Furthermore, as the main focus of Cisco is cloud-based technologies, Cisco pays attention to planning the security of the cloud-based technologies, using SOC 2 Type II, and ISO 27001 industry certifications.

The developing phase in Cisco involves internal security training to improve the engineers’ security knowledge. As this process is ongoing, we put it in the education and awareness phase in Table 3.

During the launch phase, Cisco pays attention to security readiness to prepare a product for customer use and to check the critical security and privacy controls. In the company there is also a channel (Product Security Incident Response Team (PSIRT)) between the company and customers to mitigate critical security risks.

### 3.2.11 The Citrix methodology

In 2021 Citrix published the “Citrix Security Development Lifecycle” [12]. We briefly call it the Citrix methodology.

Citrix pays attention to internal and external engagement. For example, Citrix created a Red Team that is responsible for year-round imitation of attacks on projects. Furthermore, Citrix hires external companies to provide external security assessments and penetration testing. Citrix Product Security Engineering team also yearly provides penetration tests. In addition, the company is involved in the Bug Bounty program to allow researchers to find vulnerabilities in the company’s products. The combination of results from Red Team work, external assessment, Bug Bounty program, and Product Security Engineering team is the basis of security remediation programs.

Supply chain security in the Citrix framework includes not only the third-party component management but also analysis, tracking, and testing of CI/CD (continuous integration, continuous delivery) pipeline components.

### 3.2.12 BSIMM

The latest version of Building Security In Maturity Model (BSIMM) was published in 2021 [66]. This model is a result of analysis of gathered data on which security practices different organizations take to address to solve software security problems. The basic structure underlying the BSIMM is the software security framework that comprises 12 security practices. These security practices are divided into four domains: (1) governance, (2) intelligence, (3) SSDL Touchpoints, (4) deployment. The security practices embrace a total of 112 security activities divided into three levels of maturity. As the maturity models lie beyond the scope of our research, we investigate only underlying the BSIMM framework.

We found a similarity between the McGraw Touchpoints [57] *knowledge* pillar and the BSIMM *intelligence* domain. The goal of both is to gather and share knowledge throughout the organization. The collected knowledge can be applied at different stages of the SDLC for specific projects. The intelligence domain has three security practices (1) attack models, (2) security features & design, (3) standards & requirements. We consider these practices to be organizational-wide because they lead to the accumulation of corporate knowledge used in the implementation of software security activities throughout the organization [66].

The touchpoints of BSIMM are associated with a particular SDLC process and include (1) architecture analysis, (2) code review, and (3) security testing.

The *deployment* domain includes (1) penetration testing, (2) software environment, and (3) configuration management and vulnerability management. *Software environment* embraces configuration documentation, code signing, and change management.

According to BSIMM, the ten most observed in the organizations security activities are: implement lifecycle instrumentation and use to define governance, ensure host and network security basics are in place, identify PII obligations, perform security feature review, use external penetration testers to find problems, create or interface with incident response, integrate and deliver security features, use automated tools, ensure QA performs edge/boundary value condition testing, translate compliance constraints to requirements. All these practices are distributed among the BSIMM framework security practices.

In this paragraph, we considered secure software development practices in the methodologies created by industry. Next, the methodologies published by government are discussed.

### 3.3 Government methodologies

#### 3.3.1 The Grip on SSD methodology

The center for Information Security and Privacy Protection (CIP) was founded by Dutch Tax Authorities and contributes to ensure the security of the Dutch public services. In 2014 around twenty organizations founded “SSD practitioner community” to distribute their knowledge and experience in secure software development. Since that year community worked on the improvement of secure software development best practices. In 2015 CIP published “Grip on Secure Software Development (SSD)” [41]. In the same year, 23 organizations signed the manifesto to apply Grip on SSD.

While investigating the methodology, we found one significant similarity between Grip on SSD [41] and McGraw Touchpoints [57]. The McGraw *touchpoints* pillar is similar to the *contact moments* pillar in Grip on SSD, and consists of security practices distributed among the SDLC stages. The *standard security requirement* pillar in Grip on SSD comprises a list of policies, principles, and attack patterns applicable to all projects within the organization. The McGraw’s *knowledge* pillar includes the same tasks but also education and awareness.

Grip on SSD pays attention to the *processes* that compose the guidance for a client on how to effectively operate security measures. This support is important because the methodology works effectively only if a client actively supports and propagates the methodology. The guidance embraces *maturity* for determining how much control an organization has over deploying secure software, *risk control and risk acceptance*, *risk analysis*, *business impact analysis*, and *maintaining standard security requirements*.

What is remarkable about the Grip on SSD methodology is that the design phase only involves test plans that are based on misuse and abuse cases.

#### 3.3.2 NIST 800-160

In 2016 National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) published “Systems Security Engineering: Considerations for a Multidisciplinary Approach in the Engineering of Trustworthy Secure Systems” [67]. NIST 800-160 uses categorization of processes of ISO/IEC/IEEE 15288 [76]. Although NIST 800-160 is developed for all engineering systems (cyber-physical systems, Internet of Things, hardware security, etc.), the publication can be also applied for software engineering.

The authors of NIST 800-160 decompose the practices of system engineering into technical and non-technical processes during life-cycle. The technical processes include engineering design and analysis, while non-technical processes combine engineering management, agreements between parties and project-enabling support [67]. The importance to achieve security goals by integrating security activities and considerations during both technical and non-technical processes is emphasized.

NIST 800-160 focuses on organizational practices that cover the entire SDLC of a project. *Business or mission analysis* implemented in close cooperation with the stakeholder needs and requirements definition process. Through this analysis, the engineering team can define the drivers and the scope of business and mission problems and also opportunities to mitigate these problems.

*Technical management* process combines risk management, decision management, configuration management, information management, and measurement. All together, these practices are used to evaluate the progress, establish and execute the plans, and control the execution of the project.

Another significant category of security-related processes that cover all projects is organizational *project-enabling processes*. This category combines life cycle model management, infrastructure management, portfolio management, human resource management, quality management, and knowledge management. The role of these practices is to help to ensure the capabilities of the organization to fulfill the project.

In 2021 NIST Published Volume 2 “Developing Cyber Resilient Systems: A Systems Security Engineering Approach” [68]. This volume focuses on the characteristic of cyber resilience, which is the property of an engineered system and guides on how to implement cyber resilience concepts in system security engineering.

#### 3.3.3 The methodology from Singapore

In 2017 Cyber Security Agency of Singapore published a white paper “Security-by-Design Framework” [36]. For short, we call this the methodology from Singapore.

Each activity of the security-by-design framework is associated with roles and responsibilities, and also with inter-dependencies. Inter-dependencies characterize the incorporation of several methodologies to enhance the system’s security. For example, while performing a security review results should be used to improve security controls as well as to establish the effectiveness of security controls.

According to the authors, the key role of the security-by-design framework is the steering committee which must

approve milestones before the project can be moved to the next phase. These milestones are security planning and risk assessment, critical security design review, system security acceptance testing, and penetration testing.

The methodology from Singapore implies the adoption of security-by-design for agile methodology. The security practices are the same as for the Waterfall methodology. The only difference is the quick iterations of software development stages in agile methodology. There is a loop between the construction stage and the transition stage. This loop allows delivering of changes in stakeholder requirements iteratively and incrementally. The secure practices in the construction and the transition phases are similar for the Agile and Waterfall methodologies: application security testing and system security acceptance testing, but for the transition phase penetration testing is added for Agile.

### 3.3.4 The methodology from Malaysia

In 2020 CyberSecurity Malaysia, which is a “national cyber security specialist agency under the purview of the Ministry of Communications and Multimedia Malaysia”, published “Guidelines for Secure Software Development Life Cycle (SSDLC)” [42]. For short, we call this the methodology from Malaysia.

In the requirement stage, *data classification* is involved to choose protection needs for data. The process of data classification consists of (1) defining the type of data, (2) defining the level of sensitivity, (3) ownership of data, (4) a policy-based data management, and (5) privacy requirements.

In the implementation phase, *certification and accreditation* practice is used for the technical verification. During deployment, *installation* practice is used to make secure production of the system and involves such activities as environment configuration and release management. For handling the change requests, *change management* is used. There is also *verification and validation* in the release and maintenance phase. While the testing phase focuses on ensuring the code developed runs as intended, the main goal of the *verification and validation* is to ensure the software truly meets security requirements. To reduce the residual risks during the disposal phase, the methodology implies *end-of-life* policies. The organization should follow these policies to correctly dispose of data, documents, and software.

### 3.3.5 NIST 800-218

In 2022 NIST released “Secure Software Development Framework (SSDF) Version 1.1: Recommendations for Mitigating the Risk of Software Vulnerabilities” [35].

NIST 800-218 pays attention to the preparation stage to ensure that people, technologies and processes are getting ready to integrate security in the lifecycle. If the project requires, the organization should create new roles and responsibilities, and train the personnel. Also, *maintaining the security environment*, *defining criteria for security checks*, and *implementation of the supporting toolchains* are the parts of the organization’s preparation.

It is important to mention that the *define security requirements* process does not concern defining the security requirements for a specific project. Conversely, this process

involves defining the policies of the organization, risk management strategy, business objectives, applicable regulations, etc. Moreover, it is important to maintain the security requirements of the policies throughout SDLC.

Another remarkable practice in NIST 800-218 is the *design software to meet security requirements*. This practice involves the identification and evaluation of security requirements, defining security risks, and designing decisions for mitigating the risks, so it encompasses both requirements and design stages.

While investigating NIST 800-160 and NIST 800-218, we discovered that these methodologies are organization-oriented frameworks. That means that the methodologies are focused on the preparation of the organization to ensure that organization has the sufficient capability (people, processes, and technology) to develop the project. For ensuring this, NIST 800-218 uses the *prepare the organization* category of the practices, while NIST 800-160 includes *organizational project-enabling processes*.

### 3.3.6 Romanian SSDLC methodology

In 2021 National Cyber Security Directorate of Romania published a paper “Security in SDLC – Secure Software Development Lifecycle” [31]. We briefly call it the SSDLC methodology. Generally, this methodology is similar to Microsoft [33], SAFECode [64], and Malaysia [42]; it does not contain any security practices distinct from these methodologies.

In this section, we have considered the secure software development practices in the methodologies created by governments. Next, the methodologies published by scientific researchers are discussed.

## 3.4 Academia methodologies

### 3.4.1 The methodology by Jones and Rastogi

In 2004 Jones and Rastogi [69] published the software development methodology with baked-in security. For short, we call this the methodology by Jones and Rastogi. To the best of our knowledge, this paper is the first academic paper that describes the security practices involved in each phase of SDLC.

The authors mention that the methodology is based on existing risk management, but they do not reveal the meaning of risk management in the context of security. They also do not show which software development stages are covered by risk management. Nevertheless, the authors take a detailed look at the interweaving between security practices and life cycle stages.

For example, in the *secure coding* practice, the authors summarize the secure coding practices, such as always authenticate, fail securely, least privilege. [69].

Another remarkable security practice in the methodology is the *security test plans* which is developed in the implementation phase. The test plans are based on system risks revealed during the risk assessment practice.

The maintenance phase in this methodology comprises organization-wide practices for the preparation of the maintenance phase: defining the response process for handling security bugs, defining backup procedures, and defining business continuity procedures. These procedures are to be

prepared before the maintenance phase. The maintenance phase also includes ongoing security training for project managers, software architects, and software developers. We consider this part to be an organization-wide practice.

The security disposal phase is the last stage of the methodology. Jones and Rastogi emphasize that security is as much important during disaster occurs or disposal of the system as during all other stages of SDLC [69].

The authors emphasize their philosophy of secure SDLC processes. The main idea is that organizations should provide top-level support (CEO, CFO, CIO), training of involved project members, and management techniques sufficient to include and support security practices.

### 3.4.2 The methodology by Apvrille and Pourzandi

In 2005 Apvrille and Pourzandi published “Secure Software Development by Example” [32]. For short, we call this the methodology by Apvrille and Pourzandi. The authors introduce secure practices by the example of PICO (Presence and Instant Communication) application, which is a “very simplified representation of ICQ or America Online Instant Messenger” [32].

The experiment of the authors revealed that the best way to provide security testing is a code review. Furthermore, to show security concepts during the design stage UMLsec is the best tool.

### 3.4.3 SSDM

In 2006 Sodiya, Onashoga, and Ajayi published “Towards Building Secure Software Systems” (SSDM) [43]. This framework intertwines the software development path and the security engineering path. The authors also present basic laws to support the way to create secure software. The most important laws are:

- Continuously update security knowledge.
- The software developers must assess their work at the end of each stage.
- To easily implement security practices all security specifications must be concise and clear.

One of the remarkable practices of the methodology is *security specification* in the design phase. The result of security specification is the policy with guideline on how to behave against attacks.

In the implementation and maintenance phase, *training the users* practice is included. However, the authors do not provide security concerns in this practice.

The authors use the *implementation and maintenance phase* practice in the sense of release and maintenance and includes installing the software mad implementing the changes.

### 3.4.4 ISDF

In 2010 Alkussayer and Allen introduced the Integrated Security Development Framework (ISDF) Framework [38]. This framework consists of two main elements: security best practices and the security pattern utilization process. The most remarkable patterns are security patterns identification during the requirement stage, architecture evaluation during the design phase, and feedback on new patterns in the verification and operation phase.

Moreover, the authors highlight that critical security concern rises during the post-implementation phase, which is under the path between the deployment and operation phases. The problem is to perform the integrity and authenticity throughout the supply chain. To solve this problem, the authors provide security feedback, response execution, and threat model update models.

Even though the authors proposed a framework with a picture of security practices involved in every SDLC phase, there is a lack of description of these practices. For example, test plans, external reviews, and quality gates are mentioned in the picture of the methodology but not in the text. Therefore, we suggest that the authors provide an inconsistent presentation of the framework.

### 3.4.5 The methodology by Daud

In 2010 Daud published “Secure Software Development Model: A Guide for Secure Software Life Cycle” [44]. For short, we call this the methodology by Daud. Although the author proposes that his model is based on Extreme Programming (XP) concept, there is no mention of keywords related to Agile methodology. For instance, the author does not use one-time, bucket, and every-sprint requirements, as MS SDL-Agile and GE do. The Daud’s methodology therefore is located in the Waterfall methodologies category in Table 3. Even though the author shows the iterative model of secure SDLC based on the XP technique with several security practices, all secure practices to be taken are displayed in the Waterfall SDLC.

The iterative model can be explained as follows. The five main lifecycle stages are security functional requirements, analysis, design, development, and testing. There are also three cycles involved in an iterative model (1) between analysis and security functional requirement phases, (2) between analysis and design phases, and (3) between the development and testing phases. Next, the security components involved in each phase are considered.

During the cycle (1) uncertain requirements transfer into refined requirements. Then, during the cycle (2), threats coming from the analysis phase are processed in the design phase and become new security requirements. After that, the known security vulnerabilities and mitigation plan from the design phase transfer to the development phase. Throughout the cycle (3), implementation risks taken from development and user stories go to the testing phase. The result of the testing phase is vulnerabilities that are to be processed in the development phase. If during testing design bugs are identified, then these bugs should be transferred to the design phase.

Secure practices involved in the Daud’s Waterfall model are similar to other methodologies (Jones and Rastogi [69], SSDM [43], ISDF [38]). In addition, the author did not provide information on the distinctive features of his result.

### 3.4.6 The methodology by Khan

In 2011 Khan published a prescriptive framework [39] for secure software development. For short, we call this methodology by Khan. To consider security throughout the development lifecycle, the author proposed a framework but does not emphasize what novel activities have been added to the

framework. This framework looks like other methodologies, such as Microsoft SDL [33] and Singapore [36].

### 3.4.7 The methodology by Chatterjee, Gupta, and De

In 2013 Chatterjee, Gupta, and De published a framework for the development of secure software [40]. For short, we call it the methodology by Chatterjee, Gupta, and De. According to the authors, the remarkable feature of the methodology is that it “involves converting security requirements and threats into design decisions to mitigate the identified security threats” [40]. However, this process is the obvious goal of the security design and is used in every methodology we found.

This methodology is similar to other existing frameworks like Microsoft SDL [33] and CLASP [62]. The methodology does not include any unique security practices, as can be observed in Table 3.

### 3.4.8 The methodology by Farhan and Mostafa

In 2018 Farhan and Mostafa published “A Methodology for Enhancing Software Security During Development Processes” [45], where enhancing means reducing the software vulnerabilities. For short, we call this methodology by Farhan and Mostafa.

According to the authors, their role in enhancing security is implementing security measures in every process at every step of SDLC instead of measuring security only at the testing stage. These measures are considered in RQ3. However, the authors do not describe security practices incorporated in the methodology, but only display them in the picture.

## 3.5 Agile methodologies

### 3.5.1 SDL-Agile

In 2012 Microsoft released [63] SDL-Agile methodology where the authors highlight the problem of merging two worlds, classic SDL and SDL-Agile. The problem is that in the SLD-Agile methodology every requirement cannot be completed for every sprint, because the sprint takes a very small amount of time (usually 15-60 days). To solve this problem, the authors apply two changes to adopt classic SDL for agile development. The first change is that all development phases from classic SDL are to be reorganized to a more Agile-friendly pattern. The second change is that team members must do sufficient SDL work on a feature before working on another feature.

In addition, Microsoft proposed two main points that must be considered while adopting SDL-Agile methodology: SDL-agile requirements and applying classic SDL tasks for sprints. Within the first process classic SDL requirements are allocated into one of three categories, that is every-sprint requirements, bucket requirements, and one-time requirements. The listed categories mean frequency, how often requirements must be completed.

Next, the main points of SDL tasks are considered. The authors advise using threat modeling as a part of the design of every sprint. Using a spike (a mini security push) helps to update risky code in a short time by analyzing how bad the bugs in the code are. When reviewing the requirement exception workflow in an SDL-Agile project, members can apply for exclusion of requirements for sprint duration or

to exclude for a specific period of time. However, in the classic SDL requirements, exceptions can be provided only for the life cycle. Moreover, the authors advise applying *final security review* that is similar to the classic SDL and is performed in every sprint at the end.

### 3.5.2 GE

American General Electric Company (GE) published a white paper “GE Digital Platform & Product Cybersecurity (GED P&P Cybersecurity) Secure Development Lifecycle (SDL)” [34] with guidelines for ensuring product security and reliability for agile development. For short, we call this GE methodology.

GE proposed a framework for Agile methodology aimed more at Industrial Internet. All the practices are divided into three types: one-time practices, every sprint practices, and bucket practices. In addition, GE distributed practices throughout the life cycle that can be found in Table 4. One notable practice of GE is *developer security training* which includes ongoing courses provided to developers. Despite the fact that the practice is ongoing, the authors marked it as a bucket practice that is inconsistent with SDL-Agile.

## 4 AUXILIARY PRACTICES

In this section, we answer RQ2. While investigating the secure SDLC methodologies, we discovered that they involve organizational, behavioral, legal, policy, and governance aspects, aside from purely technical aspects focused on developing software systems. The combination of these aspects we call auxiliary (non-technical practices).

### 4.1 Relevance of auxiliary practices

Researchers have demonstrated the influence of cultural, organizational, and personal factors on secure development. For example, Arizon-Peretz, Hadar, and Luria [77] investigated cultural, organizational, and personal factors that affect the implementation of security by design approach. They found that developers do not feel motivated or responsible for proactive security design due to a low-level security climate and a low level of self-efficacy of the developers. The authors suggest that a high-level organizational security climate may improve security self-efficacy and proactive security behavior.

According to the 2022 Data Breach Investigation Report [78], 82% of data breaches involved human factors. Furthermore, it is emphasized that “people continue to play a very large role in incidents and breaches alike”. The experiment conducted by Spiekermann et al. [79] showed that a third of 124 engineers did not feel motivated or responsible for designing security mechanisms. Alavi, Islam, and Mouratidis [80] argue that human factors “can deeply affect the management of security in an organizational context despite all security measures” [80]. According to the authors, human factors are involved in communication (documentation, collaboration), security awareness (motivation, training), and management support (skills, leadership).

Pirzadeh [21] revealed that human factors are not considered in the late phases of the software development process. However, late development processes are involved



in improving the processes and maintenance according to the customer satisfaction and feedback from developers and customers. More research is therefore required on human factors in late stages of SDLC to contribute to improvements in software development projects [21].

The research conducted by Mokheri and Beznosov [22] revealed 17 factors which make secure software development challenging for developers and lead to more vulnerable software. These factors can be divided into three groups: (1) human, (2) organizational, (3) technological. Among these challenges are extremely low and high confidence level of the developers, insufficient security knowledge, finding security hard to grasp, a lack of security culture, a lack of clear security policy, a lack of effective communication, misuse of security APIs/Libraries and protocols, fear to update and upgrade. To overcome these problems, the authors recommend to encourage developers to use security knowledge and create a sense of responsibility, create a security policy and strategies to assist developers, promote a culture of communication between developers and security experts, and motivate developers to advance security knowledge.

All these studies mentioned above show that organizations need to think beyond pure software development activities when engaging in security-by-design. Therefore, we need to find auxiliary practices in the presented SSDMs.

To present auxiliary practices, we divide them into several categories. At the same time, their categories are interwoven and they are closely related, so auxiliary practices from one category may be also a part of another category. For example, practices from the *understanding human behavior* category can also be considered in the *communication process* category.

## 4.2 Risk management framework

Risk management framework is defined in Touchpoints [57], NIST 800-160 [68], the methodology from Singapore [36], the methodology from Malaysia [42], the BSA [37] framework and the methodology by Jones and Rastogi [69]. NIST 800-160 [67] provides a detailed explanation of practices involved in risk management processes. The following security activities and tasks are included:

- *Planning of security risk management.* This involves defining the security aspects of the risk management strategy. Security aspects may be stakeholders' concerns, trustworthiness, and assurance.
- *Managing the security aspects.* The information management process is involved to provide security risks to stakeholders.
- *Analysis of security risks.* With the support of the system analysis process, the analysis identifies security risks and assesses the likelihood of occurrence and consequences of these risks.
- *Treatment of security risks.* With the support of the decision management process, this is used to identify security treatments that may be recommended to stakeholders.
- *Monitoring of security risks,* which involves monitoring the changes, and assessment of the effectiveness of security measures.

McGraw [57] describes his philosophy of risk management framework (RMF) as a full life cycle activity that occurs in parallel with SDLC activities to identify, track and mitigate risks that appear over project development. In his methodology software risk management is strongly influenced by business motivation and takes place in the context of the business. Business goals and priorities are taken into account while identifying and analyzing the risks. The RMF can be considered as a fractal, continuous multilevel loop because the full process can be applied at different levels, such as project level, software lifecycle phase level, and artifact level.

In the methodology from Singapore [36], the BSA [37] framework, and the methodology by Jones and Rastogi [69] the authors only mention that the methodology is based on the risk management framework. However, they do not provide any specific details.

## 4.3 Security metrics

Security metrics are measurements that used to assess the effectiveness of security processes. The methodologies that mention security metrics in the secure SDLC [57], [33], [67], [64], [65], [62] highlight that there is no perfect answer how to measure security.

McGraw [57] considers metrics and measures to be a crucial part of introducing SDLC in large organizations. According to the author, ideally, the metrics and measures are focused on the following areas: project, process, product, and organization. Taking these areas into account, it is possible to assess all activities in a software development effort. Moreover, all metrics should reflect strategic business goals.

NIST 800-160 [67] includes the *measurement process* as a part of the technical management process. The main goal of the measurement process is to support effective management and show the quality of the product. The methodology also has the *project assessment strategy* that concerns the measurement of security because it establishes criteria of security assessment performance, methods, and activities for evaluation of the security.

Microsoft SDL [63] and NIST 800-218 [35] use vulnerability severity scores to define the severity threshold of security vulnerabilities and to determine the minimum acceptable security performance levels.

In contrast to the above-mentioned methodologies, the CLASP methodology [62] considers the role of metrics to be not only the likely level of security but also to identify specific areas for improvement. The metrics of CLASP help to assess the quality of work made by project members. For example, the metrics support to decide which part of the project requires expert attention or which project members require additional training. In the CLASP methodology, a project manager is responsible for monitoring security metrics to assess the progress of either project or a team working on a project. Compared to other methodologies [33], [67], [64], [65], CLASP provides an overview of the metrics that can be used to measure security.

- *Worksheet-based metrics* are based on questions regarding system assessment. Questions can be divided into the *critical*, *important* and *useful* groups, and the metric may be based on these groups.

- *Attack surface measurement* is “a count of numbers of data inputs to the program or system” [62].
- *Coding guideline adherence measurement* allows to weight guidelines using the organizational risks.
- *Reported defect rates* allow to measure the number of defects based on their severity.
- *Input validation thoroughness measurement* allows assessing whether all data from untrusted sources perform input validation.
- *Security test coverage measurement* allows to assess the quality of testing.

In addition, the authors of CLASP highlight that it is insufficient to only identify metrics and apply them. It is crucial to take into account historical metrics data and to track the developers’ progress constantly. The output of metrics also should be periodically reviewed.

BSIMM [66] and OWASP SAMM [23] use the *strategy & metrics* domain in the structure of the framework. We discovered that in BSIMM [66] no security activities from the top 10 activities list refer to security metrics. In OWASP SAMM [23], defining different metrics is considered in security activities in maturity levels, but not in the framework.

The methodology by Jones and Rastogi [69] mentions a process of establishing *internal metrics and key performance indicators*. However, the authors do not provide any specific details on these metrics. Moreover, this process is not considered to be a security practice of the methodology but the advice of the authors.

The methodology by Farhan and Mostafa [45] proposed the metrics to measure the security efforts in all phases of SDLC. These metrics are:

- Effort and progress metric to measure the actual and estimated efforts and the progress;
- Time to deliver variance rate to indicate the variance of actual progress from the baseline for the entire project;
- Schedule variance to measure the actual duration of the project;
- Stability metric to show the impact of requirements changes;
- Quality measure to provide insight on the quality and compliance;
- Work product quality and software quality.

While the above-mentioned methodologies provide information on how to measure security, the SAP methodology involves the assessment of privacy. The methodology uses *a data protection compliance evaluation* to assess the fulfillment of legal requirements, for instance, GDPR (General Data Protection Regulation).

#### 4.4 Building a culture of security

One of the aims of the authors of the methodology by Google [65] is to investigate the efforts to create *a culture of security and reliability* in the organization, or, in other words, *security-centric culture*. Because human factors are the most important drivers of security practices, everyone must be responsible for security in the organization. Security should be considered as a team responsibility, a daily habit of every team member.

McGraw [57] describes the cultural changes required to adopt the secure SDLC framework for large organizations. In his view, the organization should include a well-defined roadmap of how to involve security practices in the SDLC. This roadmap includes the following practices: (1) assign the leader of each security initiative who will be responsible for it, (2) train not only developers but also all involved in the project staff, and (3) establish the metric programs and other.

The authors of SAFECode [64] propose that the culture of the organization should be considered when introducing new security practices. Thus, in some organizations team members will respond better to corporate mandates from senior managers, while others respond better to the support from a team of engineers. If in the organization mandates work better, it makes sense to define key managers who will communicate and support security initiatives.

One of the components of security culture is *education and awareness* programs. These programs include appropriate training of personnel involved in the project on security basics and trends. Measuring outcome performance also helps to find areas for update [35]. The education and awareness concern is a part of the secure SDLC concept from the beginning of the appearance of SSDMs. Over half the methodologies that we found involves ongoing security training of team members: (Microsoft SDL [33], Touchpoints [57], CLASP [62], NIST 800-160 [67], SAFECode [64], the methodology by Google [65], BSA [37], SAP [11], Cisco [13], Citrix [12], BSIMM [66], SAMM [23], SDL-Agile [63], GE [34], the methodology by Jones and Rastogi [69], SSDM [43], ISDF [38], the methodology by Farhan [45]).

The following methodologies also consider the aspects of *education and awareness* programs. NIST 800-160 [67], *human resource management* includes a process that establishes a plan for skill development and includes maintaining the competence of the human resources. CLASP argues that a good way to increase security awareness is designating a security officer, who is enthusiastic about security. Furthermore, rewarding personnel for compliance with security guidelines is an effective way to raise awareness [62]. The authors of SAFECode [64] claim that to be successful in implementing secure SDLC in the organization, all project members need to be aware of the significance of security and attend the training programs. Furthermore, for each secure practice organizations should consider the required level of expertise.

McGraw [57] included the knowledge in one of the pillars. In his view, the knowledge “involves the collection, encapsulation, and sharing of security knowledge that can be used to build a solid foundation for software security practices” [57]. McGraw also defines the following knowledge categories: principles, guidelines, rules, vulnerabilities, exploits, attack patterns, and historical risks. These categories are distributed among the software SDLC. For example, rules are used in static analysis and code review, while historical risks are applied to requirement, design, implementation, and verification phases. The author argues that one of the best ways to distribute software development knowledge is security training of software development staff.

The goal of *knowledge management* in NIST 800-160 [67] is similar to the knowledge pillar of Touchpoints [57] and an intelligence domain in BSIMM [66]. The idea is to define, obtain and maintain security knowledge and skills.

#### 4.5 Understanding human behavior

The authors of the methodology by Google [65] propose that sometimes the fear of changing or resistance to change may appear in team members. A successful case-building process should involve the prioritization of initiatives that have a chance of success. Also, sometimes it is better to stop introducing a change if the initiative lost causes.

Furthermore, the authors [65] emphasize that to build secure and reliable systems it is important to *understand adversaries*. For instance, one of the motivations of an attacker may be fun, fame, activism, financial gain, coercion, manipulation, espionage, and destruction. The CLASP [62] methodology also analyzes the attack profile. According to CLASP, there are (1) insiders, (2) “script kiddies”, (3) competitors, (4) governments, (4) organized crime, and (5) activists. Compared to CLASP, the methodology by Google has two more attacker profiles, such as automation and artificial intelligence, and vulnerability researchers. The SSDM methodology [43] also involves *understanding attackers’ interests on the software being developed* but in the security training process.

User behavior is also involved in the process to withstand DoS attack [65]. Sometimes external events and humans decisions may lead to the synchronization of human behavior. For instance, when an emergency happens in a big city, a lot of people may search the incident details, publish information and share information with friends on social networks.

The authors of the methodology by Google [65] mention that human-centered software expertise helps to solve problems that humans experience while interacting with the software. Because the user is not supposed to have the expertise in security, the security of the software should not depend on the end user.

The BSA methodology [37] suggests that the software should be configured secure based on its intended user usage.

#### 4.6 Policies, strategies, standards and conventions

According to NIST 800-160 [67] and NIST 800-53 [81], security policy is “a set of rules that governs all aspects of the security-relevant system and system component behavior”. The security policies and strategies establish rules and procedures for managing the security within a company. The overview of security policies and strategies used in SSDMs is shown in Table 5.

The Grip on SSD methodology [41] and CLASP [62] include the practice to have a list of baseline (or standard) security requirements that can be used for each project within a company. *The standard security requirements* in SSD, as was discussed in the section 3.2, allow to avoid drawing up all security requirements afresh for each project. The standard security requirements includes:

- Security architecture. In the organization of a client, some security controls may be already implemented.

Security architecture defines these controls and describes the relationship between controls.

- Baseline security defines international standards that can be used in the organizations, for example, ISO 27002:2005, ISO/IEC 27002:2013, ISO 25010.
- Classification of systems and data. The client classifies the software into security classes (high, medium, and low).
- The client generates a list of known risks and then during risk analysis, relevant to current project risks are selected.

To maintain standard security requirements the authors recommend “to exchange information on the standard security requirements with other (semi) public bodies” [41] to achieve greater efficiency as more knowledge is accumulated. In CLASP [62] baseline security requirements are identified in *global security policy*.

Cisco [13] believes privacy to be a fundamental human right. The company published the privacy policy<sup>10</sup> which is used for privacy control validation and privacy assessment practices.

Several methodologies claim that security practices need to be performed according to security policies [40], [45], [44], [36], [42], [60], [32], [39], [38]. However, these methodologies do not define these policies. For example, the authors of the methodology from Singapore [36] claim that many practices such as penetration testing, the evaluation of security specifications should be performed according to security policies.

When writing the code, the developers may make mistakes. Defining the standards and conventions such as coding standards, languages, frameworks, and libraries helps to reduce the number of unintentional vulnerabilities in the code [62]. SAFECode [64], CLASP [62], BSA [37] involve *establish coding standards* as a part of secure coding practices. CLASP does not use coding standards as a practice but as a list of the resource. The methodology by Google [65], Cisco [13], NIST 800-218 [35], the methodology by Jones and Rastogi [69], the methodology by Farhan [45], the methodology by Apvrille and Pourzandi [32] use coding standards, but identification of these standards is not a practice of the methodology.

BSIMM [66] and OWASP SAMM [23] include the governance domain that helps to organize, manage and measure security activities. Both BSIMM and SAMM have *strategies & metrics* and *compliance & policy* practices. OWASP SAMM also has *education and guidance* and BSIMM has *training* practice. Furthermore, both BSIMM and SAMM include establishing the policies activities grouped in maturity levels. As the security activities involved in maturity levels lie beyond the scope of the research, we do not include specific security policies in Table 5.

#### 4.7 Auxiliary practices of incident or vulnerability response

Bearing in mind that humans make mistakes [65], [31], it is crucial to detect these issues at the early stages of SDLC to reduce the costs of correction of the mistakes [4]. However,

10. <https://www.cisco.com/c/en/us/about/trust-center/global-privacy-policy.html>

TABLE 5  
Policies and strategies of secure software development

Name of policy	Meaning	Source
Global security policy	Provide default standard security requirements applicable to all projects within a company	CLASP [62], Grip on SSD [41], NIST 800-218 [35], the methodology by Google [65]
End-of-life (disposal) policies	Are used in managing the risks in terminating the system	Malaysia [42], NIST 800-160 [67]
Security requirements definition strategy	Information gathering activities which are used to define together with stakeholders common security requirements	NIST 800-160 [67]
Project assessment strategy	Is used to measure the security	NIST 800-160 [67]
Project control strategy	Handles problems when the project do not meet security goals	NIST 800-160 [67]
Decision management strategy	Includes defining roles and responsibilities, schemes to support the decision making process	NIST 800-160 [67]
Risk management strategy	Security aspects of risk management strategy must be defined	NIST 800-160 [67]
Risk treatment strategy	Requires to take into account costs, schedule, and the effectiveness in reducing security risks	NIST 800-160 [67]
Configuration management strategy	Involves a variety of different activities, such as roles and responsibilities, the storage media constraints, security activities among acquirer, supplier, logistics and other activities	NIST 800-160 [67]
Information management strategy	Addresses security and privacy concerns of all types of information involved in the project (for example, intellectual property)	NIST 800-160 [67]
Quality assurance strategy	Helps to ensure that quality management process is effectively applied for the project	NIST 800-160 [67]
Vulnerability response policies	Considers vulnerability disclosure and remediation processes, roles and responsibilities	Microsoft SDL [33], SAFECODE [64], BSA [37], NIST 800-218 [35], the methodology by Khan [39], SDL-Agile [63]
Privacy policy	Is used for privacy control validation and privacy assessment practices	Cisco [13]
Disaster response strategy	Procedures that define (1) the roles and responsibilities, (2) how the incident is reported to the incident response team, and (3) communications with external stakeholders, responders, and support teams	the methodology by Google [65]
Maintenance strategy	Defines resources, security considerations, schedules, measures to perform maintenance of the system	NIST 800-160 [67]
Policy for authentication and authorization decisions	To verify the identity and access rights	the methodology by Google [65]
Risk acceptance and exception policy	To consider residual risks in the deployment phase of SDLC	the methodology from Malaysia [42]
Process management policies	Ensure that policies and procedures are consistent	NIST 800-160 [67]
Quality management strategy	Is oriented toward achievement of security quality objectives	NIST 800-160 [67]
Security requirements definition strategy	Aims to reach an agreement with stakeholders on which common security requirements must be used. The process also includes information gathering activities, methods, and techniques that are used to acquire information from stakeholders	NIST 800-160 [67]
Policies to control access to data and processes	Are used in identity and access management	The BSA framework [37]
Coding standards	Coding rules, guidelines, and best practices	SAFECODE [64], CLASP [62], the BSA framework [37], the methodology by Google [65], the Cisco methodology [13], NIST 800-218 [35], the methodology by Jones and Rastogi [69], the methodology by Farhan [45], the methodology by Aprville and Pourzandi [32], the methodology from Singapore [36], the methodology by Khan [39]
Design standards	Provide guidance on how security features are to be used in the design of software	Singapore [36], SSDLC [31], the SAP methodology [11]
Define cryptography standards	Best practices and recommendations for using encryption	Microsoft SDL [33]
Define approved tools	To support engineers to use state-of-art version of tools	Microsoft SDL [33]
Define security tools	best practices for using encryption	NIST 800-218 [35]

mistakes in released software still may exist. Many methodologies use preliminary activities to be prepared to respond to vulnerabilities and incidents. Next, the auxiliary practices of incident or vulnerability response will be considered.

According to Microsoft SDL [33], organizations should identify the security response center that includes people who are responsible for responding to externally discovered vulnerabilities and cooperating with security researchers who found the vulnerabilities. The response center informs the researcher about the status of the response and update process. It is important to mention that the relationship between the response team and the vulnerability researcher includes building relationships of confidence and trust. This helps to reduce customer exposure to vulnerabilities until the fix is released. The following techniques may be used to enforce the collaboration with the vulnerability researcher (1) simple communication in a human and personal way, (2) believing that the vulnerability researcher is not the enemy who just wants to criticize the product, (3) acknowledge the contribution of vulnerability researchers, (4) conduct partner programs, giving the vulnerability researchers early access to the software, (5) give the researchers the early access to update to test.

Similar to Microsoft, SAFECODE [64] emphasizes that it is crucial to keep in contact with reporters with the latest status. Moreover, as soon as the fix of vulnerability is available, it should be communicated to customers. The communication process with customers and security researchers is described in CLASP [62] and NIST 800-218 [35] as well. Cisco [13] and Citrix [12] have "Product Security Incident Response Team (PSIRT) to communicate with customers.

The authors of the methodology by Google [65] focus on human behavior while preparing for and being in *incident or disaster*. This strategy should involve (1) analysis of potential disasters, (2) establishing a response team, (3) creating a response plan, (4) configuring systems properly, (4) testing the procedures, and (5) receiving feedback. Next, these components of preparation for disaster are considered.

According to the methodology by Google [65], formalization of team structure, information management, and communication between the recovery team are vital components for *recovering from the incident*. The scope of recovery depends on the type of the attack. After recovering the system and ejecting the attacker, it is important to consider the impacts of the attack. This will help to improve incident handling. While analyzing the impact, the following questions may be considered (1) what are the main factors that contributed to the incident? (2) how quickly was the incident detected? (3) how may the detection system be improved?

To prevent total disruption of the system, organizations should conduct a disaster risk analysis. This analysis includes (1) human or technological resources required to respond to an incident, (2) disaster scenarios that may occur in the system, and (3) systems, which are disabled or disrupted, and can disable operations. When developing a response plan, organizations should create high-level procedures that define (1) the roles and responsibilities, (2) how the incident is reported to the incident response team, and (3) communications with external stakeholders, responders, and support teams. Organizations also should

train engineers in response activities and provide feedback to prevent the same mistakes.

#### 4.8 Communication process and customer responsibilities

In SAFECODE *stakeholder management and communication* includes the explanation to stakeholders of the value and commitment to secure development practices.

The *processes* pillar of Grip on SSD [41] includes business impact analysis (BIA) the objective of which is to create "quality requirements for the information systems used within that operational process" [41]. In BIA client is one of the responsible parties. The client's responsibilities are:

- to determine the goals of operational processes in the context of the implementation of the main tasks of the organization;
- to determine the main and auxiliary sub-processes;
- to check the execution of the BIA process.

Furthermore, a non-technical practice that involves the client in Grip on SSD is risk acceptance (one of the contact moments) before the release phase. Risk acceptance requires a client with the support of a security advisor to decide on risk acceptance. There are three options that a client may choose (1) the software complies and may be accepted, (2) the software does not comply and should be modified, and (3) software does not comply but is temporarily allowed. If the client chooses to temporarily accept the product, then the following points should be considered:

- the plan with the information regarding when and how the solution will be presented;
- the required budget for introducing the plan;
- the client should approve the plan.

In the methodology from Malaysia [42], the customer is responsible for the acceptance of residual risks.

The authors of the methodology by Google [65] highlight that during tough deadlines and stress, communications with members and others outside may be difficult. The cause of these problems with communications may be misunderstandings. To mitigate this problem it is better to be over communicative and explicit. Another problem is hedging because hedging often confuses the situation and puts uncertainty in the decision-making process. Regular properly managed meetings help to maintain control and visibility of what is happening. The next communication problem is understanding the right level of details that must be shared.

#### 4.9 Ethics

CLASP [62] touches on the ethics in secure software development. As a whole, the organization should behave ethically, but should not expect individual components to be ethical. For example, the behavior of insiders who attack the organization is not ethical and the organization should take it into account. Ethical behavior as a whole means that the user is provided with a privacy policy, its changes and to notify users of the breach in privacy.

#### 4.10 Privacy

Microsoft SDL v.5.2 [63] and SDL-Agile [63] concern privacy requirements. Also, the privacy advisor is assigned for privacy support. However, the responsible member for the privacy is the privacy lead who is one of the project team members. In SDL-Agile one of the every-sprint requirements is reporting design changes that affect privacy to the privacy advisor. During the release phase in Microsoft SDL V.5.2. it is important to create an approve privacy disclosure with a privacy advisor and legal representatives.

According to the methodology by Google [65], organizations should be able to investigate systems after failure. The organizations therefore should design the logging system with access control and protection. While designing the logging system, privacy and legal members should be involved.

Cisco involves *privacy assessment* to assess privacy controls according to laws and regulations. Cisco also has dedicated to privacy Trust Portal<sup>11</sup> for customers to know what data is processed.

Privacy requirements and controls are considered in Malaysia methodology [42]. For example, data anonymization, disposition, and pseudonymization.

### 5 EVALUATION OF METHODOLOGIES

For organisations that want to adopt an SSDM (e.g., one among the 28 SSDMs we study) it is important to know what are the benefits of this methodology, and how effective it is in improving the security of the developed software.

To find the literature on providing evidence of effectiveness, we performed the additional research process. For each academic paper we identified the list of citations, read the title and the abstract of relevant papers. For industrial methodologies we searched the websites of the organizations that published the methodology to find the relevant white papers or blogs on the effectiveness.

In this section, we investigate what evidence publications the authors of the methodologies provide to assess the effectiveness of the methodologies and what evaluation methods they use (RQ3).

#### 5.1 Evaluation of the methodologies in academic research

One of the ways to assess whether a methodology brings benefits to an organization is via conducting case studies [82]. In the studied literature we found that the most common way to evaluate the effectiveness of the proposed methodology is via case studies.

The methodology by Apvrille and Pourzandi [32] presented the methodology on the example of the instant messaging application. While the evaluation of the methodology is beyond the scope of the research, the authors believe that the methodology can improve the level the security of the software.

The authors of SSDM methodology [43] conduct a case study by implementing the SSDM methodology in an accounting system. During the 3 years of usage of the system,

there were 129 security breaches. However, after the implementation of SSDM no security breaches have been found in one year of usage. The result of the case study shows a security improvement. We do not have information on whether the company used any other SSDM before the case study or not.

The authors of ISDF [38] built an e-commerce system to illustrate the advantage of the methodology. The authors provide the example only for the requirement and design stages. Thus, there is a lack of activities to demonstrate the advantage of the methodology.

Chatterjee, Gupta, and De [40] demonstrate a case study of the web-based banking system with a focus on security design. As well as in ISDF [38], the authors involve only requirements and the design phase. Furthermore, the authors compare their methodology with the methodology by Apvrille and Pourzandi [32] and AOD approach [83], which proposes security aspects for the design stage. The results show that the methodology by Chatterjee, Gupta, and De proposes more suitable design decisions than other methodologies [32], [83]. However, this case study does not prove the effectiveness of the methodology.

The methodology by Jones and Rastogi [69], the methodology by Daud [44], the methodology by Khan [39], the methodology by Farhan and Mostafa [45] does not provide any experiments on the methodology to provide evidence of efficiency.

We found a survey [84] on the effectiveness of Microsoft SDL [33], Touchpoints [5] and the methodology by Jones and Rastogi [69]. The authors rank the methodologies according to their effectiveness based on 11 assessment criteria: (1) Waterfall or Agile rooted, (2) universal, (3) model has all phases, (4) compatibility, (5) for new or continued development, (6) initiation phase effectiveness, (7) has operation and maintenance phase, (8) security testing is performed in two or more phases, (9) security is integrated into all phases, (10) difficulty of implementing security training, (11) has security staff. Thus, the study revealed that the methodology by Jones and Rastogi [69] is effective, especially for agile development but cannot be applied to all projects. An effective alternative for the Waterfall projects is Touchpoints [57]. In contrast, Microsoft SDL [33] is considered to be less effective because it is customised by Microsoft and cannot be widely used by other organizations.

#### 5.2 Evaluation of the methodologies from the industry

While investigating the industry and government SSDMs we discovered that no methodology provides evidence of effectiveness. The authors of NIST 800-218 [35] argue that involving the security practices mentioned in the methodology will help to reduce the number of vulnerabilities in the software. Nonetheless, the authors of this methodology do not present the results of the experiments that reveal it.

CLASP [62], SAFECode [64], Grip on SSD [41], the methodology by Google [65], the SAP methodology [11], the Cisco methodology [13] and the Citrix methodology [12] highlight that the methodologies are the results of years of experience to create a set of security best practices. SAP has

11. <https://trustportal.cisco.com/c/r/ctp/trust-portal.html>

a blog<sup>12</sup> where the Head of Product Security SAP compares the SAP methodology and NIST 800-218. The result reveals that almost all practices and recommendations of NIST 800-218 SAP has corresponding measures and controls. This example demonstrates the way of evaluating the methodology by making a comparison with security standards.

Microsoft's website on the Frequently Asked Questions page contains information that "The SDL has proven to be effective at reducing vulnerability counts of flagship Microsoft products after release" [33].

McGraw [57] ranks the touchpoints according to their effectiveness and importance. According to the author [57], the rank is based on the experience of applying touchpoints in different organizations. Nevertheless, the author does not provide concrete evidence of the effectiveness (case studies, experimental results, etc.).

Both maturity models SAMM [23] and BSIMM [66] allow the organisations to assess the maturity of the software development process and to receive an overview of the status of security activities. However, the maturity level does not reflect the effectiveness of the security process. Thus, neither SAMM nor BSIMM allow to assess the effectiveness of security efforts.

### 5.3 Other literature on assessing effectiveness of SSDM

Besides the authors of the studied methodologies, other researchers have also investigated methods for assessing effectiveness of secure software engineering.

Busch, Koch, and Wirsing [85] present the SecEval method for evaluation of engineering approaches in the SDLC. According to the authors, SecEval is applicable for "structured evaluation of methods, tools, notations, security properties, vulnerabilities and threats" [85]. The model includes three components: (1) context model that describes of security properties, threats and vulnerabilities, (2) data collection model that records how data is collected, (3) data analysis model which specifies how reasoning is performed based on previously collected data.

Shostack et al. [86] present the discussions at the Dagstuhl seminar "Empirical Evaluation of Secure Development Processes". One of the relevant to our research topic discussed in that seminar is "How do we know that the system is really secure?" [86]. According to Bodden [86, p.21], metrics for software security should take into account the assume-breach paradigm that means the ability of software to withstand attacks despite known and unknown vulnerabilities in the system. In other words, the metrics should not be based on the assumption that the software is free of vulnerabilities. The author argues that establishing a measurable notion of security can help to create effective software security metrics. Weber et al. [86, p.23] also discuss the question of how to empirically evaluate the processes for software development. According to the authors, to get a complete picture of the advantages and disadvantages of a particular development methodology, many techniques will almost certainly be required.

12. <https://blogs.sap.com/2019/09/11/new-nist-white-paper-on-secure-software-development/>

## 6 DISCUSSION

In this section, we discuss the key findings with regard to our research questions.

To answer RQ1, we have discovered 28 SSDMs published in the period from 2004 till 2022. These methodologies come from industry, governments and academic researchers. The majority of the discovered methodologies emerged from large companies. Based on the summary of security practices shown in Table 3 and Table 4, we discovered that the methodologies did not evolve substantially from 2004. The first methodologies considered the auxiliary practices, such as organizational, behavioral, legal, policy, governance aspects, and common technical security practices. However, over the 18 years, some methodologies, such as NIST 800-218 [35] and BSA [37] have become more specific with the enumeration of security practices with references to the standards for each security practice.

While mapping the security practices according to the SDLC stages, we found that some practices are auxiliary which include cultural, organizational, and personal factors. We combined these practices to answer RQ2. Thus, we received 9 categories of auxiliary practices, however, the categories are intertwined. We revealed a set of the following security practices: risk management, security measurement, building a culture of security, understanding human behavior, creating policies and strategies, and communication process.

In RQ3 we investigated the methods which the authors use to provide evidence of the effectiveness of the secure software development process. As a result, we discovered that most of the methodologies imply that they work effectively and help to improve software security, but do not provide any evidence of it. Of eight academic papers, only one methodology includes a case study, while two methodologies involve a case study with security practices in the requirements and/or design stages. Industry and government methodologies do not provide any evidence of their effectiveness.

While investigating the methodologies, we found significant gaps that have to be addressed to foster the security of software. For example, as discussed above, it is required to explore the ways to assess the effectiveness of SSDMs. Another observed gap is the shortage of auxiliary (non-technical) practices in academic papers. The only considered practices are *risk management framework* (in the methodology by Jones and Rastogi [69]) and *education and awareness* (in the methodology by Jones and Rastogi [69], SSDM [43], ISDF [38], the methodology by Farhan [45]). As we discussed when answering RQ2 (section 4), there are many more auxiliary practices, such as privacy, ethics, human behavior, and communication processes. All these auxiliary practices are derived only from industry and government methodologies.

In addition, after performing this survey, two questions appeared:

- Why are there so many methodologies? Why do more and more new methodologies appear?
- Why do data breaches still exist even if all stages of the secure SDLC are performed?

To answer these questions further research is required.

## 7 RELATED WORK

### 7.1 Existing literature reviews

To the best of our knowledge, ours is the most comprehensive effort to survey the existing SSDMs. Nevertheless, other related attempts have been made to investigate security practices involved in the software development process. The existing literature reviews that investigate at least one of our research questions are summarized in Table 6.

While most of the relevant literature reviews differ from ours only in the number of SSDM included, some of them investigate the research questions that lie beyond the scope of our research. Thus, Williams [18] studied the integration of SSDM with any software development model: agile and DevOps, mobile applications, IoT, cloud computing, road vehicles and ECommerce. Nunez [19] presented the Viewnext-UEX model that contains security practices from observed well-known models and corrects the weaknesses of these models. The new proposed security practices are: *state of the project*, *security observatory* and *vulnerabilities repository*. The goal of the first new practice is to verify compliance with the security guidelines that is to evaluate the project from the security perspective. The objective of the second new practice is to reduce the time being in an insecure state by searching new attack techniques and vulnerabilities. The last practice builds a knowledge base from security failures and errors to train developers. Ramirez, Aiello and Lincke [20] included the analysis of not only SSDMs but also standards and certifications (e.g. Common Criteria and The Open Group Architecture Framework).

We have applied the same inclusion and exclusion criteria from Table 1 when selecting studies for Table 6. E.g., some studies were excluded because they investigate security practices in different stages of SDLC but not across the whole SDLC. Still, there are works relevant to our research that do not appear in Table 6. Al-Matouq et al. [87] proposed a maturity model for secure software design that is based on security practices found in a multivocal study. The scope of the study [87] is broader than ours and includes not only SSDMs but also maturity models and methodologies for the software design phase. The research [87] also focused not on the methodologies but on the papers that include security practices.

Khan et al. [88] investigated security approaches in secure software engineering. The authors focus on security practices included in different phases of the SDLC, but not across the whole SDLC. Khan et al. [89] also explored security risks and its practices in secure software development.

### 7.2 Other relevant literature

Some researchers investigate the interaction between the developers and secure software processes. For example, Acar et al. [90] argue that developers need human-centered security experts and legal experts for solving social engineers' problems. Assal and Chiasson [91] also claim that the main reasons for postponing security are organizational issues, such as the lack of security plans, procedures, knowledge, or resources, are the main reasons for postponing security.

There are studies aimed at security models that lie beyond the scope of this research. For instance, Myrbakken and Colomo-Palacios [55] conducted a literature review on

DevSecOps methodologies. Sánchez-Gordón and Colomo-Palacios [92] conducted a literature review to understand DevSecOps culture from the human factor's perspective. Cybersecurity capability maturity models are investigated in [93], [94], [95], [96].

Some researchers explored the security methodologies for a specific area. For example, Uzunov, Fernandez, Falkner [97] investigated security methodologies applicable to distributed systems. Suganya, Jothi, and Palanisamy [98] explored security Methodologies in E-Voting System. Malik and Nazir [99] studied security frameworks for the cloud computing environment. Babar [100] proposed an embedded security framework for the Internet of Things. Pacheco and Hariri [101] performed an IoT security framework for smart infrastructures. ENISA [102] also introduced the practices for the security of IoT. Agile security methods are considered in [103].

Although there is an exhaustive number of publicly available literature focused on secure development activities and methodologies, several studies have discovered the challenges that organizations and developers face to adopt secure software development practices. Maher et al. [104] revealed that a lack of clear vision, lack of clear guidelines from top management and lack of clear guidelines on how to incorporate security practices are challenges to adopt secure software development. Gasiba et al. [105] also discovered that despite developers are motivated to produce secure code, the lack of knowledge of the secure coding guidelines impede to produce it. The study by Kirlappos, Beautement and Sasse [106] observed the key reasons for non-compliance with the organizational policies. The authors concluded that security practices adoption must be de-centralized; employees should decide how to involve security into individual tasks. The survey conducted by Geer [107] revealed that the organizations do not widely adopt the formal secure SDLC framework due to the challenges such as the lack of awareness of methodologies and the methodologies are time consuming.

## 8 CONCLUSION

In this survey, we collected 28 SSDMs from industry, government, and academia sectors. While mapping the security practices according to the SDLC phases, we discovered that not only purely technical practices are involved in the SDLC process but also auxiliary. Among these auxiliary practices are measuring security, building a culture of security, creating policies and strategies, communication within a team, ethics and privacy.

Investigating the ways how the authors provide the evidence of the effectiveness of the methodologies, we discovered that most of the methodologies imply that they work effectively and help to improve software security, but do not provide any evidence of it. In some methodologies the effectiveness is not even mentioned. Of eight academic papers, only one methodology includes a case study, while two methodologies involve a case study with security practices in the requirements and/or design stages.

As a result of the survey, several research gaps are addressed. One of the open questions is why companies tend to create their methodologies but do not adopt the



TABLE 6  
Chronological summary of literature reviews

Year	Author and title	How many methodologies are investigated	Which of our research questions are investigated			
			RQ1	RQ2	RQ3	RQ4
2008	De Win et al. "On the secure software development process: CLASP, SDL and Touchpoints compared" [14]	3	✓	×	×	✓
2005	Davis "Secure software development life cycle processes: A technology scouting report" [15]	10	✓	×	×	×
2007	Gregoire et al. "On the Secure Software Development Process: CLASP and SDL Compared" [16]	2	✓	×	×	✓
2013	Fonseca, Vieira "A Survey on Secure Software Development Lifecycles" [17]	4	✓	×	×	×
2019	Williams "Secure Software Lifecycle Knowledge Area" [18]	3	✓	×	×	×
2020	Núñez, Andrés, and Rodríguez "A Preventive Secure Software Development Model for a Software Factory: A Case Study" [19]	7	✓	✓	×	×
2020	Ramirez, Aiello, Lincke "A Survey and Comparison of Secure Software Development Standards" [20]	24	✓	×	×	×

existing methodology. Another research gap is why the evidence of the effectiveness of the methodologies is based on the belief that the number of vulnerabilities in software is reduced. The authors also do not provide any facts that support their beliefs. The academic methodologies also involve auxiliary (non-technical) security practices sparingly, focusing only on technical security practices. Several academic methodologies even do not provide information on what is novel in their methodologies, using the security practices from methodologies that have been already published. And finally, why there is a trend of increasing the number of vulnerabilities produced in software despite there are many SSDMs. We believe that exploring the gaps that we found may contribute to producing software with fewer number of vulnerabilities. Investigation of these gaps provides the basis for future work.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This research has been partially supported by the Dutch Research Council (NWO) under the project NWA.1215.18.008 Cyber Security by Integrated Design (C-SIDE).

## REFERENCES

- [1] MITRE, "CVE details," available at <https://www.cvedetails.com/browse-by-date.php>.
- [2] Forbes, "Alarming cybersecurity stats: What you need to know for 2021," available at <https://www.forbes.com/sites/chuckbrooks/2021/03/02/alarming-cybersecurity-stats-----what-you-need-to-know-for-2021/?sh=5ff0d7a658d3>. Accessed in 2022.
- [3] RiskIO, "The evil internet minute 2019," available at <https://www.riskiq.com/resources/infographic/evil-internet-minute-2019/>. Accessed in 2022.
- [4] M. Howard and S. Lipner, *The security development lifecycle*. Microsoft Press Redmond, 2006, vol. 8.
- [5] G. McGraw, "Software security," *IEEE Security & Privacy*, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 80–83, 2004.
- [6] J. M. Wing, "A call to action look beyond the horizon," *IEEE Security & Privacy*, vol. 1, no. 6, pp. 62–67, 2003.
- [7] G. McGraw, "Building secure software: better than protecting bad software," *IEEE Software*, vol. 19, no. 6, pp. 57–58, 2002.
- [8] —, "From the ground up: The dimacs software security workshop," *IEEE Security & Privacy*, vol. 1, no. 2, pp. 59–66, 2003.
- [9] D. LeBlanc and M. Howard, *Writing secure code*. Pearson Education, 2002.
- [10] J. Viega and G. R. McGraw, *Building secure software: How to avoid security problems the right way, portable documents*. Pearson Education, 2001.
- [11] "The secure software development lifecycle at SAP," SAP, Tech. Rep., 2020, available at <https://www.sap.com/documents/2016/03/a248a699-627c-0010-82c7-eda71af511fa.html>.
- [12] "Citrix security development lifecycle," Citrix, Tech. Rep., 2021, available at [https://www.citrix.com/content/dam/citrix/en\\_us/documents/about/citrix-security-development-lifecycle.pdf](https://www.citrix.com/content/dam/citrix/en_us/documents/about/citrix-security-development-lifecycle.pdf).
- [13] "Cisco secure development lifecycle," Cisco, Tech. Rep., 2021, available at [https://www.cisco.com/c/dam/en\\_us/about/doing\\_business/trust-center/docs/cisco-secure-development-lifecycle.pdf](https://www.cisco.com/c/dam/en_us/about/doing_business/trust-center/docs/cisco-secure-development-lifecycle.pdf).
- [14] B. De Win, R. Scandariato, K. Buyens, J. Grégoire, and W. Joosen, "On the secure software development process: CLASP, SDL and Touchpoints compared," *Information and software technology*, vol. 51, no. 7, pp. 1152–1171, 2009.
- [15] N. Davis, "Secure software development life cycle processes: A technology scouting report," Carnegie-Mellon Univ Pittsburgh Pa Software Engineering Inst, Tech. Rep., 2005.
- [16] J. Gregoire, K. Buyens, B. De Win, R. Scandariato, and W. Joosen, "On the secure software development process: CLASP and SDL compared," in *Third International Workshop on Software Engineering for Secure Systems (SESS'07: ICSE Workshops 2007)*. IEEE, 2007, pp. 1–1.
- [17] J. Fonseca and M. Vieira, "A survey on secure software development lifecycles," in *Software Development Techniques for Constructive Information Systems Design*. IGI Global, 2013, pp. 57–73.
- [18] L. Williams, "Secure software lifecycle knowledge area," 2019, available at [https://www.cybok.org/media/downloads/Secure\\_Software\\_Lifecycle\\_issue\\_1.0.pdf](https://www.cybok.org/media/downloads/Secure_Software_Lifecycle_issue_1.0.pdf).
- [19] J. C. S. Núñez, A. C. Lindo, and P. G. Rodríguez, "A preventive secure software development model for a software factory: a case study," *IEEE Access*, vol. 8, pp. 77 653–77 665, 2020.
- [20] A. Ramirez, A. Aiello, and S. J. Lincke, "A survey and comparison of secure software development standards," in *2020 13th CMI Conference on Cybersecurity and Privacy (CMI)-Digital Transformation-Potentials and Challenges (51275)*. IEEE, 2020, pp. 1–6.
- [21] L. Pirzadeh, "Human factors in software development: a systematic literature review," 2010.
- [22] A. Mokhberi and K. Beznosov, "Sok: Human, organizational, and technological dimensions of developers' challenges in engineering secure software," in *European Symposium on Usable Security 2021, 2021*, pp. 59–75.
- [23] OWASP, "OWASP SAMM, version 2," Tech. Rep., available at <https://owasp.samm.org/model/>.
- [24] G. McGraw, B. Chess, and S. Miguez, "Building security in maturity model," *Fortify & Cigital*, 2009.
- [25] D. Y. Weider and K. Le, "Towards a secure software development lifecycle with SQUARE+R," in *2012 IEEE 36th Annual Computer Software and Applications Conference Workshops*. IEEE, 2012, pp. 565–570.
- [26] A. Van Den Berghe, R. Scandariato, K. Yskout, and W. Joosen, "Design notations for secure software: a systematic literature review," *Software & Systems Modeling*, vol. 16, no. 3, pp. 809–831, 2017.

- [27] P. H. Meland and J. Jensen, "Secure software design in practice," in *2008 Third International Conference on Availability, Reliability and Security*. IEEE, 2008, pp. 1164–1171.
- [28] C. Haley, R. Laney, J. Moffett, and B. Nuseibeh, "Security requirements engineering: A framework for representation and analysis," *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering*, vol. 34, no. 1, pp. 133–153, 2008.
- [29] J. Tyndall, "The AACODS checklist," 2010, available at [https://dspace.flinders.edu.au/xmlui/bitstream/handle/2328/3326/AACODS\\_Checklist.pdf?sequence=4](https://dspace.flinders.edu.au/xmlui/bitstream/handle/2328/3326/AACODS_Checklist.pdf?sequence=4).
- [30] C. Wohlin, "Guidelines for snowballing in systematic literature studies and a replication in software engineering," in *Proceedings of the 18th international conference on evaluation and assessment in software engineering*, 2014, pp. 1–10.
- [31] T. Adam, F. Andrei, L. Gabudeanu, and V. Rotaru, "Security in SDLC – secure software development lifecycle – SSDLC," Tech. Rep., 2021, available at <https://dnsc.ro/vezi/document/security-in-sdlc>. Last access in 2022.
- [32] A. Apvrille and M. Pourzandi, "Secure software development by example," *IEEE Security & Privacy*, vol. 3, no. 4, pp. 10–17, 2005.
- [33] Microsoft, "SDL," available at <https://www.microsoft.com/en-us/securityengineering/sdl/practices>.
- [34] "Secure development lifecycle," GE, Tech. Rep., available at <https://www.ge.com/digital/documentation/predix-platforms/sdl.html>. Last access in 2022.
- [35] "Secure software development framework (SSDF)," National Institute of Standards and Technology, Version 1.1, 2022, available at <https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.SP.800-218>.
- [36] "Security-by-design framework," Cyber Security Agency of Singapore, Version 1.0, 2017, available at [https://www.csa.gov.sg/-/media/Csa/Documents/Legislation\\_Supplementary\\_References/Security\\_By\\_Design\\_Framework.pdf](https://www.csa.gov.sg/-/media/Csa/Documents/Legislation_Supplementary_References/Security_By_Design_Framework.pdf).
- [37] "The BSA framework for secure software," BSA, Version 1.1, 2020, available at [https://www.bsa.org/files/reports/bsa\\_framework\\_secure\\_software\\_update\\_2020.pdf](https://www.bsa.org/files/reports/bsa_framework_secure_software_update_2020.pdf).
- [38] A. Alkussayer and W. H. Allen, "The ISDF framework: towards secure software development," *Journal of Information Processing Systems*, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 91–106, 2010.
- [39] R. Khan, "Secure software development: a prescriptive framework," *Computer Fraud & Security*, vol. 2011, no. 8, pp. 12–20, 2011.
- [40] K. Chatterjee, D. Gupta, and A. De, "A framework for development of secure software," *CSI Transactions on ICT*, vol. 1, no. 2, pp. 143–157, 2013.
- [41] M. Koers, R. Paans, R. van der Veer, C. Kok, and J. Breeman, "Grip on secure software development (SSD)," CIP, Version 2.0, 2015, available at [https://www.cip-overheid.nl/media/1105/20160622\\_grip\\_on\\_ssd\\_the\\_method\\_v2\\_0\\_en.pdf](https://www.cip-overheid.nl/media/1105/20160622_grip_on_ssd_the_method_v2_0_en.pdf).
- [42] "Guidelines for secure software development life cycle (SSDLC)," Ministry of communications and multimedia Malaysia, First edition, 2015, available at [https://www.cybersecurity.my/data/content\\_files/56/2073.pdf](https://www.cybersecurity.my/data/content_files/56/2073.pdf).
- [43] A. S. Sodiya, S. A. Onashoga, and O. Ajayi, "Towards building secure software systems." *Issues in Informing Science & Information Technology*, vol. 3, 2006.
- [44] M. I. Daud, "Secure software development model: A guide for secure software life cycle," in *Proceedings of the International MultiConference of Engineers and Computer Scientists*, vol. 1, 2010, pp. 17–19.
- [45] A. S. Farhan and G. M. Mostafa, "A methodology for enhancing software security during development processes," in *2018 21st Saudi Computer Society National Computer Conference (NCC)*. IEEE, 2018, pp. 1–6.
- [46] D. G. Feitelson, E. Frachtenberg, and K. L. Beck, "Development and deployment at facebook," *IEEE Internet Computing*, vol. 17, no. 4, pp. 8–17, 2013.
- [47] N. MacDonald and I. Head, "Devsecops: How to seamlessly integrate security into devops," *Gartner, Tech. Rep.*, 2016.
- [48] R. N. Rajapakse, M. Zahedi, M. A. Babar, and H. Shen, "Challenges and solutions when adopting devsecops: A systematic review," *Information and Software Technology*, vol. 141, p. 106700, 2022.
- [49] V. Mohan and L. B. Othmane, "Secdevops: Is it a marketing buzzword?—mapping research on security in devops," in *2016 11th international conference on availability, reliability and security (ARES)*. IEEE, 2016, pp. 542–547.
- [50] B. S. Farroha and D. L. Farroha, "A framework for managing mission needs, compliance, and trust in the devops environment," in *2014 IEEE Military Communications Conference*. IEEE, 2014, pp. 288–293.
- [51] C. Schneider, "Security devops—staying secure in agile projects," *OWASP AppSec Europe*, 2015.
- [52] A. A. U. Rahman and L. Williams, "Software security in devops: Synthesizing practitioners' perceptions and practices," in *2016 IEEE/ACM International Workshop on Continuous Software Evolution and Delivery (CSED)*. IEEE, 2016, pp. 70–76.
- [53] S. Cash, V. Jain, L. Jiang, A. Karve, J. Kidambi, M. Lyons, T. Mathews, S. Mullen, M. Mulsow, and N. Patel, "Managed infrastructure with ibm cloud openstack services," *IBM Journal of Research and Development*, vol. 60, no. 2-3, pp. 6–1, 2016.
- [54] S. de Vries, "Continuous security testing in a devops world," *OWASP AppSec Europe*, 2014.
- [55] H. Myrbakken and R. Colomo-Palacios, "DevSecOps: a multi-vocal literature review," in *International Conference on Software Process Improvement and Capability Determination*. Springer, 2017, pp. 17–29.
- [56] Z. Ahmed and S. C. Francis, "Integrating security with devsecops: Techniques and challenges," in *2019 International Conference on Digitization (ICD)*. IEEE, 2019, pp. 178–182.
- [57] G. McGraw, "Software security: Building security in," 2006.
- [58] J. Payne, "Integrating application security into software development," *IT Professional*, vol. 12, no. 02, pp. 6–9, mar 2010.
- [59] ISO/IEC/IEEE, "ISO/IEC/IEEE information technology — security techniques — application security," *ISO/IEC/IEEE 27034 First edition 2011-11*, pp. 1–167, 2011, available at <https://www.iso.org/standard/44378.html>.
- [60] M. Nambiar, "ReBIT application security framework," Tech. Rep., 2020, available at [https://pub.rebit.org.in/inline-files/ReBIT\\_Application\\_Security\\_Framework\\_2020.pdf](https://pub.rebit.org.in/inline-files/ReBIT_Application_Security_Framework_2020.pdf).
- [61] D. Verdon and G. McGraw, "Risk analysis in software design," *IEEE Security & Privacy*, vol. 2, no. 4, pp. 79–84, 2004.
- [62] OWASP, "Comprehensive, lightweight application security process," 2006, available at [https://owasp.org/www-pdf-archive/Us\\_owasp-clasp-v12-for-print-lulu.pdf](https://owasp.org/www-pdf-archive/Us_owasp-clasp-v12-for-print-lulu.pdf).
- [63] Microsoft, "Security development lifecycle SDL process guidance," Version 5.2, 2012, available at <https://www.microsoft.com/en-us/download/details.aspx?id=29884>.
- [64] SAFECODE, "Fundamental practices for secure software development," Third edition, 2018, available at [https://safecode.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/03/SAFECODE\\_Fundamental\\_Practices\\_for\\_Secure\\_Software\\_Development\\_March\\_2018.pdf](https://safecode.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/03/SAFECODE_Fundamental_Practices_for_Secure_Software_Development_March_2018.pdf).
- [65] H. Adkins, B. Beyer, P. Blankinship, P. Lewandowski, A. Oprea, and A. Stubblefield, *Building Secure and Reliable Systems: Best Practices for Designing, Implementing, and Maintaining Systems*. O'Reilly Media, 2020.
- [66] E. Erikhman, J. Ewers, S. Miguez, and K. Nassery, "BSIMM12," available at <https://www.bsimm.com/framework.html>.
- [67] R. Ross, M. McEvilly, and J. C. Oren, "Systems security engineering: Considerations for a multidisciplinary approach in the engineering of trustworthy secure systems," National Institute of Standards and Technology, Tech. Rep., 2016, available at <https://nvlpubs.nist.gov/nistpubs/SpecialPublications/NIST.SP.800-160v1.pdf>.
- [68] R. Ross, V. Pillitteri, R. Graubart, D. Bodeau, and R. McQuaid, *Developing Cyber Resilient Systems: A Systems Security Engineering Approach*, 2021, vol. 2, revision 1, available at <https://nvlpubs.nist.gov/nistpubs/SpecialPublications/NIST.SP.800-160v2r1.pdf>.
- [69] R. L. Jones and A. Rastogi, "Secure coding: building security into the software development life cycle," *Inf. Secur. J. A Glob. Perspect.*, vol. 13, no. 5, pp. 29–39, 2004.
- [70] I. Sommerville, *Software Engineering: (Update) (8th Edition) (International Computer Science)*. USA: Addison-Wesley Longman Publishing Co., Inc., 2006.
- [71] G. Hoglund and G. McGraw, *Exploiting software: How to break code*. Pearson Education India, 2004.
- [72] D. Graham, "Introduction to the CLASP process," *Build Security In*, 2006.
- [73] J. H. Saltzer and M. D. Schroeder, "The protection of information in computer systems," *Proceedings of the IEEE*, vol. 63, no. 9, pp. 1278–1308, 1975.
- [74] SAFECODE, "Tactical threat modeling," Tech. Rep., 2017, available at [https://safecode.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/05/SAFECODE\\_TM\\_Whitepaper.pdf](https://safecode.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/05/SAFECODE_TM_Whitepaper.pdf).

- [75] —, “Managing security risks inherent in the use of third-party components,” Tech. Rep., 2017, available at [https://safecode.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/05/SAFECode\\_TPC\\_Whitepaper.pdf](https://safecode.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/05/SAFECode_TPC_Whitepaper.pdf).
- [76] ISO/IEC/IEEE, “ISO/IEC/IEEE international standard - systems and software engineering – system life cycle processes,” *ISO/IEC/IEEE 15288 First edition 2015-05-15*, pp. 1–118, 2015.
- [77] R. Arizon-Peretz, I. Hadar, and G. Luria, “The importance of security is in the eye of the beholder: Cultural, organizational, and personal factors affecting the implementation of security by design,” *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering*, 2021.
- [78] Verizon, “Data breach investigations report (DBIR),” 2022, available at <https://www.verizon.com/business/resources/reports/2022/dbir/2022-data-breach-investigations-report-dbir.pdf>. Accessed in 2022.
- [79] S. Spiekermann, J. Korunovska, and M. Langheinrich, “Inside the organization: Why privacy and security engineering is a challenge for engineers,” *Proceedings of the IEEE*, vol. 107, no. 3, pp. 600–615, 2018.
- [80] R. Alavi, S. Islam, and H. Mouratidis, “A conceptual framework to analyze human factors of information security management system (ISMS) in organizations,” in *International Conference on Human Aspects of Information Security, Privacy, and Trust*. Springer, 2014, pp. 297–305.
- [81] S. NIST, “800-53 rev. 5: Security and privacy controls for information systems and organizations,” 2020.
- [82] B. Kitchenham, L. Pickard, and S. Pfleeger, “Case studies for method and tool evaluation,” *IEEE Software*, vol. 12, no. 4, pp. 52–62, 1995.
- [83] G. Georg, I. Ray, and R. France, “Using aspects to design a secure system,” in *Eighth IEEE International Conference on Engineering of Complex Computer Systems, 2002. Proceedings*. IEEE, 2002, pp. 117–126.
- [84] J.-C. Liou and S. R. Duclervil, “A survey on the effectiveness of the secure software development life cycle models,” in *Innovations in Cybersecurity Education*. Springer, 2020, pp. 213–229.
- [85] M. Busch, N. Koch, and M. Wirsing, “Evaluation of engineering approaches in the secure software development life cycle,” in *Engineering Secure Future Internet Services and Systems*. Springer, 2014, pp. 234–265.
- [86] A. Shostack, M. Smith, S. Weber, and M. E. Zurko, “Empirical evaluation of secure development processes (dagstuhl seminar 19231),” in *Dagstuhl Reports*, vol. 9, no. 6. Schloss Dagstuhl-Leibniz-Zentrum fuer Informatik, 2019.
- [87] H. Al-Matouq, S. Mahmood, M. Alshayeb, and M. Niazi, “A maturity model for secure software design: A multivocal study,” *IEEE Access*, vol. 8, pp. 215 758–215 776, 2020.
- [88] R. A. Khan, S. U. Khan, H. U. Khan, and M. Ilyas, “Systematic mapping study on security approaches in secure software engineering,” *IEEE Access*, vol. 9, pp. 19 139–19 160, 2021.
- [89] —, “Systematic literature review on security risks and its practices in secure software development,” *IEEE Access*, 2022.
- [90] Y. Acar, C. Stransky, D. Wermke, C. Weir, M. L. Mazurek, and S. Fahl, “Developers need support, too: A survey of security advice for software developers,” in *2017 IEEE Cybersecurity Development (SecDev)*. IEEE, 2017, pp. 22–26.
- [91] H. Assal and S. Chiasson, “‘Think secure from the beginning’ a survey with software developers,” in *Proceedings of the 2019 CHI conference on human factors in computing systems*, 2019, pp. 1–13.
- [92] M. Sánchez-Gordón and R. Colomo-Palacios, “Security as culture: a systematic literature review of devsecops,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE/ACM 42nd International Conference on Software Engineering Workshops, 2020*, pp. 266–269.
- [93] B. Stevanović, “Maturity models in information security,” *International Journal of Information and Communication Technology Research*, vol. 1, no. 2, 2011.
- [94] A. Rabii, S. Assoul, K. O. Touhami, and O. Roudies, “Information and cyber security maturity models: a systematic literature review,” *Information & Computer Security*, 2020.
- [95] N. T. Le and D. B. Hoang, “Can maturity models support cyber security?” in *2016 IEEE 35th international performance computing and communications conference (IPCCC)*. IEEE, 2016, pp. 1–7.
- [96] A. M. Rea-Guamán, I. Sánchez-García, T. San Feliu, and J. Calvo-Manzano, “Maturity models in cybersecurity: A systematic review,” in *2017 12th Iberian conference on information systems and technologies (CISTI)*. IEEE, 2017, pp. 1–6.
- [97] A. Uzunov, E. Fernandez, and K. Falkner, “Engineering security into distributed systems: A survey of methodologies,” 2012.
- [98] R. Suganya, R. A. Jothi, and V. Palanisamy, “A survey on security methodologies in e-voting system,” *International Journal of Pure and Applied Mathematics*, vol. 118, no. 8, pp. 511–515, 2018.
- [99] A. Malik and M. M. Nazir, “Security framework for cloud computing environment: A review,” *Journal of Emerging Trends in Computing and Information Sciences*, vol. 3, no. 3, pp. 390–394, 2012.
- [100] S. Babar, A. Stango, N. Prasad, J. Sen, and R. Prasad, “Proposed embedded security framework for internet of things (iot),” in *2011 2nd International Conference on Wireless Communication, Vehicular Technology, Information Theory and Aerospace & Electronic Systems Technology (Wireless VITAE)*. IEEE, 2011, pp. 1–5.
- [101] J. Pacheco and S. Hariri, “IoT security framework for smart cyber infrastructures,” in *2016 IEEE 1st International workshops on Foundations and Applications of self\* systems (fas\* w)*. IEEE, 2016, pp. 242–247.
- [102] ENISA, “Good practices for security of IoT - secure software development lifecycle,” 2019, available at <https://www.enisa.europa.eu/publications/good-practices-for-security-of-iot-1>.
- [103] K. Rindell, S. Hyrynsalmi, and V. Leppänen, “Busting a myth: Review of agile security engineering methods,” in *Proceedings of the 12th International Conference on Availability, Reliability and Security, 2017*, pp. 1–10.
- [104] Z. Maher, A. Shah, S. Chan-dio, H. Mohadis, and N. Rahim, “Challenges and limitations in secure software development adoption-a qualitative analysis in malaysian software industry prospect,” *Indian Journal of Science and Technology*, vol. 13, no. 26, pp. 2601–2608, 2020.
- [105] T. E. Gasiba, U. Lechner, M. Pinto-Albuquerque, and D. M. Fernandez, “Awareness of secure coding guidelines in the industry—a first data analysis,” in *2020 IEEE 19th International Conference on Trust, Security and Privacy in Computing and Communications (TrustCom)*. IEEE, 2020, pp. 345–352.
- [106] I. Kirlappos, A. Beauteament, and M. A. Sasse, “‘‘comply or die’’ is dead: Long live security-aware principal agents,” in *International conference on financial cryptography and data security*. Springer, 2013, pp. 70–82.
- [107] D. Geer, “Are companies actually using secure development life cycles?” *Computer*, vol. 43, no. 6, pp. 12–16, 2010.