

The future of cybersecurity, today: Free and open source tools for compliance

Philippe Ombredanne,
Lead maintainer of AboutCode

Agenda

1. Introductions

- Philippe and AboutCode
- What you need to know about:
 - CRA
 - SCA

2. Cybersecurity challenges for software supply chains

- Open source is everywhere
- Compliance = critical
- Modern software requires modern cybersecurity
- Proprietary != scalable and efficient

3. Overview of FOSS tools for cybersecurity and compliance

- Discovering and identifying third-party code
- Discovering, triaging, and managing vulnerabilities
- Standards for tool interoperability
- Open license, package, and vulnerability databases
- Automating compliance processes

4. So, what's next?

- Questions?

About Philippe and AboutCode

- FOSS-first mission: Make it easier to reuse open source, safely and efficiently, with open source code and open data
 - Creator of Package-URL (PURL), co-founder of SPDX and ClearlyDefined, contributor to CycloneDX, and trusted SCA expert since 2007
 - pombredanne@aboutcode.org
 - <https://github.com/pombredanne>
 - <https://www.linkedin.com/in/philippeombredanne>
- Lead maintainer of AboutCode: <https://aboutcode.org>
 - Open source tools and open knowledge base: ScanCode, VulnerableCode
 - Simple and practical standards: PURL
 - Apps for legal, security, and business users with APIs for everything: DejaCode



What you need to know about the Cyber Resilience Act (CRA)

CRA = Cybersecurity for digital products

- Adopted on October 10th, 2024 and applicable once published in the EU's official journal (12/24/36 months)
 - Declaration of conformity by adding CE marking on products
- Different requirements depending on the economic actors putting the product on the market and the category of the product
 - Economic operators: manufacturers, importers, distributors, open source stewards
 - Manufacturers: full range of obligations
 - Open source stewards: light-touch regulatory regime
 - Category of products
 - Includes open source and other third-party components

CRA's essential requirements

- Secure by design
- Secure default configuration
- No known vulnerabilities
- Security updates
- Access control
- Confidentiality and integrity protection
- ...
- Vulnerability handling
 - SBOMs
 - Address and publish vulnerabilities
 - CVD policy
- Documentation obligations
 - Risk assessment
 - Processes
 - Intended use

SCA = Software Composition Analysis

- SCA is essential to know what components are actually in the software
 - Includes processes to identify components, their licensing, and known vulnerabilities (like the AboutCode stack), and evaluate the quality of a software unit (like the CHAOSS project)
 - Read "SCA the FOSS Way": <https://www.nexb.com/software-composition-analysis/>
 - Critical to comply with mandated Software Bill of Materials (SBOMs) and other regulations
- SCA needs to be a core competency for any software development organization
 - Embed in the software development workflow from design through release -
 - Similar to manufacturing
 - The choice of SCA tools will depend on your platform, stack and product

**The letter "F" in
"Compliance" is for Fun**

"The 'SB' in SBOM does not stand for Silver Bullet"

- Allan Friedman, US Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency (CISA)

Cybersecurity challenges for software supply chains

Open source is everywhere

- Defined by open source licenses
 - Identifying licenses and license compliance still a problem at scale
- Modern software is composed of mostly open source
 - Common to see a software product or system include 99% open source components
 - Driven by modern software development, easy to have an app that depends on 10,000+ packages
- FOSS compliance is licensing AND security
 - Requirement for everyone organization with regulations and SBOM mandates
 - Very difficult to track all open source and third-party components - including dependencies, licensing, and compliance obligations - with the high volume and rate of change

Compliance = critical

- Always important, now urgent with CRA and other regulations and more cybersecurity attacks
 - Disproportionate effect on SMEs, nonprofits and other organizations with same compliance needs as big companies and governments but without the resources
 - No dedicated security teams (usually) or budgets for expensive tooling and processes
- Must automate compliance processes (when possible) for efficiency
 - Imperative to balance compliance efforts and shipping products
 - Critical to ensure software supply chain security and integrity

Modern software requires modern cybersecurity

- Explosion in volume of vulnerabilities and vulnerability data sources
 - Each project provides reference vulnerability data (good), but requires multiple sources to access all the data (bad)
- Biggest threat = false positives and vulnerability fatigue
 - Also challenging to triage and mitigate vulnerabilities at scale
- Fundamental mismatch between legacy DBs and FOSS-driven modern software development
 - Centralized vulnerability databases, keyed by assigned CVEs + CPE, failing
 - US government-funded NVD is not reliable with CPEs and CVSS no longer assigned

Proprietary != scalable and effective

- Commercial tools for security are cost-prohibitive and not efficient
 - Increasing expensive with surge of interest in SBOMs and developer-based pricing
 - Gold rush from commercial vendors to sell anything related to CRA, SBOM, compliance, vulnerability, cybersecurity
 - Not efficient for compliance tooling and processes
 - Cost of scan curation is prohibitive with high false positive rates and poor origin and license detection accuracy
- Proprietary data for FOSS is wrong
 - Most current data about FOSS packages and vulnerabilities is proprietary
 - Vendors may offer some free or open source tools but must pay for access to their data
 - Vulnerability and security data about open source must be free and open
 - Security is a fundamental right
 - Safe open source software is a public good

Overview of FOSS tools for cybersecurity and compliance

Modern software requires FOSS for FOSS tools and open data

LEGACY

- ✗ Vulnerability-centric
- ✗ Proprietary data
- ✗ Siloed
- ✗ Vendor-driven
- ✗ Centralized
- ✗ Security team
- ✗ Reactive

FUTURE = Open source

- ✓ Package-centric
- ✓ Open data
- ✓ Interoperable
- ✓ Community-driven
- ✓ Decentralized, federated
- ✓ Security team + developers
- ✓ Proactive

Identify third-party code

1. Scan code

- Based on package manifests, and other clues present locally in the code

2. Match code

- Based on content and fuzzy fingerprints matched to an external open knowledge base
- PURL-based

3. Identify license, copyright, other origin clues

- Including binary analysis and build tracing

Many tools, but still "unsolved"

- Recent study to compare commercial and FOSS SCA tools for containers was ... sad 🐱
 - More on this later
- Email pombredanne@aboutcode.org for the sanitized report

FOSS tools to identify third-party code

FOSS Tool	Scanning	Matching	Other origin clues
Google OSV	✓	✗	✗
SCANOSS	✗	✓ (source only)	✗
ORT	✓	✓	✓
Syft	✓ (mostly containers)	✗	✗
Trivy	✓ (mostly containers)	✗	✗
BANG	✗	✗	✓ (including binary)
ScanCode	✓	✗	✓ (including binary)
MatchCode	✗	✓ (including binary)	✗
Many other tools	✓	✗	✗

Triage vulnerabilities

1. Lookup (open) vulnerability databases
2. Rank severity and exploitability
3. PURL-based
4. VEX export

Package-URL (PURL) enables tool interoperability

- Critical for managing software supply chain security and integrity
- URL string to identify and locate software packages across various ecosystems and repositories, adopted by:
 - All SBOM and VEX standards including CycloneDX, SPDX, CSAF, and OpenVEX
 - All open source SCA and SBOM tools and most proprietary SCA, SBOM, and code host tools
 - Most open vulnerability databases (part of CVE specification v5.1)
 - Recommended by US CISA, German BSi and the CERT-India
- In the process of Ecma standardization: <https://tc54.org/purl/>
- Read more: <https://nexb.com/purl-universal-software-package-identification/>

FOSS tools to triage vulnerabilities

FOSS Tool	Lookup vulnerability databases	Rank severity and exploitability	PURL-based	VEX export
DependencyTrack	✓	✓	✓	✓
DefectDojo	✓	✓	✗	✗
DejaCode CRAVEX	✓	✓	✓	✓

Need more (and better) tools with more capabilities, especially for mitigating and managing vulnerabilities

And we don't need more vulnerability databases

- We need just one good open package-based vulnerability database
 - Federated with projects submitting vulnerabilities
 - Keyed by PURL to ensure tool interoperability



Peter J. Yost (© 2021) "The One Ring made from scratch in Blender 3D software." (CC BY-SA 4.0). https://upload.wikimedia.org/wikipedia/commons/d/d4/One_Ring_Blender_Render.png

Open vulnerability databases

Open vulnerability database	Open source code	Open infrastructure	PURL-based	Updated data	Scope
US NVD	✗	✗	✗	✗ (delayed)	System + app package + prop
Google OSV	✓	✗	✓ (mostly)	✓	System + app package
GitHub Advisories	✗	✗	✓ (compatible)	✓	App package
GitLab Advisories	✓	✗	✓ (mostly)	✗ (1 month delay)	App package
VulnerableCode	✓	✓	✓	✓	System + app package
Linux distro advisories	✗	✗	✓ (compatible)	✗	System
Ecosystem advisories	✗	✗	✓ (compatible)	✗	App package

Manage compliance

1. Aggregate SBOMs
2. Export VEX and SBOMs
3. PURL-based
4. Dependency updates and remediation

FOSS tools to manage compliance

FOSS Tool	Aggregate SBOMs	Export VEX, SBOMs	PURL-based	Dependency updates and remediation
AboutCode stack (WIP)	✓	✓	✓	✗
OCCTET (WIP)	✓	✓	✓	✗
DependencyTrack	✓	✓	✓	✗
RenovateBot	✗	✗	✗	✓
DependendaBot	✗	✗	✗	✓

Need more (and better) tools with more capabilities, especially for compliance automation

FOSS tools still have work to do

- The state of SCA tooling accuracy is not great
 - Recent large scale comparison of both FOSS and commercial container scanners using SBOMs to compare scans of the same container images
 - Commercial tools made up packages and PURLs
 - Several tools created invalid SBOMs
 - Most only looking at package manifests and DB
 - Beyond package origin, quality of report licenses is bad and misleading
 - In most cases, this is a grep on the declared license of package manifests
- We can do better!
 - FOSS tools performed better than commercial
 - Still many functionality missing to complete end-to-end automation of compliance processes

So, what's next?

We need your help.

We are still missing critical parts.

**We need more open tools, with
more capabilities.**

We need process guides for CRA compliance.

**We need more open
reference data for FOSS.**

**We need this to
solve license AND security!**

Solve the problem(s) with open source tools and open data

- More work to build a complete end-to-end compliance solution:
 - Compliance of open source projects against the CRA compliance
 - Security by design and by default
- Start small and avoid complexity
 - Waste of resources
- Contribute to open source projects
 - <https://github.com/aboutcode-org>
 - <https://www.osadl.org/Projects.osadl-projects.0.html>
- Engage with the community
 - Attend the FOSS compliance tools workshop before FOSDEM 2025: <https://workshop.aboutcode.org>
 - Join the Open Regulatory Compliance Working Group: <https://orcwg.org/>
 - AboutCode Slack: https://join.slack.com/t/aboutcode-org/shared_invite/zt-2hjzc448i-SZULSu10~h6YNSUnBWIAqA

**Part two will cover
how to use FOSS tools to
automate compliance**

Questions?

Connect on LinkedIn!



Philippe Ombredanne

**Lead Maintainer,
AboutCode**

Project Nayuki (© 2024) QR-Code-generator [Source code]
(MIT). <https://github.com/nayuki/QR-Code-generator>