

Dalla Malware Analysis alla Cyber Threat Information Sharing



Who I am

O Independent Consultant in many cyber security realms as digital forensics investigation and incident response management



O Partner and Principal Scientist at DeepCyber

Get in touch!

- **Email**: fschifilliti@gmail.com
- ► **Twitter**: @fschifilliti
- LinkedIn: https://www.linkedin.com/in/fschifilliti



Agenda





Evaluation and Classification of Information Sharing

Pyramid of Pain

Representation of Threat Information Elements

Introduction to the STIX Language

Cyber Threat Intel to represent Malware Analysis



Cyber Threat Information Sharing

Goal of Cyber Threat Intelligence Sharing Create an ecosystem where actionable cyber threat intelligence is automatically shared in real-time to enable real-time defense – the detection, prevention and mitigation of cyber threats before or as they occur.



Cyber Threat Information Sharing - Basic questions

1 What to share?

Assuming that a **cyber threat** is "any circumstance or event with the potential to adversely impact organizational operations [..], organizational assets, individuals, other organizations, or the Nation through an information system via unauthorized access, destruction, disclosure, or modification of information, and/or denial of service."

(Cyber) Threat information is any information related to a threat (Indicators, TTPs, Security alerts, etc...) that might help an organization protect itself against a threat or detect the activities of an actor.

2 With whom to share?

Any Public or Private 'organizations' that collect knowledge/experiences and can sharing them within a <u>community of</u> <u>interest</u>, in order to enhancing the defensive capabilities of multiple organizations.

B Why to share?

- Improved Security Posture. By developing and sharing threat information, organizations gain a better understanding of the threat environment and can use threat information to inform their cybersecurity and risk management practices.
- Knowledge Maturation. When <u>seemingly unrelated</u> observations are shared and analyzed by organizations, those observations can be correlated with data collected by others. This enrichment process increases the value of information by enhancing existing indicators and by developing knowledge of actor TTPs that are associated with a specific incident, threat, or threat campaign. Correlation can also impart valuable insights into the relationships that exist between indicators.
- Greater Defensive Agility. Actors continually adapt their TTPs to try to evade detection, circumvent security controls, and exploit new vulnerabilities. Organizations that share information are often better informed about changing TTPs and the need to rapidly detect and respond to threats.



Cyber Threat Information Sharing – Minimum conditions

Each Sharing Relationships (or Trusted Circles), at least, MUST:

- Specify the scope of information sharing activities: the scoping activity should identify types of information that an organization's key stakeholders authorize for sharing, the circumstances under which sharing of this information is permitted, and those with whom the information can and should be shared.
- Establish information sharing rules: sharing rules are intended to control the publication and distribution of threat information, and consequently help to prevent the dissemination of information that, if improperly disclosed, may have adverse consequences for an organization, its customers, or its business partners.





Cyber Threat Information Sharing - Sharing Models

Hub and Spoke

Hub and Spoke is a sharing model where one organization functions as the central clearinghouse for information, or *hub*, coordinating information exchange between partner organizations, or *spokes*. Spokes can produce and/or consume information from the Hub.

Source/Subscriber

Source/Subscriber is a sharing model where one organization functions as the single *source* of information and sends that information to *subscribers*.

Peer to Peer

Peer to Peer is a sharing model where two or more organizations share information directly with one another. A *Peer* to *Peer* sharing model may be ad-hoc, where information exchange is not coordinated ahead of time and is done on an as-needed basis, may be well defined with legal agreements and established procedures, or somewhere in the middle





Producer only



Cyber Threat Information Sharing – Intel Consuming



Applications/Platforms Layer Protocol				
MISP Malware Information Sharing Platform				
TAXIL Trusted Automated Exchange				
Structured Information				
لا المعالية المعامة المعامة (المعامة المعامة الم				
Feeds in STIX format got by API request				
$=$ {JSON} Feeds in JSON format got by file				
Unstructured Information				
🔄 Information Intel (e.g. IoC) in CSV format				
Information Intel (e.g. loC) in PDF format				
🖄 Information Intel (e.g. loC) in email messages				
Information Intel (e.g. IoC) in shared folders				



Cyber Threat Information Sharing - Intel Producing



9

Processes involved in the Intel

Implementation of CTI Process Lifecycle



CTI Process Lifecycle

- Direction: Define a clear CTI mission that speaks to the goals of the program.
- Collections & Processing: Using a data acquisition strategy, determine how, when, why, and what should be collected to fulfill requirements. Normalize, de-dupe and enrich threat data to produce information that's consumable and applicable. To reduce processing time, automated collection systems
- Production & Analysis: Produce finished intelligence products such as briefings and technical reports that are timely, relevant, actionable, and trace back to stakeholder needs. To the finished intelligence is applied the evaluation, analysis and interpretation against your program's requirements to provide the objectives defined in the dissemination phase.
- Dissemination & Feedback: Deliver finished intelligence products to internal or external stakeholders at defined frequencies and methods. Products should outline expected courses of action and provide a means for stakeholders to evaluate the product received.

Threat Intelligence Platform (TIP)



Cyber Threat Information Ingestion – A sample of Unstructured T.I.



Winter 2017 Edition

elected buscleet all	OVERVIEW OBSERVABLES	NEIGHBORHOOD JSON VERSIONS	HISTORY
me	= 1 + 5-		
Unveiling_Patchwork.pdf	8 I. J. 19		
7ce893d1e08ef1ce62706eabe9aa0813e5e49	✓ TYPE	Type~/ Value	Relation
extremerebolt.com from https://otx.alienvaul	Type to filter ×	uri: http:///http/down.php	Description
53a30dfd90bd1208dcfe534ccd0b798d629aa	🗌 domain	uri: http://7zip.exe/netmon.exe	Description
nduformation com from https://oty-alienvaul	🗌 uri	uri: http://t.ymlp50.com/jmyafaejshbafahsh	Description
f0=0000027h==+0=00020h16=f200=00=1h0h	hash-sha256	uri: https://dev.to/rly	Description
198900092/00008008000200160120080981000	ipv4	uri: http://www.indetectables.net/viewtopic	Description
c2d39a5ed25caf84d5ce68375e420b6445afti	Cve	uri: https://github.com/PowerShellMafia/Po	Description
43c1bee83e6f814a4028192f9f52fb89fea986	nash-md5	uri: http://cnmilit.com/	Description
milresearchcn.com from https://otx.alienvau	asn	uri: http://0entropy.blogspot.com/2012/04/p	Description
53dc1535397fe9bdefd4d69bf8b22751668dfc	> RELATION	uri: https://www.360totelsecurity.com/	Description
lujunxinxi.com from https://otx.alienvault.com	N MALICIOUSNESS	uri: https://www.exploit.db.com/exploits/35	Description
bbe27671b94d040342312431a24ebb4f9685	y MALICIOUSNESS		
637b305164ed634f4c20bcb89030417f9d414	> DATE	1 - 10 of 265	

12

Cyber Threat Information Ingestion – Some sample of Structured T.I.



Evaluation of Information

Evaluation of Information occurs in the processing stage of the intelligence cycle recognizing that collected information cannot be accepted at face value. Each item of information used in the creation of an assessment is given an indication of source reliability and assessed accuracy, based on corroboration or other assessment. The method used to such as this evaluation is dubbed *Admiralty System* (or NATO System).

 A
 I
 I
 I
 I

 B
 C
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I

 B
 C
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I

 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I

 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I

 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I

Accuracy of Information



- A Completely reliable: No doubt of authenticity, trustworthiness, or competency; has a history of complete reliability
- **B** Usually reliable: Minor doubt about authenticity, trustworthiness, or competency; has a history of valid information most of the time
- C Fairly reliable: Doubt of authenticity, trustworthiness, or competency but has provided valid information in the past
- **D** Not usually reliable: Significant doubt about authenticity, trustworthiness, or competency but has provided valid information in the past
- E Unreliable: Lacking in authenticity, trustworthiness, and competency; history of invalid information
- F Reliability cannot be judged: No basis exists for evaluating the reliability of the source

Accuracy of data. An item is assessed for credibility based on likelihood and levels of corroboration by other sources.

1 - Confirmed by other sources: Confirmed by other independent sources; logical in itself; Consistent with other information on the subject

- 2 Probably True: Not confirmed; logical in itself; consistent with other information on the subject
- **3** Possibly True: Not confirmed; reasonably logical in itself; agrees with some other information on the subject
- 4 Doubtful: Not confirmed; possible but not logical; no other information on the subject
- 5 Improbable: Not confirmed; not logical in itself; contradicted by other information on the subject
- 6 Truth cannot be judged: No basis exists for evaluating the validity of the information



Classification of Information Sharing

Classification of Information for sharing it is designed to improve the flow of information between individuals, organizations or communities in a controlled and trusted way. The **Traffic Light Protocol** (TLP) is based on the concept of the originator labeling information with one of four colors to indicate what further dissemination, if any, can be undertaken by the recipient. The recipient must consult the originator if wider dissemination is required.

TLP:RED = Not for disclosure, restricted to participants only. Sources may use TLP:RED when information cannot be effectively acted upon by additional parties, and could lead to impacts on a party's privacy, reputation, or operations if misused. Recipients may not share TLP:RED information with any parties outside of the specific exchange, meeting, or conversation in which it was originally disclosed. In most circumstances, TLP:RED should be exchanged verbally or in person.

TLP:AMBER = Limited disclosure, restricted to participants' organizations. Sources may use TLP:AMBER when information requires support to be effectively acted upon, yet carries risks to privacy, reputation, or operations if shared outside of the organizations involved. Recipients may only share TLP:AMBER information with members of their own organization, and with clients or customers who need to know the information to protect themselves or prevent further harm. Sources are at liberty to specify additional intended limits of the sharing: these must be adhered to.

TLP:GREEN = Limited disclosure, restricted to the community. Sources may use TLP:GREEN when information is useful for the awareness of all participating organizations as well as with peers within the broader community or sector. Recipients may share TLP:GREEN information with peers and partner organizations within their sector or community, but not via publicly accessible channels. Information in this category can be circulated widely within a particular community. TLP:GREEN information may not released outside of the community.

TLP:WHITE = Disclosure is not limited. Sources may use TLP:WHITE when information carries minimal or no foreseeable risk of misuse, in accordance with applicable rules and procedures for public release. Subject to standard copyright rules, TLP:WHITE information may be distributed without restriction.



Let there be IoC



16

Indicators of Compromise (IoC)

Indicators of Compromise (IOCs) are forensic artifacts of an intrusion that can be identified on a host or network.

Using Indicators of Compromise, insights an incidents become shareable with other organizations. An incident at one organization can be only one of multiple, similar incidents at other organizations. Information regarding an incident at one organization can lead to detection and possibly prevention within other organizations.



AACK IN BO[®] Winter 2017 Edition

(*) https://blogs.technet.microsoft.com/mmpc/2017/06/27/new-ransomware-old-techniques-petya-adds-worm-capabilities

Limitation of IoC: Indicators of Compromise don't provide any information in support of such *contextualization* of an incident as the following:

- 1. Who was hit by this attack?
- 2. Who is behind this attack, and what is the sophistication level of this attacker?
- 3. What happened and what is the damage done?
- 4. Where in the network did the attack take place?
- 5. When did the attack take place?
- 6. Why did this attack take place?



Pyramid of Pain

The *Pyramid of Pain* shows the relationships between the types of indicators you might use to detect an adversary's activities and how much pain it will cause them when you are able to deny those indicators to them. The Pyramid measures potential usefulness of your intel and the difficulty of obtaining that intel.



Each elements in the Pyramid of Pain found should be closely **linked** to the others and **validated** to avoid great errors

Pyramid of Pain and never a some of joy

EACH INDICATOR OF A PYRAMID OF PAIN IS NEEDED TO ANALYZE AN INCIDENT!

Okay, but:

Issues #1: How representing all indicators in a Pyramid of Pain?

Issues #2: Our work is completed after being given all indicators?



Representation of threat information elements



What is threat intelligence?

 $((\cdot))$



Type of Threat Intelligence

Winter 2017 |Ed



Different type of Threat Intelligence

Technical & Tactical TI: Tech&Tactical threat intelligence can be one of the most useful forms of intelligence in terms of protecting the organization. It is defined as information that concerns the tactics used by threat groups – including their tools and methodologies – and is often referred to as Tactics, Techniques, and Procedures (TTPs)

Operational TI: Operational threat intelligence is actionable information on specific incoming attacks. Ideally, it informs on the nature of the attack, the identity and capability of the attacker – and gives an indication of when the attack will take place. It is used to mitigate the attack: for example, by removing attack paths or hardening services.

Strategic TI: Strategic threat intelligence is consumed by high-level strategists within an organization, typically the board or those who report to the board. Its purpose is to help strategists understand current risks, and to identify further risks of which they are as yet unaware. It deals in such high-level concepts as risk and likelihoods, rather than technical aspects; and it is used by the board to guide strategic business decisions and to understand the impact of the decisions that are made.

23

STIX - Use Cases

STIX is targeted to support a range of core use cases involved in cyber threat management. Very simple overviews of these *use cases* are provided below:



STIX – Language components

STIX is a language for the specification, capture, characterization and communication of standardized cyber threat information. It does so in a structured fashion to support more effective cyber threat management processes and application of automation.



STIX – Component data models (STIX v1.x)



STIX Domain Objects (SDO)

Observable. Represents information about stateful properties or measurable events pertinent to the operation of computers and networks. Information about a file (name, hash, size, etc.), a registry key value, a service being started, or an HTTP request being sent are all simple examples of observables



Indicator. Contains information on observable patterns of entities, events, behaviors of interest, etc. within a cyber security context. It relates these observable patterns to particular TTPs that threat actors employ and provide additional information such as confidence in the indicator's assertion, handling restrictions, valid time windows, likely impact, sightings of the indicator, structured test mechanisms for detection, related campaigns, suggested courses of action, related indicators, the source of the Indicator, etc.



TTP. Borrowed from a military term "Tactics, Techniques, Procedures" to represent the adversary's behavior (or modus operandi) when executing the attack. A TTP may contain information such as what victims the threat actor targets, what attack patterns and malware they use, and what resources (infrastructure, tools, personas) they leverage



Incident. Describes a cyber security incident, e.g. what occurred, the impact of the incident on systems and information, the incident timeline, points of contact, and other descriptive information



Threat Actor. Characterizes or identifies the attacker or adversary. Provides information such as identifying characteristics, sophistication of the threat actor, its motivations and desired effects, and historically observed behavior.



Exploit Target. Contains information about a technical vulnerability, weakness, or misconfiguration in software, systems, or networks that may be targeted for exploitation by a threat actor



Course of Action. Represents a set of activities that may be taken either in response to an attack or as a preventative measure prior to an attack



((•))

Winter 2017 Edi

Campaign. Represents a set of activities or mission that a threat actor(s) carries out to achieve a desired effect

ndicatedTTP[*] Campaign Observabl HistoricalCampaign[*] Attribution[*] RelatedObservable[* RelatedIncidentI* ObservedTTP[* LeveragedTTP[*] -ExploitTarget[*] COATaken[*] ThreatActo Incider COARequested[*

RelatedExploitTa

RelatedIncident[*]

STIX Relationship Objects (SRO)



SuggestedCOA[*]

ParameterObservable[*

STIX – Component data models (STIX v2.x)



STIX v2 Domain Objects (SDOs):

Attack Pattern. A type of Tactics, Techniques, and Procedures (TTP) that describes ways threat actors attempt to compromise targets



Campaign. A grouping of adversarial behaviors that describes a set of malicious activities or attacks that occur over a period of time against a specific set of targets



Course of Action. An action taken to either prevent an attack or respond to an attack.



Identity. Individuals, organizations, or groups, as well as classes of individuals, organizations, or groups.



Indicator. Contains a pattern that can be used to detect suspicious or malicious cyber activity.



Intrusion Set. A grouped set of adversarial behaviors and resources with common properties believed to be orchestrated by a single threat actor.



Malware. A type of TTP, also known as malicious code and malicious software, used to compromise the confidentiality, integrity, or availability of a victim's data or system



Observed Data. Conveys information observed on a system or network (e.g., an IP address).



Vulnerability. A mistake in software that can be directly used by a hacker to gain access to a system or network

Tool. Legitimate software that can be used by threat actors to perform



attacks.

Report. Collections of threat intelligence focused on one or more topics, such as a description of a threat actor, malware, or attack technique, including contextual details.



Threat Actor. Individuals, groups, or organizations believed to be operating with malicious intent

STIX Relationship Objects (SROs)



Relationship. Used to link two SDOs and to describe how they are related to each other.



Sighting. Denotes the belief that an element of CTI was seen (e.g., indicator, malware).



Some difference between STIX 1.X/CybOX 2.X and STIX 2

In the following, are reported just a few difference between STIX v1 and STIX v2:

 $((\cdot))$

- ► OASIS Cyber Threat Intelligence decided to merge the CybOX into STIX v2. Cyber Observable eXpression (CybOX[™]) objects are now called STIX Cyber Observables.
- ► JSON vs. XML: STIX 2.0 requires implementations to support JSON serialization, while STIX 1.x was defined using XML.
- STIX Domain Objects: All objects in STIX 2 are at the top-level, rather than being embedded in other objects. The generic TTP (tactics, techniques, procedures) and Exploit Target types from STIX 1.X have been split into separate top-level objects (Attack Pattern, Malware, Tool and Vulnerability) with specific purposes in STIX 2.
- Relationships as Top-Level Objects: STIX 2.0 introduces a top-level Relationship object, which links two other top-level objects via a named relationship type. STIX 2 content can be thought of as a connected graph, where nodes are SDOs and edges are Relationship Objects.
- Data Markings: Data markings no longer use a serialization specific language, e.g., XPath. In STIX 2, there are two types of data markings: object marking applicable to a whole object, and granular markings applicable to a property or properties of an object. Data markings scope is only within the object where they are defined.

Graphical Representation of some elements of APT1 Report



Some benefits of using STIX Representation of CTI

- > STIX and TAXII have reached a good level of maturity it is growing its adoption at many organizations
- ► STIX can be used to characterize indicators, TTPs, exploit targets, and other aspects of a cyber threat. STIX takes advantage of another MITRE schema,

CybOX and can be extended to utilize existing schemas, such as CAPEC or OpenIOC.



- STIX can be used to describe cyber threat intelligence manually or the process can be automated. For those looking to automate the production of STIX XML documents, MITRE has created Python and Java tools to do that.
- On the basis of the timestamp associated to the IoCs ingested, analysts can easily create and maintain updated the timelines related to the incidents analyzed/monitored
- It is possible associate by labeling an entity into a threat intel model (e.g. Diamond Model, Cyber Kill Chain Model, ATT&CK Model, etc)
- ► It is possible give to any information intel a value on trustness and reliability
- The Relation-based of the information intel entities represented in STIX format allows to extend the set of information associated to an analysis



STIX/TAXII Paradigm

Threat Information Representation

2017 Edi

...

Threat Information Sharing

(*)

TAXII (Trusted Automated eXchange of Indicator Information) is the main transport mechanism for cyber threat information represented in STIX. Through the use of TAXII services, organizations can share cyber threat information in a secure and automated manner.

CybOX (Cyber Observable eXpression) is a language for describing events of stateful properties that are observable in the cyber domain. STIX leverages CybOX for this purpose, such as in indicator patterns, infrastructure descriptions, and course of action parameters.

MAEC (Malware Attribute Enumeration and Classification) is a language for describing malware behavior and the results of a malware analysis. STIX leverages MAEC via the TTP construct for this purpose, and additionally both STIX and MAEC use CybOX.

STIX can utilize **CAPEC** (Common Attack Pattern Enumeration and Classification) for structured characterization of tactics, techniques, and procedures (TTP) attack patterns through use of the CAPEC schema extension.

OpenIOC is an extensible XML schema for the description of technical characteristics that identify a known threat, an attacker's methodology, or other evidence of compromise

(*) http://taxiiproject.github.io 31

MAEC + STIX for a ever richest representation



Captures structured, detailed malware information:

- Capabilities
- **Behaviors**
- Actions
- **AV** Classifications ٠
- **Extracted Objects**
- Relationships ٠
- Associated Metadata

Provides analytical context

- "What" does the malware do?
- "How" does the malware operate?

Target audience:

- Malware Analysts/Reverse Engineers

Target audience:

•

information:

Type

Name

Description

- **CTI** Analysts
- SOC/CERT Operators

Provides surrounding context

"Who" used the malware?

"Where" was the malware used?

Incident Responders

Captures unstructured, basic malware Captures broad spectrum of malware information: Basic, descriptive information via STIX and provides Identification

Detailed, structured information via MAEC and provides broader understanding

Brief description of a malware family and detailed descriptions of several of its Members

Provides surrounding and analytical context

- Connects detailed malware information to broader threat context
- "what" specific features of a malware instance are associated with a particular threat actor?

Target audience:

- Malware Analysts/Reverse Engineers
- Cyber Threat/Intelligence Analysts
- **SOC/CERT** Operators
- **Incident Responders**



(*) http://maecproject.github.io

From Malware Analysis to Cyber Threat Intelligence



33

From Malware Analysis to Cyber Threat Intelligence, cont'd

Winter 2017 Edition



Practical example – Main components of infection

OBJECT OF ANALYSIS (brief description): Since August 2017 was observed a campaign tied to the spread of the RAT (Remote Access Trojan) *Netwire.* The campaign impacted also Italy country and target the Bank & Finance sector.



Practical example – IoC representation in STIX

Туре	Value		
filename MD5 IPv4 MD5 Domain Domain MD5 MD5 MD5 MD5	a.js d1b423eecf49097d7443535638cebeff 185.61.138.175 6e5a490ebeeafd8690b7ecbfb9d2acfb 6d3a33e26343f545060f2e209ecdee9e stabber.net amante2.carvalhoassessoria.com f01e60b97574b919067bcee155496d87f9a594e3fc10999dec998e0a114349f5 fbd224d7a654a48da17e2999532f1d0c8f3d114e3bca4a41a1bdf9f684499901 3406cf0450ee28bf09ba837f16b20a39bbf5cccce94f63101ac3eb1f6fe4bdbd a4c40ae7709bbd4f2bf9d100981e20fe6210117e89a816e3fde65d88e27df1eb	Representation of Observables in STIX	Anded-Do Threat Actor d.TTPs Netwire Campa erMelwar
MD5 MD5 MD5 MD5 MD5 URL filename filename URL URL URL MD5 IPv4	6003a334a639b9515c2aad18357994cb836908222494f3aea7e4c2326c90f881 2bd5ea2cfdd822a7654c9b58475b1db655f7c4c77d1ff60b0db5596a4fb5cbe5 e03134bfff2db681f32d9129d1c8ee9393a98ad3093a43740d730975ae87c161 665e56f7de896d691701defce31889534c9e98b9b66f20019eee3a8df9771600 f1fcb9aeff61cc7415661e9927cea51664771fe031d4f52ef124ee55d64ad297 dcc20632135c4c6ebe55389bee231f39e82454458ac4b76b9cb88e49894ff2eb http://185.61.138.175/temp/borah/unknown/1.exe 1.doc 1.xls http://185.61.138.175/temp/borah/unknown/1.xls http://185.61.138.175/temp/borah/unknown/1.xls http://185.61.138.175/temp/borah/unknown/1.xls http://185.61.138.175/temp/borah/unknown/1.xls http://185.61.28	185.61.138.17 91.215.153.25 91.215.153.25 extract 10000ed-Malwa 10000ed-Malwa 10000ed-Malwa 1010000ed-Malwa 1010000ed-Malwa 10100000000000000000000000000000000	iso20022 bank Pownloader iso20022 bank extract Downloaded-Do Indicated TTPs Related TTPs Related TTPs Netwire Campa
document na Filename Filename	ISO20022 Bank Transaction Codes - Structure Report susliks.dll Foreground.cab Loading of the Indicat conteined in the Observ	enrichment enrichment manpower123.s cors vables extract coded-Malware coded-Malware uRL-C2_Netwire Dow	Indicated TTPs cated TTPs Loader-Malwar mloader-Ma extract susliks (file)
Winter 2017 Ec	lition	manpower123 s	a (file) 36

Practical example – First Enrichment & Correlation phase





